LEGISLATIVE RECORD

OF

SENATOR ROBERT L. OWEN.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

To my dear friend Brougham

Sincerely Yours

June 13. 1942

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

51st Cong., 1st Sess.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

2123
Senate
100615

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

CONTAINING

THE PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES

OF THE

SIXTY-FIRST CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION,

ALSO

SPECIAL SESSION OF THE SENATE.

VOLUME XLIV.

WASHINGTON:
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE.
1909.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAMES AND POST-OFFICE ADDRESSES

OF

SENATORS

IN THE

FIRST SESSION OF THE SIXTY-FIRST CONGRESS.

2. Retired not in 60th Cong
25 Senators retired
9 dead

JAMES S. SHERMAN, Vice-President, Utica, N. Y.
WILLIAM P. FRYE, President pro tempore, Lewiston, Me.

Name.	Home post-office.	Name.	Home post-office.
Aldrich, Nelson W	Providence, R. I.	Hale, Eugene	Ellsworth, Me.
Bacon, Augustus O	Macon, Ga.	Heyburn, Weldon B	Wallace, Idaho.
Bailey, Joseph W	Gainesville, Tex.	Hughes, Charles J., jr	Denver, Colo.
Bankhead, John H	Fayette, Ala.	Johnson, Martin N	Petersburg, N. Dak.
Beveridge, Albert J	Indianapolis, Ind.	Johnston, Joseph F	Birmingham, Ala.
Borah, William E	Boise, Idaho.	Jones, Wesley L	North Yakima, Wash.
Bourne, Jonathan, jr	Portland, Oreg.	Kean, John	Elizabeth, N. J.
Bradley, William O	Louisville, Ky.	Knox, Philander C [a]	Pittsburg, Pa.
Brandegee, Frank B	New London, Conn.	La Follette, Robert M	Madison, Wis.
Briggs, Frank O	Trenton, N. J.	Lodge, Henry Cabot	Nahant, Mass.
Bristow, Joseph L	Salina, Kans.	Lorimer, William	Chicago, Ill.
Brown, Norris	Kearney, Nebr.	McCumber, Porter J	Wahpeton, N. Dak.
Bulkeley, Morgan G	Hartford, Conn.	McEnery, Samuel D	New Orleans, La.
Burkett, Elmer J	Lincoln, Nebr.	McLaurin, Anselm J	Brandon, Miss.
Burnham, Henry E	Manchester, N. H.	Martin, Thomas S	Charlottesville, Va.
Burrows, Julius C	Kalamazoo, Mich.	Money, Hernando D	Mississippi City, Miss.
Burton, Theodore E	Cleveland, Ohio.	Nelson, Knute	Alexandria, Minn.
Carter, Thomas H	Helena, Mont.	Newlands, Francis G	Reno, Nev.
Chamberlain, George E	Portland, Oreg.	Nixon, George S	Reno, Nev.
Clapp, Moses E	St. Paul, Minn.	Oliver, George T [b]	Pittsburg, Pa.
Clark, Clarence D	Evanston, Wyo.	Overman, Lee S	Salisbury, N. C.
Clarke, James P	Little Rock, Ark.	Owen, Robert L	Muskogee, Okla.
Clay, Alexander S	Marietta, Ga.	Page, Carroll S	Hyde Park, Vt.
Crane, W. Murray	Dalton, Mass.	Paynter, Thomas H	Greenup, Ky.
Crawford, Coe I	Huron, S. Dak.	Penrose, Boies	Philadelphia, Pa.
Culberson, Charles A	Dallas, Tex.	Perkins, George C	Oakland, Cal.
Cullom, Shelby M	Springfield, Ill.	Piles, Samuel H	Seattle, Wash.
Cummins, Albert B	Des Moines, Iowa.	Rayner, Isidor	Baltimore, Md.
Curtis, Charles	Topeka, Kans.	Richardson, Harry A	Dover, Del.
Daniel, John W	Lynchburg, Va.	Root, Elihu	New York City.
Davis, Jeff	Little Rock, Ark.	Scott, Nathan B	Wheeling, W. Va.
Depew, Chauncey M	New York, N. Y.	Shively, Benj. F	South Bend, Ind.
Dick, Charles	Akron, Ohio.	Simmons, F. M	Trenton (R. F. D.), Jones Co., N. C.
Dillingham, William P	Waterbury, Vt.		
Dixon, Joseph M	Missoula, Mont.	Smith, Ellison D	Florence, S. C.
Dolliver, Jonathan P	Fort Dodge, Iowa.	Smith, John Walter	Snow Hill, Md.
du Pont, Henry A	Winterthur, Del.	Smith, Wm. Alden	Grand Rapids, Mich.
Elkins, Stephen B	Elkins, W. Va.	Smoot, Reed	Provo, Utah.
Fletcher, D. Upshaw	Jacksonville, Fla.	Stephenson, Isaac	Marinette, Wis.
Flint, Frank P	Los Angeles, Cal.	Stone, William J	Jefferson City, Mo.
Foster, Murphy J	Franklin, La.	Sutherland, George	Salt Lake City, Utah.
Frazier, James B	Chattanooga, Tenn.	Taliaferro, James P	Jacksonville, Fla.
Frye, William P	Lewiston, Me.	Taylor, Robert L	Nashville, Tenn.
Gallinger, Jacob H	Concord, N. H.	Tillman, Benjamin R	Trenton, S. C.
Gamble, Robert J	Yankton, S. Dak.	Warner, William	Kansas City, Mo.
Gore, Thomas P	Lawton, Okla.	Warren, Francis E	Cheyenne, Wyo.
Guggenheim, Simon	Denver, Colo.	Wetmore, George P	Newport, R. I.

[a] Resigned March 5, 1909.

[b] Elected in place of Philander C. Knox, resigned.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

OLMSTED—Continued.
Petitions and papers presented by, from
Citizens and individuals 120, 461.
Remarks by, on
Adjourning over 2648.
Extra pay to employees 4570, 4571, 4572.
Notification to President 55.
Porto Rico 1996, 2125, 2126, 2465, 2466, 2468, 2470, 2472, 2515, 2517, 2518, 2522, 2523, 2723, 2917, 2918, 2919, 2930, 2931, 2933, 2934.
President's traveling expenses 4480, 4481.
Rules of House 28.
Rules of House and power of Speaker. (Appendix 103.)
Tariff bill 1291, 1292.
Votes of. *See* YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

OLMSTED, MARTIN L., increase pension (see bill H. R. 6717).

OLMSTED, WILLIAM W., increase pension (see bill S. 2868).

OLSCAMP, JOSEPH S., increase pension (see bill H. R. 10548).

OLSEN, MRS. LAURITZ
Resolution in House to pay (H. Res. 73), passed 2935, 3772.

OLSON, FRED, ALIAS WILLIAM BROWN, pension (see bill H. R. 10260).

OLSON, MAGGIE, increase pension (see bill S. 1584).

OMAHA, NEBRASKA
Bill to establish army quartermaster's depot at (see bill S. 229).
Bill creating an additional division of Railway Mail Service with headquarters at (see bill S. 542).
Amendment in Senate making appropriation for erection of warehouse for Indian Service at 136.

OMAHA GRAIN EXCHANGE
Telegram relating to duty on barley 2553.

OMAHA INDIANS. *See* INDIANS.

O'MARA, JOHN L., relief (see bill H. R. 4291).

OMWEG, ANNA, pension (see bill S. 1406).

ONANCOCK RIVER, VIRGINIA
Bill to improve (see bill S. 2521).

O'NEIL, CORNELIUS, increase pension (see bill H. R. 8084).

O'NEIL, MARY E., pension (see bill H. R. 3359).

O'NEILL, CORA C., pension (see bill S. 72).

O'NEILL, MICHAEL, increase pension (see bill H. R. 3816).

ONIONSKIN PAPER
Letter of Mutual Paper Company relative to tariff on 3379.

ONTARIO, OREGON
Bill to allow chamber of commerce to bridge Snake River (see bill S. 837).

OPERTI, ALBERTI, relief (see bill H. R. 1078).

ORANGE, JAMES, remove charge of desertion (see bill H. R. 1335).

ORANGEBURG, SOUTH CAROLINA
Bill for relief of German Lutheran Church of (see bill H. R. 7465).
Joint resolution to donate condemned cannon for decoration of monument at (see H. J. Res. 60).

ORANGES.
Statistics relating to production of 2567, 2573.

ORDNANCE AND FORTIFICATIONS
Bill to acquire lands at Cape Henry, Va., for fortification and coast defense (see bill H. R. 3066).

ORDWAY, CHARLES N., relief of estate (see bill H. R. 11677).

OREGON
Bills to amend law relative to collection districts in (see bills S. 538; H. R. 45, 11132).
Bill to pay war claim of (see bill H. R. 9962).
Bill to issue homestead patents to certain lands in former Siletz Indian Reservation in (see bill H. R. 11490).
Bill reserving certain public lands for public park in (see bill H. R. 11934).
Memorial of legislature for establishment of line of steamships along Pacific coast 255, 308.
Report of Court of Claims on claim of State of (S. Doc. 28) 1692.
Resolution of inquiry in Senate relative to salaries of postmasters in (S. Res. 72) 4920.

OREGON CITY, OREGON
Bill making appropriation for boat canal and locks at (see bill H. R. 50).
Bill to erect public building at (see bill H. R. 3046).

ORGAN, ROLLIN B., increase pension (see bill H. R. 2043).

ORGANIZED MILITIA. *See* MILITIA.

ORINOCO STEAMSHIP COMPANY AND OTHERS
Message of President transmitting report relative to claims against Venezuela of (S. Doc. 13) 1401.

ORLANDO, FLORIDA
Bill to erect public building at (see bill S. 1387).

ORMSBY, JOHN H., increase pension (see bill S. 2243).

O'ROURKE, J. M., pension (see bill H. R. 536).

O'ROURKE, JAMES, pension (see bill H. R. 6713).

ORR, ROBERT, increase pension (see bill H. R. 8319).

ORR, WILLIAM, increase pension (see bill H. R. 12021).

ORTH, JACOB G., increase pension (see bill H. R. 1376).

ORTIZ, JOSE SALAZAR Y, relief (see bill H. R. 6338).

ORTMAN, JULIUS, pension (see bill S. 418).

OSAGE INDIANS. *See* INDIANS.

OSAGE RIVER, MISSOURI
Bill to improve (see bill H. R. 2267).

OSBAN, JESSE, correct military record (see bill H. R. 9892).

OSBORN, ALLEN, increase pension (see bill S. 2522).

OSBORN, ISAAC G., correct military record (see bill H. R. 11884).

OSBORN, ISRAEL T., increase pension (see bill H. R. 7722).

OSBORN, ROBERT, increase pension (see bill H. R. 8317).

OSBORN, THOMAS E., pension (see bill H. R. 9251).

OSBORNE, DAVID, increase pension (see bill H. R. 7747).

OSMAN, ISRAEL, increase pension (see bill H. R. 4232).

OSTEEN, RICHARD S., pension (see bill H. R. 6827).

OSTHELDER, JOSEPH, increase pension (see bill H. R. 1790).

OSTRANDER, BRADFORD G., increase pension (see bill H. R. 9600).

OSTRANDER, THEODORE, increase pension (see bill H. R. 6268).

O'SULLIVAN, DANIEL, correct military record (see bill H. R. 3834).

OTIS, SAMUEL, relief of estate (see bill H. R. 1164).

OTOE AND MISSOURIA RESERVATION. *See* INDIANS.

O'TOOLE, ALLEN EDWARD, AND OTHERS, relief (see bills S. 2262; H. R. 9156).

OTT, WILLIAM F., increase pension (see bill H. R. 11865).

OTTAWA, KANSAS
Bill to erect public building at (see bill H. R. 9276).

OTTO, JOHN, increase pension (see bill S. 2617).

OTTO, JOHN B., increase pension (see bill H. R. 1736).

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

OUACHITA RIVER
Bills to extend time for construction of bridge across (see bills S. 2827; H. R. 6866).
Bill to allow Ouachita County, Ark., to bridge (see bill H. R. 11572).

OUSLEY, EDWARD, pension (see bill H. R. 1071).
Bill for relief of (see bill H. R. 1088).

OVERCAPITALIZATION. *See* CORPORATIONS.

OVERLY, ROBERT H., increase pension (see bill H. R. 7854).

OVERLY, WILLIAM H., increase pension (see bill H. R. 8993).

OVERMAN, LEE S. (*a Senator from North Carolina*)
Attended 2, 15.
Appointed on committees 120.
Amendments offered by, to
Tariff bill—cotton ties 3877, 4140.
——— glass 1376.
——— immigrant tax 1524, 4293.
——— plate glass 4283, 4284.
——— trust made goods 1930, 4286.
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Albritton, J. C: to increase pension (see bill S. 1846) 1375.
Ballinger, James J: to increase pension (see bill S. 1835) 1374.
Beachboard, Caroline: to pension (see bill S. 1836) 1375.
Buckner, Stephen M: to increase pension (see bill S. 1837) 1375.
Burlington, N. C: to erect public building at (see bill S. 1829) 1374.
Capps, John D: to increase pension (see bill S. 1833) 1374.
Carroll, James: to pension (see bill S. 1852) 1375.
Carroll, Smith F: to increase pension (see bill S. 1841) 1375.
Carter, Wilson: to increase pension (see bill S. 1847) 1375.
Creasman, William L: to increase pension (see bill S. 1849) 1375.
Edge, H. J: to increase pension (see bill S. 1840) 1375.
Edwards, Timothy: to pension (see bill S. 1855) 1375.
Hagan, Chisley G: to increase pension (see bill S. 1850) 1375.
Henderson, Jane: to increase pension (see bill S. 1856) 1375.
Hensley, Elijah P: to increase pension (see bill S. 1839) 1375.
Hess, William, alias William Smith, to increase pension (see bill S. 1834) 1374.
Johnson, Stephen: for relief of estate (see bill S. 1830) 1374.
Lawrence, Elza: to pension (see bill S. 1843) 1375.
Monteiro, P. C: to increase pension (see bill S. 1853) 1375.
Rector, Alfred: to increase pension (see bill S. 1832) 1374.
Roberts, Sophronia: to increase pension (see bill S. 1844) 1375.
Roberts, Wiley S: to pension (see bill S. 1838) 1375.
——— to increase pension (see bill S. 1858) 1375.
Rockingham, N. C: to erect public building at (see bill S. 1828) 1374.
Skipper, Daniel: to pension (see bill S. 1851) 1375.
Smith, John: to increase pension (see bill S. 1848) 1375.
Sprinkle, James B: to increase pension (see bill S. 1842) 1375.
Stanton, Zennie: to pension (see bill S. 1831) 1374.
Stephens, Edwin: to increase pension (see bill S. 1854) 1375.
Voris, Joseph B: to pension (see bill S. 1857) 1375.
Wacaster, Seymour B: to pension (see bill S. 1845) 1375.
White, Henry A: to increase pension (see bill S. 1860) 1375.
Petitions and papers presented by, from
Citizens and individuals 1445.
Societies and associations 2604, 3415.
Remarks by, on
Corporation tax 4028, 4065.
Immigrant tax 1524, 1528, 3156, 4293, 4294, 4298.
Income tax 4110, 4111.
International Harvester Company 3158, 3159.

OVERMAN—Continued.
Remarks by, on
South and prosperity 3159.
Tennessee Coal and Iron Company 3158.
Tariff 1447, 3154, 3158.
——— agricultural implements 3834, 3835, 3853, 3854, 3855.
——— plate glass 4283, 4284.
Wages in Germany 2680.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

OVERMAN, PATRICK H., increase pension (see bill H. R. 2345).

OVERMIRE, SILAS, correct military record (see bill H. R. 6668).

OVERTON, CHARLES A., increase pension (see bill H. R. 10506).

OVERTON, E. C., relief of estate (see bill H. R. 5387).

OVERTON HOTEL COMPANY, MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE
Bill for relief (see bill H. R. 7955).

OVERTURF, FRANKLIN C., increase pension (see bill H. R. 1679).

OWEN, ALFRED, increase pension (see bill H. R. 6701).

OWEN, BENJAMIN F., increase pension (see bill H. R. 913).

OWEN, HARRY W., pension (see bill H. R. 2055).

OWEN, J. B., relief of estate (see bill S. 2676).

OWEN, JOHN T., relief (see bill H. R. 5572).

OWEN NATHANIEL L., increase pension (see bill H. R. 3094).

OWEN, RACHEL B., pension (see bill S. 3057).

OWEN, ROBERT L. (*a Senator from Oklahoma*)
Attended 2.
Appointed on committees 120.
Excused from service on Joint Committee on Revision of the Laws 8.
Amendments offered by, to
Tariff bill—blankets and flannels 3037.
——— oil 3827.
——— reduction of schedule rates 2105, 3934, 4282.
——— woolens 1680.
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Absentee Shawnee Indians: for relief (see bill S. 2029) 1568.
Baca, Juan Rey: for relief (see bill S. 1974) 1490.
Baca, Matias: for relief of estate (see bill S. 1974) 1490.
Baca, Pablo Ciriaco: for relief (see bill S. 1973) 1490.
Baldwin, Frank D: to promote and place on retired list of army (see bill S. 2603) 3154.
Chippewa Indians: for relief of Saginaw Swan Creek and Black River land of (see bill S. 2638) 3486.
Constitution of United States: for amendment relative to election of Senators (see S. J. Res. 41) 4169.
Courts of United States: to provide against reversal of judgment in (see bill S. 1967) 1490.
——— to establish probation system in (see bill S. 2633) 3416.
Delaware Indians: to adjudicate claims of (see bill S. 1979) 1490.
Eggert, Fritz: for relief of estate (see bill S. 1977) 1490.
Fuentes, Guadalupe Lujan de: for relief of estate (see bill S. 1976) 1490.
Indians: to amend act to prohibit sale of intoxicants to (see bills S. 1980, 1981) 1490.
Jones, Sabini: for relief (see bill S. 1970) 1490.
Kaw Indians: to adjudicate claims of (see bill S. 1982) 1490.
Lepoint, Mrs. Candelaria L. de: for relief (see bill S. 1972) 1490.
Madril, Manuel: for relief (see bill S. 1971) 1490.
Marshals and special officers: to pension widows and orphans of those killed in line of duty (see bill S. 2602) 3154.
Miami Indians: for relief (see bill S. 2632) 3416.
Osage Indians: to enroll certain persons as members of tribe (see bill S. 1978) 1490.
——— to determine amount paid by Osages to "civilization fund" and applied to benefit of other Indians (see S. J. Res. 24) 1490.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

OWEN—Continued.
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service: to promote efficiency of (see bill S. 1968) 1490.
Sequoyah—Indian: to erect statue of (see bill S. 2630) 3416.
Tahlequah, Okla: to establish fish-hatchery at (see bill S. 2631) 3416.
Tucker, Joseph B: for relief (see bill S. 1975) 1490.
Williams, M. L: to pension (see bill S. 1969) 1490.
Motions and resolutions offered by
Cost of production: for reprint of report of Carroll D. Wright on (S. Doc. 20, 55th Cong., 3d sess.) 2352.
Dependent children: to print report of conference on care of (S. Res. 39) 1588.
Independent oil producers and refiners: to print proceedings of conference of (S. Doc. 88) 3162.
——— to print memorial of (S. Doc. 88, pt. 2) 3486.
Navajo Indians: to print memorial relative to imprisonment of (S. Doc. 118) 3913.
Protection's Favors to Foreigners: for reprint of article by James G. Parsons on (S. Doc. 54) 2285, 3991.
The Chase of the Sugar Smugglers: to print article entitled (S. Doc. 60) 2410.
Petitions and papers presented by, from
Citizens and individuals 3661, 3913.
Societies and associations 1489, 3628, 3913.
Remarks by, on
Crime of perjury 3436, 3437.
Davis, Mr: votes of 3916.
Income and corporation tax 1820, 1821, 2082, 2084, 2085, 2104, 2105, 4010.
Inheritance tax 3950.
Printing in Record 2410.
Tariff 3251, 3260, 3263, 3266, 3267, 3268, 3269, 3270, 3271, 3288.
——— agricultural products 3436.
——— blankets and flannels 3037, 3038, 3039, 3040, 3041, 3042, 3043, 3044, 3055, 3256, 3257.
——— cost of production 2530, 2531.
——— cotton goods 2863, 2870, 2903, 2904, 2905.
——— hides 3661.
——— incidental protection 2440.
——— oil 3823, 3824, 3826, 3827, 3923.
——— reduction of schedule rates 3934, 3935.
——— retailers' prices 2133, 2134, 2135, 2136, 2137.
——— sugar 2306, 2308, 2309, 2410, 2530, 2531.
——— tea 3923.
——— wood pulp and print paper 3395, 3396, 3405, 3406.
——— wool prices 3055.
——— woolen goods 3255, 3256, 3257, 3281.
——— woolen yarns 3040, 3041, 3042, 3043, 3044, 3256, 3257.
Tariff bill amendments 3917.
Wages in various industries 3265, 3266, 3267, 3268, 3269, 3270, 3271, 3272.
Votes of. See YEA-AND-NAY VOTES.

OWEN, WILLIAM R., correct military record (see bill S. 1224).

OWEN COUNTY, KENTUCKY
Relief (see bill S. 2007).

OWEN, ALMAREEN, SR., relief (see bill H. R. 856).

OWENS, BAILEY, relief (see bill H. R. 10346).

OWENS, CHARLES J., pension (see bills H. R. 5916, 11966).

OWENS, GEORGE W., increase pension (see bill H. R. 7186).

OWENS, JACOB, increase pension (see bill H. R. 453).

OWENS, JAMES, correct military record (see bill H. R. 11296).

OWENS, JOHN, increase pension (see bill H. R. 8992).

OWENS, ROBERT, pension (see bill H. R. 9458).

OWENS, TIDE, pension (see bill H. R. 282).

OWENS, WESLEY, increase pension (see bill H. R. 8320).

OWINGS, SAMUEL, increase pension (see bill S. 2242).

OWNBY, THOMAS, correct military record (see bill H. R. 504).

OWSLEY, ALEX, pension (see bill H. R. 9063).

OYSTER, DANIEL, increase pension (see bill H. R. 9360).

OZMENT, MARTIN H., increase pension (see bill H. R. 1264).

OZMUN, EDWARD O., relief (see bill H. R. 9107).

PACE, JOHN, relief of estate (see bill H. R. 12080).

PACE, RICHMOND, relief of estate (see bill H. R. 11458).

PACE, WILLIAM, pension (see bill H. R. 10217).

PACETTY, ADOLPHUS N., pension (see bill S. 1407).

PACIFIC COAST
Bill directing Secretary of War to establish and operate line of steamers along (see bill S. 428).
Bill to establish marine fishery station on (see bill H. R. 12002).
Memorial of legislature of Oregon for establishment of line of steamships along 255, 308.
Memorial of Portland (Oreg.) Chamber of Commerce for establishment of line of steamships along 1445.
Memorial of Spokane (Wash.) Chamber of Commerce for establishment of line of steamships along 1445.

PACK, GEORGE W., pension (see bill H. R. 11323).

PACK, HARRISON, correct military record (see bill H. R. 9891).

PACK, THEODORE, pension (see bill H. R. 7046).

PACK, WILLIAM, increase pension (see bill H. R. 8994).

PACKARD, JOHN A., increase pension (see bill S. 1415).

PACKER, R. J. AND MRS. R. V., relief of estate (see bill S. 2574).

PADDOCK, BENSON W., pension (see bill H. R. 3899).

PADEN, EMERSON E., pension (see bill S. 1264).

PADGETT, LEMUEL P. (*a Representative from Tennessee*)
Attended 17.
Appointed on committees 5091.
Leave of absence granted to 3223.
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Alexander, G. M. D: for relief (see bill H. R. 5434) 393.
Amis, Jonathan: for relief (see bill H. R. 5381) 393.
Anderson, Josephine O: for relief (see bill H. R. 5441) 394.
Anderson, Stephen: to pension (see bill H. R. 5359) 392.
Atchison, John B. and Clifton E: for relief (see bill H. R. 11688) 4491.
Bailey, S. H., sr: for relief (see bill H. R. 5365) 392.
Baugh, Joseph W., sr: for relief of heirs (see bill H. R. 5421) 393.
Beasley, William M: for relief (see bill H. R. 5376) 393.
Beiser, Joseph: to increase pension (see bill H. R. 5355) 392.
Birdsong, John H: for relief of estate (see bill H. R. 5398) 393.
Bolton, Benjamin: for relief of estate (see bill H. R. 5389) 393.
Brewer, H. J: for relief (see bill H. R. 5369) 393.
Brison, J. J: for relief of estate (see bill H. R. 5402) 393.
Buck, Randall, or Randall Conn: for relief (see bill H. R. 5432) 393.
Butt, Mitchell H: for relief (see bill H. R. 11682) 4491.
Buyers, N. M: for relief of estate (see bill H. R. 5413) 393.
Caldwell, B. H: for relief of estate (see bill H. R. 5388) 393.
Campbell, James M: for relief (see bill H. R. 11687) 4491.
Chearis, N. F: for relief (see bill H. R. 5380) 393.
Childress, Mitchell J: for relief of estate (see bill H. R. 5384) 393.
Clark, Walter C: to increase pension (see bill H. R. 5352) 392.
Clifton, Tenn., Clifton Masonic Lodge: for relief (see bill H. R. 11695) 4491.
Clifton, Tenn., Cumberland Presbyterian Church: for relief (see bill H. R. 11671) 4491.
Columbia, Tenn., St. Peter's Protestant Episcopal Church: for relief (see bill H. R. 5428) 393.
Curry, Nathan: for relief of heirs (see bill H. R. 5439) 394.
Dillard, Lydia: for relief (see bill H. R. 11665) 4491.
Eggleston, Edward W: for relief (see bill H. R. 11696) 4491.
Ewing, Joseph: for relief (see bill H. R. 11679) 4491.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

PADGETT—Continued.
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Ezell, Amasa: for relief of heirs (see bill H. R. 5422) 393.
Fariss, Mora B: for relief (see bill H. R. 11694) 4491.
Foresee, Daniel: for relief of estate (see bill H. R. 5399) 393.
Foster, Rial: for relief (see bill H. R. 11666) 4491.
Francis, W. H: for relief (see bill H. R. 5375) 393.
Franklin, Louis M: to increase pension (see bill H. R. 5353) 392.
Franklin, Tenn., Christian Church: for relief (see bill H. R. 11675) 4491.
Franklin, Tenn., Franklin Masonic Lodge: for relief (see bill H. R. 11691) 4491.
Franklin, Tenn., Harpeth Academy: for relief (see bill H. R. 11693) 4491.
Franklin, Tenn., Hiram Masonic Lodge: for relief (see bill H. R. 11669) 4491.
Franklin, Tenn., Methodist Episcopal Church South: for relief (see bill H. R. 11690) 4491.
Franklin, Tenn., Missionary Baptist Church: for relief (see bill H. R. 5437) 393.
Franklin, Tenn., Presbyterian Church: for relief (see bill H. R. 11685) 4491.
Franklin, Tenn., St. Paul's Episcopal Church: for relief (see bill H. R. 11692) 4491.
Franklin Military National Park: to establish (see bill H. R. 5195) 390.
Freudenthal, Gustave: to increase pension (see bill H. R. 5357) 392.
Gailey, Hiram: for relief of estate (see bill H. R. 5425) 393.
Garrison, Nancy P: for relief of estate (see bill H. R. 5404) 393.
Giles County, Tenn., Lynn Creek Baptist Church: for relief (see bill H. R. 11674) 4491.
Giles County, Tenn., Unity Church: for relief (see bill H. R. 12250) 4917.
Gobble, Edward W: for relief (see bill H. R. 5360) 392.
Gordon, Bolling and Richard: for relief of estate (see bill H. R. 5409) 393.
Grant, Edwin: for relief of estate (see bill H. R. 5411) 393.
Grigsby, William: for relief of estate (see bills H. R. 5418, 5420) 393.
Grimes, John H: for relief of estate (see bill H. R. 5407) 393.
Hanner, J. W: for relief (see bill H. R. 5373) 393.
Hardin, James W: for relief (see bill H. R. 5433) 393.
Harris, Henry: for relief (see bill H. R. 5379) 393.
Harvey, John W., jr: for relief (see bill H. R. 11680) 4491.
Haygood, Mary E: for relief (see bill H. R. 5426) 393.
Hays, David H: for relief of estate (see bill H. R. 5395) 393.
Henderson, James: for relief of heirs (see bill H. R. 5423) 393.
Henry, Jane: for relief (see bill H. R. 5378) 393.
Hickman County, Tenn: to establish fish-cultural station in (see bill H. R. 5196) 390.
Hines, Pleasant: for relief of heirs (see bill H. R. 5440) 394.
Holoran, Michael: for relief of heirs (see bill H. R. 5424) 393.
Horner, Thomas: to increase pension (see bill H. R. 5349) 392.
Huey, James H: for relief of estate (see bill H. R. 5417) 393.
Johnson, Isaac: for relief of estate (see bill H. R. 5419) 393.
Johnson, William: for relief of estate (see bill H. R. 5412) 393.
Jones, Nathaniel W: for relief (see bill H. R. 11667) 4491.
Kelly, Henry: for relief of estate (see bill H. R. 5408) 393.
Kilburn, W. A: to remove charge of desertion (see bill H. R. 5362) 392.
Kinkaide, W. T., alias Kincade: for relief (see bill H. R. 5371) 393.
Lawson, Thomas J: for relief (see bill H. R. 5366) 393.
Lester, Maria: for relief (see bill H. R. 11678) 4491.

PADGETT—Continued.
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Lewis, Meriwether: to erect monument to (see bill H. R. 5194) 390.
Long, Lemuel: for relief of estate (see bill H. R. 5403) 393.
Long, W. B: for relief of legal representatives (see bill H. R. 5435) 393.
Lynnville, Tenn., Presbyterian Church: for relief (see bill H. R. 11681) 4491.
McEwen, John B: for relief (see bill H. R. 11697) 4491.
McGrew, B. F: for relief (see bill H. R. 11698) 4491.
McKim, George W: to increase pension (see bill H. R. 5354) 392.
McKissock, John W: for relief of estate (see bill H. R. 5396) 393.
McLaurine, F. T: for relief of estate (see bill H. R. 5393) 393.
McNeal, Robert: to increase pension (see bill H. R. 5358) 392.
Mealor, Merida: to remove charge of desertion (see bill H. R. 5361) 392.
Milhous, J. A: for relief of estate (see bill H. R. 5390) 393.
Mills, Jonathan: for relief of estate (see bill H. R. 5394) 393.
Montgomery, William: for relief (see bill H. R. 5374) 393.
Morris, John R: to increase pension (see bill H. R. 5350) 392.
Neely, John W: for relief of estate (see bill H. R. 5400) 393.
Nelson, P. H: for relief (see bill H. R. 5370) 393.
Nichols, James K: to increase pension (see bill H. R. 5351) 392.
Nolensville, Tenn., Mount Olivet Methodist Episcopal Church South: for relief (see bill H. R. 5429) 393.
Overton, E. C: for relief of estate (see bill H. R. 5387) 393.
Patton, Mrs. Henly: for relief of estate (see bill H. R. 5415) 393.
Perkins, N. E: for relief of estate (see bill H. R. 5406) 393.
Perry, Nathan: for relief of estate (see bill H. R. 5391) 393.
Pewitt, Sarah: for relief of estate (see bill H. R. 5410) 393.
Pillow, George: for relief (see bill H. R. 5367) 393.
Prater, Holly, alias Plater: for relief (see bill H. R. 5372) 393.
Pritchett, Joseph J: to increase pension (see bill H. R. 5356) 392.
Prospect, Tenn., Methodist Episcopal Church South: for relief (see bill H. R. 11689) 4491.
Pulaski, Tenn: to erect public building at (see bill H. R. 5193) 390.
Pulaski, Tenn., Cumberland Presbyterian Church: for relief (see bill H. R. 11683) 4491.
Ramsy, James: for relief of heirs (see bill H. R. 5442) 394.
Reed, John D: for relief (see bill H. R. 5431) 393.
Reid, W. S: for relief (see bill H. R. 5436) 393.
Roberts, Andrew: for relief of estate (see bill H. R. 5416) 393.
Scott, Andrew: for relief of estate (see bill H. R. 5414) 393.
Skillern, Martha B: for relief of estate (see bill H. R. 5397) 393.
Smith, Mumford: for relief (see bill H. R. 5430) 393.
Smith, William B: for relief of estate (see bill H. R. 5385) 393.
Smith, William H: to increase pension (see bill H. R. 10263) 2481.
Speed, John M: for relief (see bill H. R. 11686) 4491.
Sprott, Blythe: for relief of estate (see bill H. R. 5386) 393.
Sprott, James P: for relief (see bill H. R. 5368) 393.
Stevens, Marcus: for relief (see bill H. R. 5382) 393.
Stockard, S. J: for relief of estate (see bill H. R. 5405) 393.
Stone, William: for relief (see bill H. R. 11668) 4491.
Teas, J. W: to remove charge of desertion (see bill H. R. 5363) 392.
Tennessee Grand Lodge, Independent Order of Odd Fellows: for relief (see bill H. R. 11672) 4491.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

WRIGHT, J. K., pension (see bill H. R. 8687).
WRIGHT, JACOB, increase pension (see bill H. R. 4843).
WRIGHT, JAMES F., increase pension (see bill H. R. 3107).
WRIGHT, JOHN M., pension (see bill H. R. 7966).
WRIGHT, MARY L., increase pension (see bills H. R. 1373, 9684).
WRIGHT, NANCY E., relief (see bills H. R. 2473, 12191).
WRIGHT, ORSON, increase pension (see bill H. R. 7084).
WRIGHT, PHILLIP D., relief (see bill H. R. 5604).
WRIGHT, ROBERT T., increase pension (see bill H. R. 5988).
WRIGHT, SILAS, increase pension (see bill S. 2092).
WRIGHT, THOMAS G., relief of estate (see bill H. R. 4095).
WRIGHT, WALTER W., increase pension (see bill H. R. 11479).
WRIGHT, WARREN, relief (see bill H. R. 3921).
WRIGHT, WILLIAM D., relief of estate (see bill S. 3146).
WRIGHT, WILLIAM HENRY, increase pension (see bill H. R. 141).
WRIGHT, WILLIAM SWIFT, pension (see bill H. R. 3437).
WRIGHTS, DANIEL, increase pension (see bill H. R. 3480).
WRIGHTSEL, HENRY, increase pension (see bill H. R. 4557).
WRIGLEY, MARY E., increase pension (see bill S. 765).
WRITS OF ERROR. *See* COURTS OF UNITED STATES.
WROE, MARY J., pension (see bill H. R. 7454).
WULFF, FREDERICK, pension (see bill H. R. 327).
WUNDER, JACOB N., pension (see bill H. R. 3832).
WURDEMANN, FERDINAND H., increase pension (see bill H. R. 5276).
WURZBACH, EMIL F., increase pension (see bill H. R. 3110).
WYATT, HIRAM C., increase pension (see bill H. R. 4460).
WYATT, J. D., increase pension (see bill H. R. 9017).
WYATT, JAMES L., increase pension (see bill H. R. 4459).
WYATT, STEPHEN H., increase pension (see bill H. R. 4622).
WYATT, WILLIAM T., increase pension (see bill H. R. 2884).
WYBLE, WILLIAM F., pension (see bill S. 3176).
WYERS, JOHN A., pension (see bill H. R. 738).
WYLDER, GEORGE W., increase pension (see bill S. 1206).
WYLIE, ANDREW G., increase pension (see bill S. 1304).
WYLLY, FREDERICK R., relief of estate (see bill H. R. 2392).
WYMAN, THOMAS, pension (see bill H. R. 983).
WYMORE, NEBRASKA
Bill to purchase site for public building at (see bill H. R. 1463).
WYNKOOP, GERRIT C., increase pension (see bill H. R. 9171).
WYNN, NOAH W., increase pension (see bill S. 1176).
WYNNE, JOSEPH, pension (see bill H. R. 2859).
WYOMING
Bills granting lands to State (see bills S. 1866, 2043).
Bill to establish fish-cultural station in (see bill S. 1039).
Joint resolution granting additional lands under Carey Act to (see S. J. Res. 11).
Joint resolution to establish winter game reserve in (see S. J. Res. 26).
Memorial of legislature of Washington for creation of reserve for American elk in 115, 127, 199.
Memorial of legislature concerning final proof of settlers under the reclamation act 115, 457.
Memorial of legislature relative to tariff on hides and wool 390, 1060, 1689.
Memorial of legislature against reduction of duty on sugar 8.
Memorial of legislature relative to creating forest reserves 1567.
Memorial of legislature relative to homestead laws 1567.
Memorial of legislature relative to reclamation of public lands 1689.
WYOMING STOCK GROWERS' ASSOCIATION
Letter relative to tariff on hides 3562.
WYTHE, GEORGE, erect shaft at grave of (see H. J. Res. 40).
WYTHEVILLE, VIRGINIA
Bill to erect public building at (see bill H. R. 19).
XANDRY, AMELIA, pension (see bill S. 841).
YACHTS. *See also* VESSELS.
Statistics relating to tax on 4875.
YACKEY, N. BENTON, pension (see bill H. R. 11365).
YAGER, CHARLES A., pension (see bill H. R. 9098).
YAGER, RACHAEL E., pension (see bill H. R. 2995).
YAKEY, WILLIAM H. H., increase pension (see bill H. R. 826).
YAKIMA RESERVATION. *See* INDIANS.
YALE, FRED M., relief (see bill H. R. 2015).
YALOBUSHA RIVER, MISSISSIPPI
Bill for survey of (see bill H. R. 5168).
YANCEY, JAMES P., relief of estate (see bill H. R. 5235).
YANCY, JOHN, relief of estate (see bill H. R. 1225).
YAQUINA RIVER, OREGON
Bill making appropriation to improve (see bill H. R. 2).
YARBOROUGH, ELIAS, increase pension (see bill H. R. 2421).
YARBRA, C. A. M., pension (see bill H. R. 1204).
YARBRAUGH, F. M., relief (see bill S. 1106).
YARBROUGH, F. M., relief (see bill H. R. 6545).
YARBROUGH, SAMUEL H., relief (see bill H. R. 5611).
YARD, ALEXANDER A., increase pension (see bill H. R. 5278).
YARD, VIRGINIA, pension (see bill S. 378).
YARNELL, DAVID L., increase pension (see bill H. R. 4556).
YARNELL, JAMES S., increase pension (see bill H. R. 8250).
YATES, GILBERT, relief (see bill H. R. 9864).
YATES, MRS. J. W., relief (see bill H. R. 7614).
YATES, JACKSON, pension (see bill H. R. 10220).
YATES, MIRIAM P., increase pension (see bill H. R. 1076).
YDRIS, JAJI BIN, relief (see bill S. 1031).
YEA-AND-NAY VOTES IN HOUSE
Adjourn 1120, 3411.
Appeal from decision of Chair 4439.
Assistant to the House tally clerk: on motion to recommit resolution to Committee on Accounts 4660.
Census: on bill (H. R. 10933) making appropriations for expenses of Thirteenth 3785.
Election of Speaker 18.
Expenses of extra session of Congress: on joint resolution (H. J. Res. 45) making appropriations to pay 1341.
Income tax: on joint resolution (S. J. Res. 40) for amendment to Constitution to provide for 4440.
Order of business 2723, 4441, 4754.
Rivers and harbors: on joint resolution (S. J. Res. 33) relating to unexpended balances of appropriation for improvement of 3616.
Rules of House: on resolutions for adoption of 20, 21, 33.
Special orders: on resolution (H. Res. 53) for special order for bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States 1118, 1119.
——— on resolution (H. Res. 89) for special order for bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States 4384, 4385.
Tariff bill (H. R. 1438) 1301.
——— on conference report on 4754, 4755.
——— on amendments proposed:
——— barley 1296.
——— hides 1297, 1298.
——— lumber 1294, 1295, 1296.
——— petroleum 1299.
——— products of North America, South America, Central America, and islands of Western Hemisphere 1294.
——— timber 1293.
Urgent deficiency appropriation bill (H. R. 11570) 4583, 4913, 4914.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

YEA-AND-NAY VOTES IN SENATE
Adjourn 3990.
Bucket shops: on amendment to tax 4244.
Census: on conference report on bill (H. R. 1033) to provide for taking the Thirteenth and subsequent decennial censuses 1410.
Corporation tax: on amendment providing for 4059, 4061, 4062, 4066.
——— on amendments providing for exemptions from operation of 4234, 4235, 4236.
Court of customs appeals: on amendments providing for appointment of 4225.
Income tax: on motions to postpone consideration of amendment providing for 2457, 3138.
——— on joint resolution (S. J. Res. 40) for amendment to Constitution providing for 4120, 4121.
——— on amendment providing for 4228.
Order of business 3347.
Philippine Islands: on amendment relative to granting independence to 3211.
——— on motion to refer to Committee on the Philippines amendment relating to duties on imports from 3212.
Prices in United States: on resolution (S. Res. 45) for select committee to investigate relative to alleged exorbitant and unreasonable 2140.
Record of votes on amendments to bill H. R. 1438 4588.
Record of every vote on tariff bill from May 5 to July 8, 1909 (S. Doc. 153) 4792–4818, 4879.
Tariff bill (H. R. 1438) 4316.
——— on conference report on 4949.
——— on concurrent resolution in Senate (S. C. Res. 8) to correct enrolled bill 4953, 4954.
——— on amendments proposed:
——— agricultural implements 2048, 3859, 4182.
——— asphaltum 4277.
——— barley 2554.
——— bichromate and chromate of potash 2237.
——— books: school 3889.
——— carbons: electric lighting 2261.
——— cash registers 3866.
——— china ware 1911.
——— cigars: Philippine 3251.
——— coal 3717.
——— cotton cloth 2865, 2872, 2873, 2874, 2901.
——— cotton gloves 2915.
——— cotton ties 3899, 4290.
——— cotton window hollands 2877.
——— customs commission 4090.
——— cutlery 2152.
——— earthern or stone ware 1908.
——— farming implements and tools 2048.
——— glass: window 3390.
——— grain bags 3873.
——— hides 3655, 3656, 3667, 3770, 4273.
——— imports from Philippine Islands 3207, 3251, 3335, 3338.
——— iron, round, etc. 2047.
——— iron and steel 3881.
——— iron ore 1995.
——— lead 1838, 1886, 1891.
——— lead: white 2233.
——— leather 3769, 3770.
——— lemons 2578.
——— linotype machines 2186, 2202.
——— lumber 3671, 3680, 3681, 3870.
——— lumber and other building materials 2336, 2337.
——— meat products 2603.
——— metal: articles of, n. s. p. f. 2203.
——— minimum and maximum rates 4085, 4086, 4100.
——— monazite sand and thorite 3814.
——— orange mineral 1759.
——— paper: print 3382, 3439, 3482, 3483.
——— paper: writing 4180.
——— petroleum 3827, 4272.
——— Philippine sugar 3207, 3338.
——— Philippine cigars 3251.
——— Philippine Islands: products from 3207, 3251, 3335, 3338.
——— pig iron 3799, 3800.
——— pineapples 3706.
——— potash: bichromate 2237.
——— printing presses 2190, 2202.
——— quebracho 2217.
——— razors 2150, 2151.
——— salt 3890.
——— sewing machines 2190, 2202.
——— sugar 2442, 2443, 3207, 3338.
——— tariff experts 4085.
——— tea 3934.
——— typewriters 2190, 2202.
——— umbrella frames 2155.
——— white lead 2233.
——— window glass 3390.
——— window hollands, cotton 2877.
——— wire nails 3805.
——— wool 3000, 3005, 3011, 3032, 3035, 3036, 3037, 3044, 3054, 3061, 3076, 3124, 3130, 3133, 3134, 3139, 4313.
——— works of art 3171.
——— zinc 3341.
Tobacco: on amendments relating to tax on 4264.
Urgent deficiency appropriation bill (H. R. 11570) 4679, 4685.

YEAGER, JOSEPH, pension (see bill H. R. 1717).
YEAGER, MILTON, increase pension (see bill S. 2494).
YELLOW FEVER
Joint resolution to appoint commission of physicians to test the arsenization theory for prevention of (see H. J. Res. 19).
YELLOWSTONE RIVER
Memorial of legislature of Montana for improvement of 257, 556, 1355.
YEOMANS, FRED, pension (see bill H. R. 4474).
YEWELL, ANDREW, relief (see bill H. R. 6059).
YINGST, NATHAN, increase pension (see bill H. R. 5555).
YOACHUM, JACOB, increase pension (see bill S. 791).
YODER, HIRAM L., increase pension (see bill H. R. 4257).
YONGE, HENRY, relief of estate (see bills S. 2495, 3119).
Papers withdrawn in House 4489.
YOOST, ROBERT C., increase pension (see bill H. R. 1828).
YORK, ANDREW M., increase pension (see bill H. R. 3965).
YORK, CHARLES E., increase pension (see bill H. R. 10632).
YORK, JOSEPH I., relief (see bill H. R. 3933).
YORK, RUSSELLA J., pension (see bill H. R. 8091).
YORK, W. C., relief of estate (see bills S. 595; H. R. 5455).
YORKSTON, MARIA, pension (see bill H. R. 5747).
YORKTOWN, VIRGINIA
Bill providing for military highway from Jamestown to (see bill H. R. 5697).
YOSEMITE NATIONAL PARK
Joint resolutions to allow city and county of San Francisco, Cal., to exchange lands in (see S. J. Res. 4; H. J. Res. 26, 28).
YOST, DAVID J., increase pension (see bill H. R. 1550).
YOST, HENRY, increase pension (see bill S. 3044).
YOUMANS, E., relief (see bill H. R. 2559).
YOUNG, ANDREW J., increase pension (see bill H. R. 2448).
YOUNG, ANNA L., pension (see bill H. R. 4512).
YOUNG, ARMAND D., relief of estate (see bill H. R. 9593).
YOUNG, CHRISTOPHER, increase pension (see bill H. R. 1976).
YOUNG, DANIEL K.
Letter relative to blending of coffee 675.
YOUNG, DARIUS, increase pension (see bill H. R. 10191).
YOUNG, FRANCES, pension (see bill H. R. 7712).
YOUNG, FRANK H., convey certain lands to (see bill S. 1870).
YOUNG, FRANKLIN D., increase pension (see bill H. R. 3992).
YOUNG, GEORGE H., increase pension (see bills H. R. 5535, 5740).
YOUNG, H. OLIN (*a Representative from Michigan*)
Attended 17.
Appointed on committees 5091.
Bills and joint resolutions introduced by
Army Engineer Corps: to increase efficiency of (see bill H. R. 7117) 1344.
Carey, Edward Joseph, alias Edward Joseph Fitzharris: for relief (see bill H. R. 6512) 1062.
Courts of United States: to regulate issue of injunctions from (see bill H. R. 10890) 3627.
Helmka, Thomas: to increase pension (see bill H. R. 6510) 1062.
Ishpeming, Mich: to erect public building at (see bill H. R. 6280) 1059.
Mackinac Island, Mich: providing for salary and allowances of postmaster at (see bill H. R. 6513) 1062.
Marquette, Mich: to construct breakwater in harbor at (see bill H. R. 6279) 1059.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

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

Mr. NEWLANDS. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will state to the Senator that Mr. Emery was an old resident of Washington, that he came from my own State, and he was mayor of the city of Washington at one time. He was a man of the highest personal and business integrity, and, from the information I get, his property is being sold without any middlemen or without any rake off to anybody. Beyond a doubt, it is very cheap property at the price at which it is offered to the Government.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I have no reason to doubt the good faith of the transaction or the reasonableness of the price.

Mr. BACON. With the permission of the Senator, I will say that I did not intend to be understood as casting any reflection on anybody. I asked in good faith, because I did not know; I desired to know, I was entitled to know, and I am glad now that I do know.

Mr. GALLINGER. I can assure the Senator from Georgia that I had no thought he asked the question in any other spirit than that of getting information.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I wish to say that I have no reason to doubt the good faith of the transaction so far as the owners of the property are concerned, and I have no reason to doubt the reasonableness of the price, but I do question the suitableness of the location. I believe that the Government should at some time acquire the block in question as a part of the great project of improving the city and improving the grounds about the Capitol, but I do not believe that this property should be acquired for this purpose.

I believe humanity demands that the Senate of the United States should adhere to this amendment, reasonable as it is, and permit the Government to exercise the judgment, which necessarily we can not exercise here, to inquire into the facts and come to a speedy conclusion, whether that conclusion be the acceptance of the present site or the construction of a proper building upon some other site to be selected by the Government. For that reason I shall oppose the adoption of the report.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I wish to correct one error that seems to be quite prevalent here, and that is that the amendment which I offered and which was adopted by the Senate, and which the conferees agreed should go out, was in conflict in any way with the provision in the census bill allowing the director to select anyone who is qualified by previous work without this examination. It is not in conflict with it, as one would think by the argument that was made by the Senator from Texas.

I want to speak with reference to another matter also, and that is as to this being general legislation. The House sent here a bill in which they repealed a part of the general legislation relating to the civil service. The House is in no position, therefore, if we adopt their clause which repeals a part of the civil-service law for the benefit of this bill, to object if we should also ask to add to the civil-service law a provision which may be called "general legislation." In other words, if they by a bill affect general legislation by an amendment, then they can not object to our affecting general legislation also by an amendment, the one adding to, the other taking away. That is the only difference in the world.

The Senator from Texas stated that it was an injury to any of these people to come from the States and go into this government employment. If it is an injury that he wants to prevent, is it not equally an injury to those who are in the city here who are put into government employment, and remain there the whole length of their lives, and have to be generally supported by the Government or by some charitable institution when they get through?

All the Senators who have spoken upon this question have agreed with me that the legislation is right and along proper lines, while they may say that it ought to be amended in some little particular. That could be done in conference. Every one of them also agrees that the injustice that is practiced under the present law is enormous. Every one of them will agree that this will to a considerable extent be remedial legislation against such injustice.

That being the case, I can see no reason why the report may not go back to the conferees and let the conferees see if they can not make such a modification as would be agreeable both to the Senate and the House. If that could not be done, the Senate will be in session to-morrow, and I would make no objection against the adoption of the report.

Mr. MONEY. Mr. President, I heard with a great deal of interest the remarks of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS]. It happened that during the taking of the last census I was in the city, in a very heated term. I do not now recollect why I was here. I recollect that I heard through the papers that seven ladies had fallen prostrated at their desks in the building down there, overheated or overworked or something. I went down there and interviewed Governor Merriam, who was the superintendent, a most excellent gentleman in every respect. He was kind enough to go over the building with me, and I found that it was a veritable hothouse. The superintendent had very pleasant rooms and so had the important clerks; but the mass of the women, who labor in tabulating statements and making out cards and I do not know what else, labor there under difficulties that would prostrate a dray horse.

It is not humane, it is not decent, to have the employees of this Government at work in such a place. The men can take care of themselves somehow, but these women can not. They are not at work for the Government for their health or for anything but the stress of hard circumstances that compel them to work for the Government, and they are entitled to good pay and they are entitled to good quarters. The health of those people ought to be considered. I do not care how much delay it takes or how much money it costs, we ought to suffer the delay and undertake the expenditure in order to secure the comfort and the health and the lives of these people. They do not forfeit their right as citizens and human beings because they become employees of the United States Government.

I have been through other places in this city where other employees were at work, because I wanted to see for myself what I had so often heard, and the conditions have been such that they would be incredible to one who had not undertaken to look for himself.

As this is an opportunity to rectify what I consider an enormous wrong, I shall agree with the Senator from Nevada to disagree to this report and let it go back in order that the Senate may insist upon its amendments.

I have nothing to say about the civil-service scheme and the work in the civil service except to say that I think the civil service itself is the biggest fraud and sham and humbug in this whole country. I do not believe in it, because I know how it works. I know that the greatest apostles and the greatest preachers of this new doctrine are those who violate it every day of their lives. The men who make the loudest professions are continually in the breach of the law.

I also know that when I was informed in the last census that I could make twelve temporary appointments for six months I did not ask anybody to come from Mississippi. I would not ask anybody to come here for six months' employment and spend three months of it in coming here and going back home, and risk the chances of the examination. So I appointed only three, whom I found here, who wanted the places. Most of the others I never saw in my life before or since, but they were people, I believe, who belong here generally in the District.

There are thousands of poor women in this District to-day who live, God only knows how, who are trying to keep the wolf from the door, some of them with the responsibilities of aged parents, some of them widows with children, who would be very glad to get these crumbs that fall from the master's table occasionally. I do not see why they should not have it. Why should any Senator insist upon dragging people two or three thousand miles to come here to do six months' service or a year's service? I quite agree with the Senator from Texas when he said, a while ago, that it was a cruel kindness to a young man to bring him from home and put him in public employment here. There he is an individual, and here he is a number. He loses his individuality, he loses his initiative, and he loses his citizenship. It is almost impossible, I suppose, to get along altogether with women in these minor clerical positions, but in such service I would take every man out of government employment as far as it could be done.

I hope that the Senate will disagree to the report and insist upon this humane amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEAN in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. HALE. I ask that the bill be informally laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business be informally laid aside. The Chair hears no objection.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Mr. HALE. I hope that we may have a vote on the conference report very soon, and that the Senate may then proceed with the unfinished business.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, the suggestion comes to me from quite a number that I should make some amendment that would enable the judgment of the Senate to be taken upon this particular question with reference to the housing of the Census Office, but as I understand it, the rules prevent that, and it is only possible to express our opinion regarding that particular amendment by rejecting the report. May I inquire if that is the case?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair so understands.

Mr. NEWLANDS. So all who stand for the humane housing of the Census Office will necessarily have to vote for the rejection of the report.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I desire to say only a word. I have no doubt, as stated by Senators on the floor, that the proposition for the sale and purchase of this particular lot is one beyond criticism, but I confess my curiosity was excited by the fact that the extraordinary position should be taken that that locality should be selected, and that alone, and that the slight opportunity for the Government to exercise any discretion was peremptorily denied. That is a strange thing to me. If the proposition were one which rejected that locality there might be some reason in the contention of those who oppose the Senate amendment; but when the Senate amendment recognizes the ability in the last resort to take that locality if it should be found necessary, and simply gives the opportunity to select some more desirable locality if it shall be found to be practicable, I can not see upon what condition such a position is assumed.

I do not desire to detain the Senate further than to say that, in common with other Senators, during the ten years since that building has been occupied it has frequently been my duty to visit it, and I have never visited it but what I have been impressed by the fact that in the whole city of Washington there is not a locality more unfit for the purposes to which it is put, owing to the circumstance that there have to be congregated there several thousand people, subjected to all the inconveniences and, to more than inconveniences, the inhumanities which are necessarily found there in the heated season of the year, when they must be at work. I have personally known of instances such as that narrated by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. MONEY], where delicate women have succumbed under the conditions, which are sufficient to overcome strong men.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report. [Putting the question.] The noes appear to have it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I should like to have the exact proposition upon which we are to vote reported to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the report.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I am aware of that perfectly; but what I want to know before I vote, and several other Senators also, is exactly the proposition in the legislative form in which it appears in the bill before we vote. We can not vote upon what we may gather from a debate, more or less necessarily discursive. At least I shall not vote without knowing upon what I am voting.

Mr. HALE. This is a case that comes up every day in the Senate. It is simply the question whether the report shall be accepted.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I am aware of that.

Mr. HALE. The report has been made, it has been read and printed, and the question is simply upon its adoption. Its reading can not be called for again, because it has already had its reading.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I am perfectly aware that it is the customary question that comes before the Senate, as to whether a report shall be agreed to or not. I am also aware that not in one case in a hundred, on the question of agreeing to a conference report, are the yeas and nays called for. There have been two propositions of some kind or other debated here at considerable length. Those two propositions are told in a few brief words in the bill. So far as I am concerned, before I vote I want to know exactly the legislative form in which they are put. I think that is a reasonable request to make before voting.

Mr. HALE. The question is always on the adoption of the report.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I know the question is on adopting the report.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Will the Senator from Indiana permit me to suggest that so far as I have heard the debate objection is made only as to two amendments?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes; and I want to have those amendments read.

Mr. NEWLANDS. One amendment relates to the civil service, the amendment in which the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER] is interested. The other relates to the housing of the Census Office, which is amendment No. 37. The two amendments are numbered 15 and 37. As I understand it, no disagreement has been expressed upon the floor of the Senate as to the action of the conferees regarding any other amendments.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The two amendments, 15 and 37, could have been reported to the Senate in far less time than the discussion has occupied.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll on agreeing to the conference report.

The Secretary called the roll, and the result was announced—yeas 32, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—32.

Aldrich	Clarke, Ark.	Fletcher	La Follette
Bailey	Crane	Frye	Martin
Briggs	Crawford	Gallinger	Nixon
Bristow	Cullom	Gamble	Perkins
Brown	Cummins	Guggenheim	Richardson
Burrows	Curtis	Hale	Root
Carter	Dillingham	Heyburn	Stone
Clapp	Elkins	Kean	Taliaferro

NAYS—43.

Bacon	Daniel	Jones	Piles
Bankhead	Dick	Lodge	Rayner
Borah	Dixon	McCumber	Scott
Bradley	du Pont	McLaurin	Smith, S. C.
Brandegee	Flint	Money	Stephenson
Bulkeley	Foster	Nelson	Sutherland
Burkett	Frazier	Newlands	Taylor
Burnham	Gore	Overman	Tillman
Chamberlain	Hughes	Owen	Warner
Clark, Wyo.	Johnson, N. Dak.	Page	Wetmore
Clay	Johnston, Ala.	Paynter	

NOT VOTING—16.

Beveridge	Davis	Oliver	Smith, Md.
Bourne	Depew	Penrose	Smith, Mich.
Burton	Dolliver	Shively	Smoot
Culberson	McEnery	Simmons	Warren

So the report was rejected.

Mr. BAILEY. I want to submit a parliamentary inquiry. The vote just taken, as I understand, sends the bill back to conference?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair so understands.

Mr. BAILEY. Does it send it back to the same conferees?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair so understands.

Mr. BAILEY. Then I ask to be excused from service on the conference committee. In view of my opinion and the vote of the Senate, it is clearly improper that I should serve on the committee, and so I ask to be excused.

Mr. ALDRICH. The bill does not go back to the same committee, unless some motion is made upon the subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair so understands.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is usual for the Senator who has the bill in charge to make the motion.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I was not aware of the practice, Mr. President. This is my first performance on a conference committee. I submit the motion that the Senate further insist upon its amendments disagreed to by the House of Representatives and ask for a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, the conferees on the part of the Senate to be appointed by the Chair. I trust that the Senator from Texas will consent to serve.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I have expressed the opinion that that amendment was a bad one and that it ought to be yielded. Entertaining that opinion when the Senate entertains the opposite opinion, I do not believe, in justice to the Senate or in justice to myself, that I can consent to serve, and I will not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin moves that the Senate insist upon its amendments, ask for a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The Chair appoints as conferees on the part of the Senate——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask to have substituted the name of the Senator from Florida [Mr. TALIAFERRO] for that of the Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] as one of the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair appoints as conferees on behalf of the Senate the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. TALIAFERRO].

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. Browning, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled joint resolutions, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice-President:

H. J. Res. 38. Joint resolution repealing joint resolution to provide for the distribution by Members of the Sixtieth Congress of documents, reports, and other publications, approved March 2, 1909; and

H. J. Res. 45. Joint resolution making appropriations for the payment of certain expenses incident to the first session of the Sixty-first Congress.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a memorial of the International Brotherhood of Paper Makers of Watertown, N. Y., remonstrating against a reduction of the duty on print paper and wood pulp, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. FRYE presented the petition of A. H. Weymouth, of East Millimockee, Me., praying for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. OLIVER presented petitions of sundry citizens of Pennsylvania, praying for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of New Castle, Pa., remonstrating against the retention of the proposed drawback feature in the so-called "Payne tariff bill" relative to tin plates, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Typographical Union No. 7, American Federation of Labor, of Pittsburg, Pa., praying for a reduction of the duty on print paper and wood pulp, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Bradford, Pa., praying for the retention of the proposed duty on imported knives or erasers, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CULLOM. I present a joint resolution of the legislature of Illinois, which I ask may be read and referred to the Committee on Finance.

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

STATE OF ILLINOIS,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

To all to whom these presents shall come, greeting:

I, James A. Rose, secretary of state of the State of Illinois, do hereby certify that the following and hereto attached is a true copy of senate joint resolution No. 16, of the forty-sixth general assembly of the State of Illinois, filed April 21, 1909, the original of which is now on file and a matter of record in this office.

In testimony whereof I hereto set my hand and cause to be affixed the great seal of state.

Done at the city of Springfield this 21st day of April, A. D. 1909.

[SEAL.] JAMES A. ROSE,
Secretary of State.

Senate joint resolution 16.

Whereas the several States are now taxing inheritances with marked success and need all the revenue that can properly be drawn from this source; and

Whereas double taxation of inheritances would be unwise, and as the Federal Government can readily raise additional revenue, when required, from other sources: Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring therein), That it is the sense of the general assembly of the State of Illinois that the taxation of inheritances should be reserved to the several States as a source of revenue for their exclusive use and benefit; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state send a certified copy of these resolutions to the Members of the Congress of the United States from Illinois.

Adopted by the senate March 11, 1909.
Concurred in by the house April 15, 1909.

Mr. CULLOM presented petitions of sundry citizens of Illinois, praying for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. OWEN. I present resolutions adopted by the Commercial Club of Tulsa, Okla., relative to the improvement of inland waterways. I ask that the resolutions be printed in the RECORD for the information of the Senate, and that they be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

THE IMPROVEMENT OF INLAND WATERWAYS.

Resolutions adopted by the Tulsa Commercial Club, Tulsa, Okla.

Whereas the railroads of the Mississippi Valley, even under normal conditions, are unable to handle the products of this wide region without delay and congestion; and

Whereas the immediate future gives promise of even greater prosperity for the United States than has ever been known in the past; and

Whereas the completion of the Panama Canal will result in a vastly increased tonnage for the already overloaded railway lines that parallel the Mississippi River and its tributaries, particularly the Arkansas; and

Whereas the immediate improvement of our inland waterways is absolutely necessary to enable them to handle their part of the increased tonnage of this vast region: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Commercial Club of Tulsa, Okla., That we ask the President-elect to bring to the attention of Congress, in his call for a special session, the imperative need of a comprehensive inland waterways improvement plan which shall be adequate and permanent; and that we ask him to urge an appropriation of not less than $50,000,000 for carrying it into effect; and be it further

Resolved, That we ask each of our Senators and Members of Congress from Oklahoma to cooperate in this restoration of our waterways, and to do everything in his power to further the long-neglected work of making our great river, the Arkansas, again navigable, from its ancient head of navigation at the mouth of Little River, thence down across southern Kansas, through Oklahoma and Arkansas to the Mississippi and the Gulf, that the products of Oklahoma's farms, mines, and factories may be given additional outlet every way in keeping with their growing importance in the commerce of the Nation.

Adopted in regular session this February 19, 1909.

M. H. MOSIER, *President.*

Attest:
ERWIN CORRY, *Secretary.*

Mr. OWEN. I present resolutions adopted by the board of directors of the Commercial Club of Muskogee, Okla., which I ask may be printed in the RECORD for the information of the Senate and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolutions.

Whereas the National Waterways Commission has announced its intention of making a personal inspection directly after the adjournment of the present Congress of various water courses of the United States with a view to recommending to the next Congress a policy looking to the improvement, for the purposes of navigation, of such streams so inspected as appear to said commission to warrant the expense of improvement; and

Whereas the Arkansas River is a navigable stream, as has been demonstrated by years of practical and profitable navigation of its waters and by the reports of the Government's engineers; and

Whereas navigation of the Arkansas River has fallen into disuse through neglect of the ordinary means of providing for and protecting it; and

Whereas by proper effort the Arkansas River may be made an asset of incalculable benefit to the State of Oklahoma and may be made the agency for solving in a large measure the question of traffic rates and freight transportation, one of the most vexatious questions now confronting the people of this Commonwealth, and may be made to promote immeasurably the common welfare of the people of Oklahoma; and

Whereas the Muskogee Packet Company is the owner of the *City of Muskogee*, a boat of 150 tons' capacity, which is available to the Commercial Club for the use hereinafter proposed, which boat is now moored near Muskogee on the Arkansas River; and

Whereas it is believed that much good in the interest of Arkansas River improvement may be accomplished by prevailing on the National Waterways Commission to inspect said river, so that it may be included in the general scheme to be reported to the next session of Congress: Be it hereby

Resolved by the board of directors for and on behalf of the Commercial Club of Muskogee, That it is earnestly desired that the National Waterways Commission inspect the Arkansas River from its mouth to the confluence of said river with the Verdigris and Grand rivers; and be it further

Resolved, That the Commercial Club offer to said commission the *City of Muskogee* to convey them from the mouth of the Arkansas River to its confluence with the Verdigris and Grand rivers and back to the mouth of the Arkansas River without cost to said commission; and be it further

Resolved, That the Oklahoma delegation in Congress be, and they hereby are, earnestly requested, for and on behalf of this club, to make said tender to the National Waterways Commission, and to request of said commission that they inspect the Arkansas River as proposed, and that they do all in their power which they may properly do to secure from said commission the acceptance of this invitation; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each Senator and Congressman from Oklahoma.

D. N. FINK, *President.*

Attest:
R. D. SANGSTER, *Secretary.*
MUSKOGEE, OKLA., *April 9, 1909.*

Mr. JONES presented petitions of sundry citizens of Spokane, Wash., and of Owasso, Okla., praying for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Igloo, No. 1, Pioneers of Alaska, of Nome, Alaska, praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict the locations of mineral ground in that Territory to individual locators, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. LODGE presented petitions of sundry citizens of Boston, Gloucester, Holyoke, South Hadley Falls, Chicopee Falls, South Essex, Springfield, Roxbury, and Willimansett, all in the State of Massachusetts, and of Bristol, in the State of Connecticut, praying for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PILES presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Spokane, Wash., praying for the repeal of the duty on works of art, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Spokane, Wash., praying for the enactment of legislation to establish a line of steamships between the Isthmus of Panama and the Pacific coast ports of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented petitions of sundry citizens of Winsted, Northfield, and Waterville, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the retention of the proposed duty on imported knives or erasers, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of the New England Tobacco Growers' Association of Hartford, Conn., remonstrating against the importation of tobacco free of duty from the Philippine Islands, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of New Haven, Thompson, and Norwich, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. ROOT presented petitions of sundry citizens of New York, praying for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Typographical Union No. 167, American Federation of Labor, of Schenectady, N. Y., praying for a reduction of the duty on print paper and wood pulp, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the State Council of the International Reform Bureau of New York, praying for the passage of the so-called "Burkett-Foelker antigambling race bill," which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens, of the board of supervisors of Washington County, and of the International Brotherhood of Paper Makers of Watertown, all in the State of New York, remonstrating against a reduction of the duty on print paper and wood pulp, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of New York, praying for a protective duty on imported post cards, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of sundry members of the legislature of New York of Albany, N. Y., remonstrating against a reduction of the duty on gypsum, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the petition of John G. Bahret, of Poughkeepsie, N. Y., and a petition of Chapel Corners Grange, No. 872, Patrons of Husbandry, of Poughkeepsie, N. Y., praying for the passage of the so-called "rural parcels-post" bill, which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. SIMMONS presented petitions of sundry citizens of Moyock, Kenly, Bushy Fork, Bath, George, Red Springs, Rural Hall, Dillard, Lillington, Pine Hall, and Conover, all in the State of North Carolina, praying for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PILES presented a petition of Igloo No. 1, Pioneers of Alaska, of Nome, Alaska, praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict the locations of mineral ground in that Territory to individual locators, which was referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. FRYE:

A bill (S. 1964) granting an increase of pension to Elbridge P. Wardwell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON:

A bill (S. 1965) to provide for the erection of a monument to mark the location of the De Vries Dutch settlement near Lewes, Del.; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. OLIVER:

A bill (S. 1966) to amend section 4919 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, to provide additional protection for owners of patents of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. OWEN:

A bill (S. 1967) to provide against the reversal of judgments in civil and criminal cases upon technicalities immaterial to the ends of substantial justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 1968) to promote the efficiency of the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service; to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

A bill (S. 1969) granting a pension to M. L. Williams; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 1970) for the relief of Sabini Jones;

A bill (S. 1971) for the relief of Manuel Madril;

A bill (S. 1972) for the relief of Mrs. Candelaria L. de Lepoint, administratrix of the estate of Don Blas Lucero, deceased;

A bill (S. 1973) for the relief of Pablo Ciriaco Baca;

A bill (S. 1974) for the relief of the estate of Matias Baca, deceased, and his son, Juan Rey Baca, of Belen, N. Mex.;

A bill (S. 1975) for the relief of Joseph B. Tucker;

A bill (S. 1976) for the relief of the estate of Guadalupe Lujan de Fuentes, deceased; and

A bill (S. 1977) for the relief of the estate of Fritz Eggert, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1978) providing for the enrollment of certain persons as members of the Osage tribe of Indians;

A bill (S. 1979) to authorize the Delaware tribe of Indians residing in Oklahoma to bring suit in the Court of Claims against the United States, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 1980) to amend section 1 of an act approved January 30, 1897, entitled "An act to prohibit the sale of intoxicating drinks to Indians, providing penalties therefor, and for other purposes;"

A bill (S. 1981) to amend section 1 of an act approved January 30, 1897, entitled "An act to prohibit the sale of intoxicating drinks to Indians, providing penalties therefor, and for other purposes" (with the accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 1982) to authorize the Kaw tribe of Indians residing in the State of Oklahoma to bring suit in the Court of Claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WARREN:

A bill (S. 1983) to grant certain lands to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. DICK:

A bill (S. 1984) to regulate the retirement of certain veterans of the civil war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DIXON:

A bill (S. 1985) for the relief of Henry Kirn (with the accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. OWEN:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 24) empowering the Court of Claims to ascertain the amount of the "civilization fund" paid by the Osages and applied to the benefit of other Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

AMENDMENTS TO THE TARIFF BILL.

Mr. GUGGENHEIM submitted five amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. ROOT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. McCUMBER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

TARIFF STATISTICS.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 36), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to:

Senate resolution 36.

Resolved, That the Secretary of Commerce and Labor be, and he hereby is, directed to cause to be compiled for the information and use of the Senate a comparative table of tariff duties levied in the United States, Germany, and France on pottery, glass bottles, plate glass, iron ore, pig iron, steel rails, structural iron, cutlery, machinery, tin plate, watch movements, raw and refined sugar, wheat, corn, flour, meats, lard, wool, woolen yarn, woolen cloth, knitted articles of wool, cotton yarn, cotton thread, cotton cloth, knitted articles of cotton, ready-made clothing, corsets, plush, hosiery, print paper, writing paper, hides, leather, leather gloves, shoes, paints and colors, and where more than one rate of duty is provided for different kinds or grades of the same article the highest and lowest rates be given. That the rates may be made strictly comparable, they shall be reduced, in so far as possible, to an ad valorem basis.

STENOGRAPHER FOR CENSUS COMMITTEE.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 37), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Senate resolution 37.

Resolved, That the Committee on the Census be, and the same is hereby, authorized to employ a stenographer, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, at the rate of $1,200 per annum until otherwise provided for by law.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

He also presented petitions of sundry shoe and harness dealers of Piqua, Ohio, praying for the repeal of the duty on hides, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of sundry importers and jobbers of tea of Boston, Mass., remonstrating against the imposition of a duty on tea, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a joint memorial of the legislature of Wyoming, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House joint memorial 3, relating to homestead laws.

Memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States.

Be it resolved by the house of representatives of the legislature of Wyoming (the senate concurring):

Whereas it has been demonstrated that the homestead act providing for the entry and settlement of 160 acres of public land by a qualified entryman does not cover the needs and reach all the conditions in the arid and semiarid sections of the West, owing to soil and climatic circumstances not considered when the homestead law was passed;

Whereas in the higher altitudes of the Rocky Mountain West the moisture rarely exceeds 12 inches, the seasons are short and the precipitation variable in quantity and uncertain during the growing season;

Whereas these facts render it necessary to conserve according to the most scientific methods all the moisture that falls in winter, spring, and summer, thus requiring that at least one-half of the tillable area lie fallow each alternate season; and

Whereas the farmer who undertakes to establish a home and make a living for himself and family in a region in which the greatest natural obstacles must be overcome, can not with safety depend alone on his crops, but must have some grazing land: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the house and senate of the Wyoming legislature, by joint memorial, do hereby indorse and approve the 320-acre homestead bill of Hon. FRANK W. MONDELL, and urge the honorable Congress of the United States to enact the same into law at its present session.

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be sent to each Member of the Senate and House of Representatives at Washington, D. C.

Approved February 17, 1909.

THE STATE OF WYOMING,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of Wyoming, ss:*

I Wm. R. Schnitger, secretary of state of the State of Wyoming, do hereby certify that the annexed has been carefully compared with the original enrolled house joint memorial No. 3, and is a full, true, and correct copy of same, and of the whole thereof.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Wyoming.

Done at Cheyenne, the capital, this 18th day of February, A. D. 1909.

[SEAL.] WM. R. SCHNITGER,
Secretary of State.

Mr. DICK presented a joint resolution of the legislature of Wyoming, which was referred to the Committee on the Conservation of the National Resources, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House joint resolution 4, relating to creating forest reserves.

Be it resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring):

Whereas the people of the State of Wyoming are oppressed by the present policy of the National Government in withdrawing large areas of the State from the operation of laws enacted by Congress, thus adding to the expense of maintaining law and order and protecting life and property; and

Whereas the creation of large forest reserves has taken from the State areas which contain many other natural resources aside from timber which must be properly utilized if the State is to develop and become a prosperous Commonwealth among those of the Union; and

Whereas our people are living under a code of rules and regulations prescribed by the Forest Service rather than under acts of Congress; and

Whereas development is greatly retarded because those responsible for such rules and regulations are unacquainted with conditions; and

Whereas the Forest Service and other bureaus at Washington maintain at government expense advertising agencies which mislead the people as to the purpose and work of such bureaus; and

Whereas the people of the State of Wyoming are fully aware that the best and highest use of natural resources is not being made under the supervision of these bureaus and that great waste now occurs which might easily be prevented by a more localized control: Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives of the State of Wyoming in legislature assembled, That Congress be, and it is hereby, petitioned to enact such laws as may be necessary for the control of natural resources, and to provide an administration of these laws, in order that direct acts of Congress may operate rather than rules and regulations prepared and enforced by an absent landlord; and be it further

Resolved, That Congress be petitioned to take such steps as will place the control and management of natural resources in the hands of the people of States as rapidly as those States prepare for the responsibility; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to each Member of Congress and to the chief administrative officers of the Interior and Agricultural departments.

Approved February 17, 1909.

THE STATE OF WYOMING,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of Wyoming, ss:*

I, William R. Schnitger, secretary of state of the State of Wyoming, do hereby certify that the annexed has been carefully compared with the original enrolled house joint resolution No. 4, of the tenth state legislature of Wyoming, and is a full, true, and correct copy of same, and of the whole thereof.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Wyoming.

Done at Cheyenne, the capital, this 18th day of February, A. D. 1909.

[SEAL.] WM. R. SCHNITGER,
Secretary of State.

Mr. WETMORE presented a petition of the Medical Society of Newport, R. I., praying for the enactment of legislation to create a national department of public health, which was referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

He also presented a petition of the Rhode Island Horticultural Society, praying for the enactment of legislation to establish a quarantine against the importation and interstate traffic in infected honey and bees, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented a petition of sundry employees of the Humason & Beckley Manufacturing Company, of New Britain, Conn., praying for the retention of the proposed duty on imported knives or erasers, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PAGE presented a petition of sundry citizens of Plymouth, Vt., and a petition of sundry citizens of Waterville, Vt., praying for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. FLINT presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Los Alamitos, Cal., remonstrating against a reduction of the duty on sugar, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Pasadena, San Francisco, Riverside, Los Angeles, and San Diego, all in the State of California, praying for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. DEPEW presented petitions of sundry employees of the Case Brothers Cutlery Company, of Little Valley; of the New York Knife Company, of Walden; of the Carrier Cutlery Company, of Elmira; and of the Cattaraugus Cutlery Company, of Little Valley, all in the State of New York, praying for the retention of the proposed duty on imported knives or erasers, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of New York, praying for an increase of the duty on lithographic products, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of Local Union No. 106, Cigar Makers' International Union, of Ogdensburg, N. Y., remonstrating against the repeal of the duty on imported cigars, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Batavia, West Winfield, and Bridgewater, all in the State of New York, praying for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry importers, manufacturers, and dealers in military supplies and equipment, of New York City, N. Y., praying for a reduction of the duty on military supplies and equipment, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of Local Union No. 89, Cigar Makers' International Union, of Schenectady, N. Y., remonstrating against the repeal of the duty on cigars imported from the Philippine Islands, which was ordered to lie on the table.

ALCOHOL AND OTHER NARCOTICS.

Mr. GALLINGER. I present certain papers read at the semiannual meeting of the American Society for the Study of Alcohol and Other Narcotics, held in the city of Washington March 17, 18, and 19, 1909. I move that the papers be referred to the Committee on Printing.

The motion was agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. PENROSE:

A bill (S. 2015) to reimburse A. J. Caufman, Girard, Erie County, Pa., in the sum of $300, together with interest thereon from October 16, 1862, for soldier furnished United States, being the amount paid by him to one Charles Morton as a substitute; and

A bill (S. 2016) for the relief of the heirs of Michael Haak, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2017) to grant an honorable discharge to George W. Hopkins; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2018) granting an increase of pension to William O'Brien;

A bill (S. 2019) granting an increase of pension to Theodore G. Stoner;

A bill (S. 2020) granting an increase of pension to Henry Wren;

A bill (S. 2021) granting an increase of pension to John M. Rhoads;

A bill (S. 2022) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth S. Reess;

A bill (S. 2023) granting a pension to Louisa W. Benade;

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

A bill (S. 2024) granting a pension to Eliza A. Miller Bradley;

A bill (S. 2025) granting an increase of pension to Frank E. Bickford;

A bill (S. 2026) granting an increase of pension to Gertrude Smith; and

A bill (S. 2027) granting a pension to John L. Penwell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS:

A bill (S. 2028) to create in the War and Navy departments, respectively, a roll to be known as the "civil-war officers' annuity honor roll," and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OWEN:

A bill (S. 2029) for the relief of the Absentee Shawnee Indians in the State of Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BURROWS:

A bill (S. 2030) granting an increase of pension to Lewis B. Moon (with the accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CULBERSON (by request):

A bill (S. 2031) for the relief of the heirs of Francisco Guilbeau, deceased (with the accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BEVERIDGE:

A bill (S. 2032) to amend an act entitled "An act granting to certain employees of the United States the right to receive from it compensation for injuries sustained in the course of their employment," approved May 30, 1908; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WARREN:

A bill (S. 2033) for the exchange of certain lands situated in the Fort D. A. Russell Military Reservation, in the State of Wyoming, for lands adjacent thereto, between the city of Cheyenne, a municipality organized and existing under the laws of the State of Wyoming, in the State of Wyoming, and the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A joint resolution (S. J. R. 26) to establish in the State of Wyoming a winter game reserve (with the accompanying paper); to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

AMENDMENT TO THE TARIFF BILL.

Mr. PAYNTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

INCOMES AND INHERITANCES.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The morning business is concluded.

Mr. BROWN rose.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that House bill 1438 be laid before the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be laid before the Senate.

Mr. ALDRICH. I am told by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BROWN] that he would like to have the joint resolution which he introduced yesterday laid before the Senate as a part of the morning business, and I am quite willing that that shall be done.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the joint resolution.

The Secretary read the joint resolution introduced yesterday by Mr. BROWN, as follows:

A joint resolution (S. J. R. 25) to amend the Constitution relative to incomes and inheritances.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following section be submitted to the legislatures of the several States, which, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States, shall be valid and binding as a part of the Constitution of the United States:

"The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes and inheritances."

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I have no intention at this time to detain the Senate with a discussion on the merits of the several income-tax amendments pending before this body. It is sufficient for the purpose that I have in mind this morning to say on that subject that I am in full accord with the proposition of laying some of the burdens of taxation upon the incomes of the country; but I rise this morning for the purpose of challenging the attention of the Senate to the fact that the Constitution of our country stands to-day in need of an amendment upon this subject if we are to have an income-tax law at all about the validity of which there can be no question.

Mr. President, the history of the income-tax proposition in the United States, both as written by the economists of the country and as written and discussed by the framers of the Constitution and as interpreted by the courts of the country, has been given to the Senate during this discussion in the last two days. It occurs to me that my distinguished friend from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] undertook to keep faith with the Senators when he told us that he intended to demonstrate that under the Constitution as it stands to-day an income-tax law ought to be sustained. In other words, he undertook to demonstrate that the decision of the courts of the country as last pronounced was wrong. I want to suggest to the Senate this afternoon just briefly that if we take everything as true as stated by the Senator from Texas, and if we accept his conclusion as absolutely right, that the decision of the court in the Pollock case was wrong, I ask you, Senators, of what avail that would be to the country or with what satisfaction could it be received? Suppose it be true that we are convinced as Senators that the decision of the court was a mistake, does it help us? Does it help to place the burdens of taxation upon those who are earning the large incomes of the country?

Mr. President, we may have the satisfaction this hour of knowing that the opinion of the court, in our own minds, was not only not sustained by the law for a century, but was contrary to the law for a century. However, I call the attention of Senators to the fact that though we may be satisfied as to what the law is we are not on the bench of this country. We do not have the right to enter a judgment. We have no power to pronounce a decree. We have no power to write our opinions in the court records of the country, which may become a basis for any execution to enforce them.

But let us go a step further. Suppose we are not only convinced that the court made a mistake on its last decision, but we are so fully convinced of that fact that we undertake and succeed here at this extraordinary session of Congress to amend this proposed law by attaching an income-tax amendment, what have we accomplished? We have carried out our judgment and written into the statute our judgment, but when the law is passed and reaches the White House and is signed by the President, it yet must come to the door of that court which very recently vetoed legislation of that character. Let it be remembered, Senators, that when a veto comes from the White House we have the power, constitutionally, if we have the votes, to override it, but when a veto comes from the court, that veto overrides us—it is final.

We then have given again to the court an opportunity to adhere to its last opinion, declaring us without power to pass such a law or to declare the reverse. I want to inquire if there is a Senator in this Chamber who is willing to stand up and tell us that he has any reason to suppose that the court has changed its mind on the law of this question. I have always been taught the good old doctrine that when the courts have spoken it is the law of the land. I have always believed in that precept which the fathers had in their hearts when they wrote the Constitution, that the legislative branch of Government was vested with the power to write laws, and that another branch of Government, the courts of the country, were vested with the power to interpret them and the Constitution upon which they were based.

But suppose, Mr. President, that not only we pass the law and it is signed by the President, but it reaches the court of last resort and we get an opinion the reverse of the last one. The law is sustained. Those of us who believe in the principle of levying taxes on incomes are satisfied, are we? The country that to-day believes in the principle of taxing incomes will be satisfied, will it? Yes, Mr. President and Senators, it will for the time being; but tell me how long will that decision stand? Our courts have demonstrated a faculty to change their opinions on this question, for they have decided it at different times different ways, and while we might hope and believe that that decision would be permanent, no man can justify a conclusion with any certainty that it would be permanent.

It is for that reason, Senators, that I present to you to-day the imperative and commanding necessity for an amendment to the Constitution which will give the court a Constitution that can not be interpreted two ways. I undertake to say that the people of the United States have a right to have an opportunity to amend the Constitution and to make it so definite and so certain that no question can ever be raised again of the power of Congress to legislate on the subject.

Mr. RAYNER. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. BROWN. Certainly.

Mr. RAYNER. In looking at the joint resolution I see that it reads "The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

A bill (S. 2054) to provide for the purchase of a site for a public building at Big Rapids, Mich.; and

A bill (S. 2055) to provide for the purchase of a site for a public building at Charlotte, Mich.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 2056) naturalizing Charles W. Hilliker;

A bill (S. 2057) naturalizing George Drought; and

A bill (S. 2058) naturalizing Charles Walkley LaDu; to the Committee on Immigration.

A bill (S. 2059) for the relief of Sophie M. Guard;

A bill (S. 2060) for the relief of I. Winslow Ayer;

A bill (S. 2061) for the relief of Orlando B. Willcox and certain other army officers and their heirs or legal representatives;

A bill (S. 2062) for the relief of Clarence A. Rendt; and

A bill (S. 2063) for the relief of John W. McCrath; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2064) to quiet title to certain land in Dona Ana County, N. Mex.; and

A bill (S. 2065) to authorize the sale of dead, down, and injured timber in Alpena and Roscommon counties, Mich.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 2066) for the establishment of a light-house and fog signal at the easterly end of Michigan Island, Apostle Group, westerly end of Lake Superior, Wisconsin;

A bill (S. 2067) to make Holland, in the State of Michigan, a subport of entry, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 2068) to make Petoskey, in the State of Michigan, a subport of entry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 2069) to correct the military record of Capt. Daniel H. Powers (with the accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2070) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to enter on the roll of the Third Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry the name of William J. Shirley;

A bill (S. 2071) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of William T. Lang;

A bill (S. 2072) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John Reed;

A bill (S. 2073) granting an honorable discharge to Benjamin W. Ehle;

A bill (S. 2074) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of David Houk;

A bill (S. 2075) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Joseph Neveau;

A bill (S. 2076) granting an honorable discharge to Glenn Bennett;

A bill (S. 2077) granting an honorable discharge to Adam D. Shriner;

A bill (S. 2078) granting an honorable discharge to Henry S. Hunter;

A bill (S. 2079) to correct the military record of Clark G. Russell;

A bill (S. 2080) to regarrison Fort Mackinac and maintain the same as a military post;

A bill (S. 2081) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John Esseltine;

A bill (S. 2082) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Earl Hoisington, jr.;

A bill (S. 2083) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Henry Fuller;

A bill (S. 2084) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Andrew Martin; and

A bill (S. 2085) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of James Malloy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2086) granting an increase of pension to Peter Boyer;

A bill (S. 2087) granting an increase of pension to Francis G. Bourasaw;

A bill (S. 2088) granting a pension to Almira J. Sterling;

A bill (S. 2089) granting an increase of pension to Josiah M. Rice;

A bill (S. 2090) granting an increase of pension to John A. Battenfield;

A bill (S. 2091) granting a pension to Rachel F. Prince;

A bill (S. 2092) granting an increase of pension to Silas Wright;

A bill (S. 2093) granting a pension to George Seward;

A bill (S. 2094) granting an increase of pension to Martha F. Turner;

A bill (S. 2095) granting an increase of pension to Isaac R. Jameson;

A bill (S. 2096) granting a pension to W. H. Rugg;

A bill (S. 2097) granting a pension to Allen B. Be Dell;

A bill (S. 2098) granting an increase of pension to Albert L. T. Bush;

A bill (S. 2099) granting a pension to Alvena Wiggins;

A bill (S. 2100) granting a pension to Emma L. Parker;

A bill (S. 2101) granting an increase of pension to Sidney M. Smith;

A bill (S. 2102) granting an increase of pension to Martin Selak;

A bill (S. 2103) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Morse;

A bill (S. 2104) granting a pension to Agnes Hunt (with the accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 2105) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Philbrick;

A bill (S. 2106) granting an increase of pension to Charles Moulton;

A bill (S. 2107) granting an increase of pension to George Alexander;

A bill (S. 2108) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin S. Whitman;

A bill (S. 2109) granting a pension to Lydia A. Brigham;

A bill (S. 2110) granting an increase of pension to Charles R. Moore;

A bill (S. 2111) granting an increase of pension to Elias Riegle;

A bill (S. 2112) granting a pension to William Cordes;

A bill (S. 2113) granting an increase of pension to Marshall H. Burnham;

A bill (S. 2114) granting an increase of pension to Alice M. S. Duryea;

A bill (S. 2115) granting an increase of pension to Jane A. Ecker;

A bill (S. 2116) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Norris;

A bill (S. 2117) granting an increase of pension to John M. Randell;

A bill (S. 2118) granting an increase of pension to George M. Peaslee;

A bill (S. 2119) granting a pension to Margaret A. Barker;

A bill (S. 2120) granting a pension to George W. Derby;

A bill (S. 2121) granting a pension to Elizabeth F. Houghton;

A bill (S. 2122) granting a pension to Mary Caroline Douglas;

A bill (S. 2123) granting a pension to Emma R. Walters;

A bill (S. 2124) granting a pension to Louisa E. Lawrence;

A bill (S. 2125) granting a pension to Sarah Elsie Green;

A bill (S. 2126) granting an increase of pension to Caroline E. Sweet;

A bill (S. 2127) granting a pension to Lucinda W. Van Hyning;

A bill (S. 2128) granting an increase of pension to Renselarr B. Ransom;

A bill (S. 2129) granting an increase of pension to Gardner B. Clark;

A bill (S. 2130) granting an increase of pension to George A. Brown;

A bill (S. 2131) granting a pension to Elizabeth A. Stebbins;

A bill (S. 2132) granting an increase of pension to Frank D. Newberry;

A bill (S. 2133) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Golding;

A bill (S. 2134) granting an increase of pension to Lyman G. Willcox;

A bill (S. 2135) granting a pension to Mary E. Smith;

A bill (S. 2136) granting a pension to Annie B. Jackson;

A bill (S. 2137) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Gaylord;

A bill (S. 2138) granting a pension to Hiram S. Millis;

A bill (S. 2139) granting a pension to Emma J. Pride;

A bill (S. 2140) granting a pension to Anna E. Warden;

A bill (S. 2141) granting a pension to Cynthia A. Slayton;

A bill (S. 2142) granting an increase of pension to David Collins;

A bill (S. 2143) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Barton;

A bill (S. 2144) granting an increase of pension to Eunice C. Wickware;

A bill (S. 2145) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Morrow;

A bill (S. 2146) granting an increase of pension to George W. Mulliken;

A bill (S. 2147) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Stroup;

A bill (S. 2148) granting a pension to Archie H. Wright;

A bill (S. 2149) granting an increase of pension to William S. Dailey;

A bill (S. 2150) granting an increase of pension to Artemus Ward;

A bill (S. 2151) granting a pension to Eliza Bracelin;

A bill (S. 2152) granting an increase of pension to Jacob R. Riblet;

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

A bill (S. 2153) granting an increase of pension to Geraldine Tift;
A bill (S. 2154) granting an increase of pension to Henry O. Briggs;
A bill (S. 2155) granting an increase of pension to James Malloy;
A bill (S. 2156) granting a pension to Sarah J. Fitzgibbon;
A bill (S. 2157) granting a pension to Sarah J. Fix;
A bill (S. 2158) granting a pension to Jennie Dunn;
A bill (S. 2159) granting a pension to Verona H. Coon;
A bill (S. 2160) granting a pension to Lucy Ann Palmer;
A bill (S. 2161) granting a pension to Frankie Esselstyn;
A bill (S. 2162) granting an increase of pension to George M. Horton;
A bill (S. 2163) granting a pension to John C. Hurst;
A bill (S. 2164) granting a pension to Helen Mirrin;
A bill (S. 2165) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Forman;
A bill (S. 2166) granting a pension to Samuel Limenstall;
A bill (S. 2167) granting a pension to Leonard C. Wiswell;
A bill (S. 2168) granting an increase of pension to Charles S. Vahue;
A bill (S. 2169) granting an increase of pension to Robert R. Marsh;
A bill (S. 2170) granting a pension to Emeline C. Seger;
A bill (S. 2171) granting an increase of pension to Wharton R. Marsh;
A bill (S. 2172) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Wiggins;
A bill (S. 2173) granting a pension to Mary A. Dawes; and
A bill (S. 2174) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Sedgwick; to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. McCUMBER. Before we pass from those bills, I wish to ask if they were all introduced by one Senator?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. They were all introduced by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. McCUMBER. Then I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan, so as to guide to a certain extent the Committee on Pensions, the number of surviving soldiers in the State of Michigan, and how that number compares with the number of bills he has just introduced.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, I refer the distinguished Senator to the records of the Grand Army of the Republic in the State of Michigan, and he will find his question answered.

Mr. McCUMBER. It is evidently true that the Senator knows what the records are and the number. I do not myself know, and therefore I ask him.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I know that these bills represent a very small proportion of the gallantry the State of Michigan furnished.

Mr. CULBERSON. I should like to know how many of these pension bills have just been introduced by the Senator from Michigan, in view of the inquiry of the Senator from North Dakota.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair has not counted them. The Secretary will count them, if the Senator desires. There are quite a number.

Mr. McCUMBER. I understand that the Senator from Michigan has not had time to count them.

Mr. CLAPP. I should like the attention of the Senate for a moment in this connection. The Senate passed a rule two or three years ago providing that pension bills, private claims bills, and other bills of that kind, may be filed with the clerks and recorded as introduced. The fact is, that either the rule has been forgotten or, in the case of those who may have come in since the rule was adopted, it has not been called to their attention, because every morning we go through the same ceremony of the introduction of bills and gain nothing by it, when most of them might be filed with the clerks, put in the RECORD, and credited to the Senator filing them.

By Mr. TALIAFERRO:
A bill (S. 2175) granting a pension to Mollie Brantley (with the accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 2176) granting an increase of pension to Peter F. Pellicer (with an accompanying paper);
A bill (S. 2177) granting an increase of pension to Cassinovo Masters (with an accompanying paper); and
A bill (S. 2178) granting an increase of pension to Peter C. Masters (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TILLMAN:
A bill (S. 2179) to authorize and empower J. L. Hankinson, N. B. Dial, and their associates, successors, and assigns, to construct a dam; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan:
A joint resolution (S. J. R. 27) granting condemned cannon for a statue to Gen. George A. Custer, of Michigan;
A joint resolution (S. J. R. 28) granting to the State of Michigan permission to use for its own purposes unused portions of condemned cannon granted to that State by joint resolution of June 23, 1906; to the Committee on Military Affairs.
A joint resolution (S. J. R. 29) appropriating $275,000 for immediate and necessary work on the harbor of refuge, Harbor Beach, Mich.;
A joint resolution (S. J. R. 30) providing for an examination and survey of White Lake Harbor, Michigan; and
A joint resolution (S. J. R. 31) directing an examination of Pigeon River, at Port Sheldon, Mich.; to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENTS TO THE TARIFF BILL.

Mr. OLIVER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. GAMBLE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. BURTON submitted three amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. GUGGENHEIM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

CARE OF DEPENDENT CHILDREN.

Mr. OWEN. I submit a resolution, and ask for its present consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 39) was read, as follows:

Senate resolution 39.

Resolved, That there be printed 6,000 copies of Report of the Conference on the Care of Dependent Children (S. Doc. 721, 60th Cong. 2d sess.), of which 1,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate and 5,000 copies shall be for the use of the conference.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oklahoma asks for the present consideration of the resolution.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask the Senator if he has ascertained the cost of the printing?

Mr. OWEN. I was just going to state that I have ascertained the cost, and it is within the limit of $500.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, notwithstanding that, it seems to me that the resolution ought to go to the Committee on Printing. I move that it be referred to the Committee on Printing.

The motion was agreed to.

SUGAR IMPORTATIONS.

Mr. BRISTOW submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 40); which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to:

Senate resolution 40.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to inform the Senate—

First. The amount of raw sugar imported into the United States during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908, by each sugar refinery in the United States.

Second. The countries from which these refineries imported such raw sugar, the amount imported from each country, and the price at American port of the sugar imported from each country during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 1438.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. RAYNER. Mr. President, my remarks will be brief, and I will kindly ask not to be interrupted. If any of my party colleagues should disagree with me in any statement that I may make, I will ask them to wait until I have finished, because I am almost sure that they will agree with me in the conclusions that I have reached.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Mr. BURKETT. That is why I asked of the Senator a while ago if the shingle business was not a piecework business. To be sure, the Orientals earn less in British Columbia because they do less work. The Senator stated a moment ago that so far as Canadian work was concerned it was piecework. That is my information. I am also informed that is largely so in the State of Washington.

Mr. PILES. The man who does the piecework is a packer, as I understand it. That, however, is but a small part of the work. The packers are paid by the thousand, but the men who do the general work are paid by the day. Work of this character is performed by Orientals in British Columbia at from 80 cents to $1.50 per day, which costs us from $2 to $2.50 per day.

It is evident to those familiar with the conditions concerning the shingle industry that unless the duty is increased we shall within a very short time lose our principal market for red cedar shingles.

FARMERS' INTERESTS; A PHASE OF CONSERVATION.

It is estimated that the small mills located throughout the country furnish a market to 2,000 farmers in my State for the shingle bolts which they cut in clearing and preparing their lands for cultivation. This market is of prime importance to them, as it costs from $50 to $100 per acre to clear logged-off lands in western Washington.

Some years ago, when our timber was wasted to the extent already referred to, our cedar trees were cut a considerable distance from the ground. The farmers, shingle-mill owners, and others engaged in supplying shingle bolts to the mills have gone over the logged-off lands in recent years, cut the cedar stumps down close to the ground, and split them into shingle bolts. They have also gathered up broken limbs and burnt and discarded portions of the cedar trees and converted them into shingle bolts. In this respect the shingle mills are a great aid to the farmers in clearing up their lands. If they do not operate, the farmer will be compelled to burn up his timber which he now converts into shingle bolts, and lose the money which he now receives from their sale.

Our shingle mills are the greatest conservators of our forests that we have. They conserve them in two ways: First, they afford a market for a waste product; and, secondly, they induce the removal of the material from logged-off lands which, if permitted to remain, becomes a constant fire menace to our standing forests.

Canada buys practically no shingles from us, but she continues year by year to increase her exportations into this country, while we are compelled by reason thereof to decrease our output, to the injury not only of our shingle manufacturers but to the detriment of the wage-earners in this particular industry.

PRESENT DUTY INSUFFICIENT PROTECTION.

In 1908 Canada sold $2,376,394 worth of shingles in our markets, while she purchased from us in that year $8,873 worth of shingles. During the last five years she sold in our markets $9,353,074 worth of shingles, while she took from us during the same period $56,913 worth of shingles. Seventy-five per cent of $9,353,074 is $7,014,805.50. Had we had reasonable protection on shingles this sum would have gone into the pockets of the shingle weavers of this country. Here, then, is an approximate loss of over $7,000,000 to the shingle weavers in this country in the last five years.

Will any fair-minded man say, in view of the facts which I have submitted, that the duty on shingles should not be increased?

No one who is acquainted with the facts will deny that our mills are closed down from three to five months each year, and no one who is acquainted with the facts will deny that the men employed in this business were conservative when they stated, in the resolutions which I have submitted to the Senate, that Canadian importations are taking a million dollars a year out of their pockets.

My friend, the senior Senator from North Dakota, has asked that the duty on wheat be increased from 25 cents to 30 cents a bushel in order to protect the farmer. I have no objection to this. I am glad to see the farmer get such protection on his products as is necessary to protect him in his enterprise, but I do object to the effort that is being made here to reduce the duty on lumber and shingles, to the detriment of the wage-earners and manufacturers not only of the State of Washington but in all the lumber-producing States in the Union.

I find, from the tables which the Finance Committee has submitted showing rates and duties collected under the law of 1897, for the year ended June 30, 1907, that there were imported in the latter year for consumption 19,142.93 bushels of wheat, of the value of $16,586.10, while for the same year there were imported for consumption in the United States 883,767,830 shingles, of the value of $1,940,892.77. Of the two commodities it would seem that shingles stand in greater need of protection.

COMMERCIAL AND LABOR SIGNIFICANCE OF SHINGLE MANUFACTURE.

Our output of lumber and shingles for 1906 was of greater value than the combined wheat, oat, and barley crops of either Kansas, Iowa, Nebraska, or Illinois for 1908. In 1906 we paid out in wages in the lumber and shingle industry a sum greater than the value of the combined wheat, oat, and barley crops of either Iowa, Nebraska, Indiana, Wisconsin, or Ohio for 1908, and greater than the value of the wheat crop of either North Dakota, South Dakota, or Minnesota for 1908.

Mr. President, the facts in this case call for relief. I have shown that British Columbia can manufacture both lumber and shingles cheaper than we can. She has the advantage in the price of labor, in the price of stumpage, in the water freight rate. It must be plain to all that if the duty be removed our California market is doomed.

There are, as I have said, over 500 American vessels on the Pacific Ocean, employing 11,000 men, prepared to transport lumber. Remove the duty from lumber and what do you do by way of encouragement to them? If upon the completion of the Panama Canal you do not put them off the sea, and the seamen off the ships, you greatly cripple their business. This question is entitled to serious consideration. It involves a great deal more than a mere contest between stumpage owners, as the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BURKETT] seems to think. It involves the welfare of the 800,000 men employed in the lumber and shingle industries of the United States, as well as that of their wives and children. It involves our commerce on the sea. It touches the homes of half a million people in the State which I have the honor in part to represent.

In this view do you wonder that I press the subject upon the attention of the Senate?

Mr. President, I am done. I have imposed upon the indulgence of the Senate much longer than I intended to when I began this discussion. The importance of a correct solution of the question at issue, to the States of the Pacific slope in particular and to the country at large, is the only justification I have to offer for the consumption of so much of your valuable time.

Washington, Mr. President, is yet young. She will not reach her twentieth birthday until the 11th day of next November. It was my pleasure to see her grow from a Territory to a State. I have watched her progress with affectionate and, I trust, pardonable pride, since the days of early manhood.

I have seen her in the throes of a terrible panic, and in the midst of universal prosperity. Her people have at all times and under all conditions—whether favorable or adverse—maintained their faith in her future.

You may obstruct her onward march for a time by striking her principal industry a terrible blow; you may give her an army of idle or underpaid men; you may inflict upon her people an unreasonable and unjust loss, but you can not prevent the fruition of their hopes. Her future is secure. Nature has blessed her beyond compare, given her forests that can not be approximated elsewhere on the globe save in the States of the Pacific. She gave Washington the most picturesque of land-locked seas, which reaches back from the ocean into the very heart of the State. She gave her the greatest rivers of the West. Her soil is underlaid with coal and in her mountains are stored iron, copper, lead, and tin and all the precious metals. The water power of her rivers is rivaled only by the falls of Niagara. Her fields are burdened with grain and her orchards are bending with fruit. Her shores are washed by the waves of the greatest of oceans and her ports will become the principal transshipping points of the Occident and the Orient.

It is not the fault of her people that British Columbia, with her immense timber area, is not a part of the Republic, for the pioneers of the old Oregon country extended their settlements to the forty-ninth parallel of north latitude under very adverse conditions. They saved the timbered areas of Oregon, Washington, and Idaho as the heritage of all. Had it not been for their heroic efforts Canada would now own it all. It would ill become Congress to cripple or destroy our greatest industry, now that it has acquired value in the commercial life of our States.

We ask but for little—the protection of our property and our laboring masses against the unfair and unjust competition of Asiatic labor on both land and sea.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment, which I shall propose at the proper time, to the woolen schedule, paragraph 375, and to every other schedule where the duty is shown by our records to be prohibitive; and at the convenience of the Senate I desire to address it with regard to that subject-matter.

I should like to have the amendment entered on the face of the RECORD, so that it may be seen by the Members of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oklahoma asks that the amendment be printed in the RECORD. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

The amendment is as follows:

After the last line of paragraph 375 insert:

"That the rate fixed on all articles enumerated in this paragraph shall be reduced 5 per cent per annum of the rate fixed in this act, annually on June 30, for each of the next ensuing ten fiscal years: *Provided*, That if such graduated reduction shall cause a diminution of the annual revenue from any one or more of the above-enumerated articles, the President is authorized and directed to fix the rate on any such article or articles at the point at which such article or articles severally are found to have the greatest normal revenue-producing power, but not at a rate higher than the rate fixed in this act: *Provided further*, That the rate shall not be reduced or fixed below the point at which it would produce an amount equal to the difference in the cost of the production of any such article in the United States and abroad."

Mr. CULBERSON. I offer two amendments to the pending bill, and ask that they be printed and lie on the table. They are intended to put bagging and ties on the free list.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, those who are members of the majority party in this Chamber and who are advocating an income tax do not concede that they are outside of party lines or that they are advocating policies or principles which are new or radical. We believe we are advocating policies and principles that are well accepted as a part of the faith to which we subscribe, and that we are advocating principles as old as the revenue laws of the United States. We advocate an income tax not as a temporary measure for the purpose of securing revenue for temporary purposes, but because we believe it should be a permanent part and portion of the revenue system of the United States.

I have reread within the last few weeks the cultured and faithful biography of John Sherman, written by one of the honored Members of this body. Although read with that object in view, I did not find that that great leader in his day was given to radicalism, socialism, or that he was often swung from his moorings as a conservative statesman. He was one of the steadfast and sturdy councilors of this country in a very trying hour. Long after the war had closed and after we had had the experience of an income tax for some several years, after we had known its benefits and its defects, its failures and its virtues, and after the necessity of maintaining it as a war tax had passed, this distinguished leader of his party, in 1871, said:

They have declared it to be invidious. Well, sir, all taxes are invidious. They say it is inquisitorial. Well, sir, there never was a tax in the world that was not inquisitorial; the least inquisitorial of all is the income tax. * * * There never was so just a tax levied as the income tax. There is no objection that can be urged against the income tax that I can not point to in every tax. * * * Writers on political economy as well as our own sentiments of what is just and right teach us that a man ought to pay taxes according to his income. * * * The income tax is the cheapest tax levied except one.

Referring at that time to the bank tax.

Again he said:

It is the only tax levied in the United States that falls upon property or office or on brains that yield property, and in this respect is distinguished from all other taxes levied by the United States, all of which are levied upon consumption, the consumption of the rich and the poor, the old and the young.

Mr. Sherman at the same time declared in favor of the constitutionality of the tax and defended it against the assaults which are usually made against the income tax, because at that time the same arguments were used against the tax that are used to-day. You will not see even in the discussion now anything that was not foremost in the arguments against the tax at the time it was in existence.

Many years afterwards, and long after this tax had been repealed by the narrow vote of 1 in Congress, and upon an occasion when he was discussing in a general way the revenue system of the United States, he used this language:

The public mind is not yet prepared to apply the code of a genuine revenue reform. But years of further experience will convince the whole body of our people that a system of national taxes which rests the whole burden of taxation upon consumption and not one cent on property or income is intrinsically unjust. While the expenses of National Government are largely caused by the protection of property, it is but right to require property to contribute to their payment. It will not do to say that each person consumes in proportion to his means. That is not true. Everyone can see that the consumption of the rich does not bear the same relation to the consumption of the poor that the income of the one does to the wages of the other. * * * As wealth accumulates this injustice in the fundamental basis of our system will be felt and forced upon the attention of Congress.

It would be useless to amplify upon that statement of this great statesman and distinguished party leader. It states in a brief paragraph the whole contention of those who are to-day advocating an income tax, not, as has been suggested here, for the purpose of raising revenue for temporary purposes alone, but that it may become engrafted in and a part of—an inseparable part of—the general revenue system of the United States, in order that we may arrive as nearly as we can, as human ingenuity can make it, at a tax which is levied upon a man's ability to pay and in accordance with what he derives as a measure of benefit from his Government.

I am aware it will be said that Mr. Sherman voted against the income tax of 1894, but I have reread within the last few days the debate which occurred at that time, and especially the speech of Mr. Sherman, and he was careful to say that he himself had reread the speech which he had made in 1871, and that there was nothing in that speech which he desired to modify or in any way change; that he voted against the income tax at that time because of the details of the bill, and especially with reference to its exemptions, and also for the reason that he thought that at that time there was no necessity for it.

Senator Morton, one of the safe and conservative counselors of his party and his Nation, said upon one occasion:

State taxation in Indiana, and I undertake to say in every other State in the Union, has in it every inquisitorial feature that the income tax has. The income tax of all others is the most equitable because it is the truest measure that has been found of the productive property of the country.

And another great leader of that era used this language:

There is not a tax on the books so little felt, so absolutely unfelt in the payment of it as this income tax by the possessors of great fortunes upon whom it falls. There is not a poor man in this country, not a laborer in this country but who contributes more than 3, more than 10, more than 20 per cent of all his earnings to the Treasury of the United States, under those very laws against which I am objecting, and now we are invited to increase their contributions and to release those trifling contributions which we have been receiving from incomes heretofore.

In this connection I call attention to a later Republican leader. While he was not at the time specifically discussing the income tax, he was discussing the basic principles upon which that tax is based, and that is the obligation of property and wealth to the Government, which protects property and wealth. This is the language of Mr. Harrison, after he had retired from the presidency:

We live in a time of great agitation, of a war of clashing thoughts and interests. There is a feeling that some men are handicapped; that the race is sold; that the old and much vaunted equality of opportunity and of right has been submerged. More bitter and threatening things are being said and written against accumulated property and corporate power than ever before. It is said that, more and more, small men, small stores, and small factories are being thrown upon the shore as financial drift; that the pursuit of cheapness has reached a stage where only enormous combinations of capital, doing an enormous business, are sure of returns.

Again he says:

The great middle class of our people has never failed to respond to the fire alarm, though they have only small properties at risk, and these not immediately threatened. But there is danger that they will lose their zeal as firemen if those in whose apartments the fire has been kindled do not pay their proportionate share of the cost of the fire department.

The people who consider themselves as conservative upon the question of making revenue laws ought not to forget that this principle spoken of by the ex-President inheres in the discussion of all these matters, and that is that unless there is a corresponding obligation faithfully met there may arise that condition in the public mind which will unsettle not only the property interests, but the stability of the Government under which the property exists.

Again he says:

The plea of business privacy has been driven too hard. If for mere statistical purposes we may ask the head of the family whether there are any idiots in his household and enforce an answer by court process, we may surely, for revenue purposes, require a detailed list of his securities. The men who have wealth must not hide it from the taxgatherer and flaunt it on the street. Such things breed a great discontent. All other men are hurt. They bear a disproportionate burden. A strong soldier will carry the knapsack of a crippled comrade, but he will not permit a robust shirk to add so much as as his tin cup to the burden.

Again he says:

I want to emphasize, if I can, the thought that the preservation of this principle of a proportionate contribution, according to the true value of what each man has, to the public expenditures is essential to the maintenance of our free institutions and of peace and good order in our communities.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I wish to ask the Senator if that is not General Harrison's speech at Chicago? Is it not the Chicago speech?

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

In this connection I desire to send to the Secretary's desk to be read the words of a great Senator, spoken in this Chamber in 1883, while, I think, the Morrison tariff bill was under discussion. I ask that the extract from Senator Vest's speech may be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

As I said the other day, I have never risen myself to that solar region, that high philosophical lunar altitude, where I could overlook the people who sent me here and the State which did me the honor to give me a place on this floor. While I am a Senator of the United States, I am not here to take care especially of Massachusetts or Pennsylvania, when they have Senators upon this floor who, more ably than I can possibly do, look to those interests. I believe, as a Democrat, that the ligament which binds these States together to a common prosperity and in a glorious Union is the ligament based upon state interests, local interests, and the fact that every local interest is represented upon this floor and in the Chamber of the other House.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, a Senator has just asked me from whose speech the extract which has just been read was quoted. I will say it was quoted from the speech of a distinguished Senator who has been referred to many times in recent debates upon this floor as an old-time Democrat; a Senator whose fervid eloquence had given a charm for twenty-four years to the debates in this Chamber; a Senator whose pathos has moved his colleagues to tears, whether in pronouncing a eulogy upon a dead Member or paying a tribute to man's best friend, the dog.

Mr. STONE. If my colleague will permit me, I should like to observe that I think that is the only expression which ever fell from the eloquent lips of my distinguished predecessor, so much beloved in Missouri, that my colleague has ever applauded.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, the discussion on the lead schedule seems to have reached a point where the only question remaining to be determined is as to the adequate rate of duty to be fixed. I do not by that remark desire to have it understood that I allege that every Senator in the Chamber will support a duty on lead or any of the products of lead, but I do think that a decided majority of the Senate is in accord with the policy which has prevailed with reference to the lead industry for a long time. I shall not, therefore, detain the Senate in any description of the vast industries, not alone of lead mining and the manufacture of lead products, but the vast interests involved in the complex commercial and industrial life of certain States in the Union where this lead production is of great local importance.

The subject is not a new one, and we are not, therefore, required to speculate as to the duty which may be deemed adequate. Under the tariff law of 1883 lead ore was made dutiable. In 1889 the Treasury Department held that lead ore was an ore in which the lead value predominated over the value of any other metallic substance contained in the ore. Lead ore as mined in Mexico and also in Colorado, Idaho, and other States of this Union is generally accompanied or found in union with silver, gold, and sometimes copper. This Treasury construction, that ore predominating in silver value was silver ore rather than lead ore where the silver value predominated or exceeded the lead value, led to vast importations of lead from Mexico under the classification of silver ore, free of duty, and that line of importations from Mexico closed down the silver-lead mines of Colorado, Idaho, Utah, and the entire Rocky Mountain country, besides introducing into the commerce of the country a surplus of free lead, which put the Missouri lead miners out of business. An attempt was made to have that Treasury ruling reversed, but without success.

When the McKinley bill came forward for consideration, the language now employed in the pending measure was used to prevent or preclude such construction as has led to mischievous results; so that this phraseology is now employed in fixing the article on which the duty is to be levied at 1½ cents per pound, to wit:

Lead-bearing ore of all kinds, 1½ cents per pound on the lead contained therein.

Under this phraseology the amount of gold or silver in the ore is of no avail as a means of evading the duty intended to be imposed on the lead imported with the ore. Notwithstanding the duty was 1½ cents a pound at the time this evasion to which I have referred occurred, the evasion was sufficient to reduce the price of lead in the United States to a point where Missouri, with its splendid measures, Colorado, with its great deposits, and Idaho, with its superb mines, were all forced to yield to the production in Mexico, upon a law that has never been enacted and never can be repealed—the law relating to the cost of labor as a factor in production. Miners were paid from 50 to 75 cents per day in Mexico to mine this ore. They could not be induced to work in the United States for less than from $2 to $3.50 per day, working eight hours per day, as the Senator from Missouri [Mr. WARNER] suggests to me. Very naturally the 75-cent man put the $3.50 a day man out of business.

A little later on, the phraseology being retained, the duty on lead ore was reduced to three-quarters of a cent per pound. That reduction was tantamount to placing the lead in the ore on the free list. This is not a matter of speculation; it is a matter of history. One of the most lusty and vigorous of the brigades in Coxey's army came in from the lead mines of the Coeur d'Alene country.

Mr. President, the fact that production has been increasing in but a meager way under the 1½ cents per pound duty, the fact that a slight evasion of the duty at that rate will prostrate this lead industry, the fact that it has been shown that a duty of three-fourths of a cent a pound is no better than free trade in lead or lead ore or the contents of lead ore, amounts, it seems to me, in our current experience to a demonstration of the fact that, as to this schedule at least, we have secured that which is adequate and not excessive as a rate of duty.

It is difficult to go into an analysis of the comparative efficiency as to miners or any other class of workmen. Mathematically considered, many questions are to be taken into consideration in determining just what is an adequate and efficient compensatory duty on the labor side of the question; but when we have an experience extending over a quarter of a century to guide us, it is not necessary to indulge in excursions through a maze or labyrinth of figures to reach correct conclusions.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] thinks $1 per hundred, or 1 cent per pound, would be an adequate duty on lead. I submit to him that three-fourths of a cent a pound was ruinous, and the meager advance he suggests might not be any better. We do know that this duty would result in keeping our miners at work and all the activities connected with the mining operations of the country in a healthy state of progress.

The Senator from Missouri said that while he would stand with his colleague for a duty of $1 per hundred, or 1 cent per pound, on lead, he thinks that on the products of lead the duty ought to be very radically reduced.

Mr. President, the principle applicable to this schedule will run through all of the schedules we may be called upon to consider in connection with this bill. It is of no avail to the grower of wool to have a duty on the wool imported into this country if he is bound by conditions to ship his wool to foreign markets for sale. The duty is of avail to him only with the American market place to sell in. I should like to have the Senator from Missouri explain how 1 cent or 10 cents a pound duty on lead would be of any use whatever to lead producers in Missouri, if those lead producers are deprived of the American markets in which to sell their lead; and the American market for the sale of lead is dependent upon the continuance of the manufacture of lead into the various forms in which it is useful to commerce and to the consumer. Put white lead on the free list, or reduce the duty on white lead so that it can not be successfully manufactured in this country, and a duty of 10 cents a pound on the lead contained in Missouri ore is no better than a duty of one-tenth of 1 cent per pound, because, in either event, the lead of Missouri must be sold in the open markets of the world, instead of in the protected market of the United States. The logic of the situation drives the Senator from Missouri either to abandon his position for any duty upon lead or constrains him to support by a reasonable compensatory duty the American manufacturer of lead products, so that he may have a market at home for that which is produced in Missouri.

It seems to me these propositions are elemental. A producer of so-called "raw material" in the United States can in no case be benefited by a protective duty on his so-called "raw material" if all the compensatory and protective duties are taken off the finished product.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, without intending to take up the time of the Senate or delay a vote, I desire to give a brief citation from that standard work entitled "Imports and Duties, 1894 to 1907, House Document 1504, second session, Sixtieth Congress." Looking at the statistics furnished in that book, it does not appear that the tariff has had exactly the effect on lead ore for which the Senator from Montana [Mr. CARTER] contends. I find on page 579 that in 1896, under the tariff law of 1894, when there was a duty of three-fourths of a cent per pound on lead, there were 42,973,425 pounds of lead imported, and that the average import price was 1.6 cents per pound. I find that, under the Dingley law, in 1906, ten years later, we imported 70,720,321 pounds, almost twice as much as in 1896, and that the import price was exactly the same—1.6 cents per pound.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Mr. ALDRICH. But if the Senator will look at the import prices for the other years, he will find that the year he has selected was the only one under the act of 1897 when the price was 1.6 cents.

Mr. NELSON. We imported 70,702,321 pounds in 1906. In 1907 we imported 29,738,375 pounds.

Mr. ALDRICH. And the unit of value in that case was 1.9 cents. In 1908 it was 2.6 cents. The year selected by the Senator from Minnesota is the only year of the eleven years in which the value reached the point suggested by him.

Mr. NELSON. The statistics show that under the Dingley law and under the Democratic tariff law of 1894 lead-bearing ore is put in two classes. There is, first, lead contained in silver ore. The import of that was, as I have said, 42,973,425 pounds. The import price was 1.6 cents per pound. Now, of lead contained in other ores and dross during that same year there were imported only 363,163 pounds, and the price was 3.9 cents per pound. I have looked through this book, and in many instances it will be found that, even where you increase the tariff, you do not diminish the importations. By increasing the tariff you simply enable the producer to levy a greater tribute.

I understood the Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND] to say that the price of lead was 4 cents, or 3½ cents. I should be glad if the Senator would state it again.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I said that during the period that the Wilson law was in operation——

Mr. NELSON. I mean now—the last two or three years; the year of 1907, for instance.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The price has ranged through the last twelve years from 4 to 6 cents. I do not recall that it has fallen below 4 cents, although it may have done so.

Mr. NELSON. That shows that it has been sold for the import rate plus the duty.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It reached the price of 6 cents only at one time for a very short period. The average price has been somewhere between 4 and 5 cents. Upon one occasion it did reach as high as 6 cents.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I trust that I will not be interrupting the debate if at this time I ask the indulgence of the Senate for a few minutes that I may place upon the record a brief comment upon the constitutionality of the income tax.

I believe in the policy of the income tax not only because it is justified on the principle of the more equitable distribution of the proceeds of human labor and that those with great incomes should contribute more to the support of government, but because, also, it will excite the interest of the wealthier classes in a more economical administration of government and in a purer form of government.

I favor an income tax broadly and without any limitations to adjust it to the opinion of the Supreme Court recently rendered (1894) in the Pollock case.

I shall not take the time of the Senate to discuss the advisability of the income tax from the standpoint that it is justified because it falls upon those more easily able to conveniently meet the expense of the Government; since this consideration, while of interest, would be of little avail if the income tax were unconstitutional.

In view of the arguments submitted before the Supreme Court, its opinions in favor of an income tax for one hundred and eight years and its change of view by the narrow margin of one vote in 1894, I agree with the Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] that we are justified in asking that there shall be a reconsideration of this question, and I shall agree, moreover, to the proposition of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BROWN], if, upon reconsideration, the Supreme Court still adheres to its opinion, that we shall propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States for the purpose of writing permanently in the policy of this country this method of raising revenues for the conduct of government.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. OWEN. With pleasure.

Mr. BROWN. I do not like to have the Senator from Oklahoma misunderstand my position. I am not in favor of waiting until the Supreme Court of the United States has reviewed its former decision in this matter before proposing an amendment to the Constitution. My proposition is to submit the amendment now, and at the same time adopt an amendment to the bill providing for an income tax.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I will agree with the Senator from Nebraska as to the immediate consideration and submission of the proposed constitutional amendment. I was only intending to suggest that I believe the Supreme Court itself would, upon a reconsideration of this matter if again submitted by the Congress and in the light of what I shall now submit to the Senate, change its opinion, because I think I can demonstrate to the Senate that the Supreme Court ought to change its opinion, and that the defense of the income tax before the court was fatally defective.

The controversy as to whether or not the income tax is constitutional turns upon the interpretation of the meaning of the words "direct tax," as used in clause 4, section 9, Article I, of the Constitution.

I have considered the decisions and the arguments made and the history of this clause, and think it my duty, as a Member of this body, to make record of my conclusions with regard to the true meaning of this term as used in the fourth clause of section 9. I do not agree with those who hold that the direct tax here referred to, and which is inhibited unless apportioned, means a tax on real property or on the individual at all; its real meaning is *a direct tax on the United States*, to be apportioned upon said States severally, in accordance to their population under the constitutional plan of apportioning representation, and does not mean *a direct tax on the citizen in any sense.*

In the Hylton case, decided by the Supreme Court in the February term of 1796, the court decided that a tax on carriages was not a "direct tax," under clause 4, because not capable of apportionment. It was a correct conclusion. But the reasoning premises were erroneous, because Justice Iredell said (3 Dallas, 181) to support the conclusion it was not a *direct tax*, under clause 4, that "a tax on carriages is a tax on expense or consumption," and in effect *an indirect* tax.

He should have said, "Congress has a right, under section 8, to impose *on the citizen a direct tax*. The 'direct tax' of clause 4, section 9, requiring apportionment, exclusively refers to a direct tax on the United States apportioned severally."

Justice Patterson, conceding, *erroneously*, that a direct tax on the citizen required apportionment, erroneously argued that a tax on carriages was indirect and therefore permissible.

He said because it was in the nature of a duty or a tax on expense and an *indirect* tax, he supported it. But he was justified in supporting it as a direct tax under section 8, and it could not be described as falling within the meaning of a *"direct tax"* in any contingency *under clause 4 of section 9*. He said he supported it because it was "in the nature of a duty or a tax on expense and an indirect tax."

And Justice Chase likewise said (ibid., 175):

It seems to me that a tax on expense is an *indirect* tax.

The decision of the court was sound in sustaining the tax, but it was decided upon the erroneous theory that a tax on carriages was not a direct tax, and that if it had been and was not capable of apportionment, it could not be laid by Congress.

Justice Iredell also said:

Perhaps a direct tax in the sense of the Constitution can mean nothing but a tax on something *inseparably annexed to the soil; something capable of apportionment under all such circumstances. A land or a poll tax may be considered of this description.*

And throughout the entire decision there runs an apologetic vein—the idea that the United States did not have the right to lay taxes directly on the citizen; but if a *direct tax were laid upon the citizen*, it must be apportioned.

And this erroneous conception of this phrase, used in clause 4, section 9, by the influence of the weight of the doctrine of *stare decisis*, has perpetuated this error from 1796, when the court decided correctly upon erroneous reasoning, down to 1904, when the Supreme Court, upon this erroneous reasoning of previous decisions decided against the income tax erroneously, but logically enough having accepted this false premise. The false premise was that a "direct tax," within the meaning of clause 4, section 9, Article I, meant *a direct tax on the citizen* and not *a direct tax on the United States.* The exact contrary was true. This question has been discussed with wonderful learning and vast research, but in all of this discussion the learned bar and bench has faithfully bowed down to the influence of *stare decisis* and learnedly perpetuated the original error. Both the friends and the foes of the income tax have acquiesced in the original and fatal error.

The clauses relating to this matter are as follows:

Article I, section 8, clause 1. The Congress shall have power *to lay and collect taxes*, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and the general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Article I, section 9, clause 5: No tax or duty shall be laid on articles exported from any State.

Article I, section 9, paragraph 4: No capitation or other direct tax shall be laid, unless in proportion to the census or enumeration hereinbefore directed to be taken.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

The enumeration referred to is found in Article I, section 2, clause 3, to wit:

Representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union according to their respective numbers, which shall be determined by the adding to the whole number of free persons, including those bound to service for a term of years and excluding Indians not taxed, three-fifths of all other persons. The actual enumeration shall be made within three years after the first meeting of the Congress of the United States, and within every subsequent term of ten years, in such manner as they shall by law direct.

Direct taxes may have either of two meanings:

First, direct taxes imposed by the State, county, or municipality directly on the citizen.

Second, direct taxes imposed on the United States, as sovereign separate entities, by the Congress, to be apportioned according to population under the same rule as determined the representation of such States.

To arrive at the true meaning of the "direct taxes" referred to in these two latter clauses it is necessary to consider the history of this phrase.

Obviously, a "direct tax" might have been imposed by Congress *on the United States* by making direct requisition on them for $100,000 apiece for the common expense, and as each of them were sovereign powers, claiming equal right of representation, this would not have been altogether unreasonable, and it was to avoid this direct tax and uniform direct tax on the States which led to clause 4, section 9, requiring its apportionment. No such reason obtains as far as the direct tax on the citizen is concerned.

But the phrase "direct tax" might also be used within the State to mean the direct tax levied on the citizen by his State, by his county, or by his municipality. And here is where the confusion has occurred, for both bench and bar have failed to perceive that the terms "direct taxes" and "direct tax" in the above two clauses exclusively meant "direct taxes" and "direct tax" to be laid *on the United States* as *States* and *therefore* to be apportioned, and did not mean "direct taxes" or "direct tax" on the citizen, the apportionment of which among the States was meaningless, illogical, absurd, and impracticable.

The word "tax" is a very comprehensive word, and possibly includes all burdens and impositions by virtue of the taxing power with the object of raising money for public purposes, and are direct or indirect according to the manner of imposition. Ordinarily we regard as indirect taxes duties, imposts, and excises which are paid by the importer or the manufacturer and charged to the ultimate consumer by an increased price, but the Constitution authorized Congress (sec. 8) to lay and collect taxes on the citizen as well as duties, imposts, and excises. The latter three are both direct and indirect taxes and were required to be made uniform; but the authority under the Constitution that Congress should lay and collect taxes involves broadly all kinds of taxes which fall upon the individual, and this right has been exercised on the individual without question until 1894, when the Supreme Court of the United States held the income tax invalid because it was a *direct tax* and not apportioned among the States according to population, as required by the two clauses last named.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. OWEN. With pleasure.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It occurs to me that the proposition the Senator is now developing is rather an original and novel one. I may be mistaken about it, however. Do I understand him to say that the Government of the United States, within the provisions of the Constitution, can levy a tax as a direct tax upon a State as a sovereignty?

Mr. OWEN. I do.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Where do you get the authority for that proposition?

Mr. OWEN. I am going to explain that at length. I find the authority in the proceedings of the Constitutional Convention. I find the authority in the Articles of Confederation and in the Constitution of the United States (clause 4, sec. 9, Art. I). I find the authority in the acts of Congress of 1798, of 1813, and of 1815, in which the Congress, in express words by acts of Congress, laid a tax of so many million dollars, not upon the citizen, but upon the United States, to be apportioned among the several States under the constitutional rule.

The defense of the income tax that it was an indirect tax was found fatally weak by a majority of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Pollock case. Their reasoning was logically correct; their premises and conclusion erroneous.

With that logical reasoning I agree. But I do not agree with the conclusion, because the United States had a right under section 8 to lay a direct tax upon the citizens and upon the States, but if it did lay a "direct tax" within the meaning of clause 4 of section 9, then it was exclusively a direct tax upon the United States as States, to be apportioned among the States severally according to the rule of population and apportionment laid down in the Constitution, Article I, section 2, clause 3.

Congress was given the broad authority to lay and collect taxes on individuals by section 8; but in laying a (gross) capitation or other "direct tax" on the United States, Congress was required to apportion the same under section 9, clause 4, and did so in the acts of 1798, 1813, 1815, and so forth.

THE HISTORY EXPLAINS THE MEANING OF THE TERM "DIRECT TAX" AS USED.

The history of clause 4, section 9, and of clause 3, section 2, explains clearly that the term "direct tax" meant neither more nor less than a direct tax on the United States, and that it did not mean a direct tax *on the citizen*.

This construction makes the Constitution harmonious with itself, and perfectly coherent and sensible and practicable.

It makes it consistent with the history immediately preceding the formation of the Constitution.

Chief Justice Fuller well said:

Under the Articles of Confederation the Government of the United States was limited in the exercise of this power *to requisitions upon the States*, while *the whole power of direct or indirect* taxation of persons and property, whether by taxes on polls or duties on imports, or duties on internal production, manufacture, or use, was acknowledged to belong exclusively to the States, without any other limitation than that of noninterference with certain treaties made by Congress. (157 U. S., 561.)

The practice of Congress prior to the Constitution was to make requisition on the States and thus impose *a direct tax* on the *United States* of the Confederation.

On the 12th of July, 1777, a draft of the Articles of the Confederation was submitted to Congress: Article 2 provides as follows:

All charges of war and all other expenses which shall be incurred for the common defense or general welfare, and allowed by the United States assembled, shall be defrayed out of a common treasury, *which shall be supplied by the several Colonies in proportion to the number of inhabitants* of every age, sex, and quality, except Indians not paying taxes, in each Colony. (1 Ell. Deb., 70–73.)

By the provisions of these articles the Colonies were required to defray the expenses of the Confederated States and Congress was denied the power to levy taxes for its needs *directly upon the States*, their property, or their inhabitants. (1 Ell. Deb., 81.)

On Friday, the 18th of April, 1783, the Articles of Confederation were amended. (Ibid., 94.)

And thenceforth—

The taxation necessary for federal purposes was to be apportioned in proportion to the whole number of white and other free citizens and inhabitants, including those bound to servitude for a term of years, and three-fifths of all other persons, except Indians not paying taxes.

The words "land, buildings, and improvements thereon" were *struck out of the domain of federal taxation* at this time prior to adoption of the Constitution. (2 Ell. Deb., 36, 56; 1 Ell. Deb., 484.)

This *apportionment* of taxation was not limited to *direct taxes or to indirect* taxes; but all the property and citizens of the several States *which each of the States was then taxing* was made liable *for the proportion of that State*, according to its population. (2 Ell. Deb., 36, 56.)

The words—

"land, buildings, and improvements thereon" were rejected by the Confederated Congress *as not being a convenient source of revenue for the Federal Government.* (1 Ell. Deb., 484.)

This amendment to the Articles of Confederation was sent forth by Congress to the people, accompanied by an address prepared by Messrs. Madison, Ellsworth, and Hamilton.

In this address, speaking of population as the rule of taxation, they said:

This rule, although not free from objection, is liable to fewer than any other that could be devised.

From the time of their adoption by the confederate congress until the decision in the Hylton case, land, building, and improvements thereon were *never thereafter regarded as the source of revenue for the Federal Government.* It results, therefore, that after "land, buildings, and improvements thereon" were withdrawn as a subject of federal taxation, *the requisitions of Congress were met by the States by their own system of taxation.* (Ely Taxn., 109; C. A. Seward.)

The various States had their own system of collecting taxes, and did collect such taxes for the benefit of the States themselves and *for the benefit of the General Government.*

In the Massachusetts convention, Mr. Dawes said:

Congress had it not in their power to draw a revenue from commerce, and therefore multiplied their requisitions on the States, and our *only course was to a direct taxation.* (2 Ell. Deb., 41.)

A direct taxation of what? A direct taxation of the several States, and not of the citizens of the State.

On the 16th of July, 1787, the following resolution was adopted:

Representation ought to be proportioned according to *direct taxation*—

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Direct taxation of what? Of the citizen? That construction is absurd. Direct taxation of the several States, and nothing but that could have been intended. It is not material (turning to Mr. Crawford) that this explanation has not heretofore been expounded, if the record and the history justify this argument, which they do most abundantly.

And in order to ascertain the alteration in the *direct taxation* which may be required from time to time by changes in the relative circumstances *of the States:*

Resolved, That a census be taken * * * and that the legislature *proportion the direct taxation* accordingly.

Proportion the direct taxation of what? Of the citizen? Impossible. No such interpretation can be put upon this language with regard to the direct taxation referred to, which was to be apportioned among the States severally, represented then by the gentlemen who were then writing the Constitution of the United States.

ONLY THE DIRECT TAXATION OF THE STATE IS BEING HERE CONSIDERED.

There was again a debate over this suggestion, which culminated in the draft of a constitution which apportioned direct taxation according to the number of the representatives. This was remodeled, and on the 12th of September, 1787, a revised draft of the Constitution was introduced, which provided that *"representatives"* and *direct taxes* shall be apportioned on the basis of population and under the rule prescribed by the Articles of Confederation. On this same 12th of September, 1787, the revised draft of the Constitution contained these words: "That no capitation tax shall be laid unless in proportion to the census hereinbefore directed to be taken."

The capitation tax in clause 4 to be laid in proportion to the census, was in like manner, *a gross sum to be laid on the States,* according to population, counting three-fifths of the slaves in making such enumeration of the population. There was nothing curious or unreasonable about this; it was understood that the slaves had not the productive quality or the worth of free men, and that in taxing the States the slave should not be counted above three-fifths of their number for purposes of taxation or for purposes of representation.

This lessened the capitation *tax on the States* having slaves, but it was *a tax* on the States nevertheless and not a tax on the citizen that was being considered.

It is clear that a capitation tax levied direct on the citizen would not and could not be apportioned under the constitutional rule, which was *based on a fixed census* of freemen counting three-fifths of the slaves.

Undoubtedly the Constitutional Convention believed that the Congress should have the power of assessing and levying *direct taxes on the States* and to apportion such taxes according to the rule of population.

Mr. King said:

It is a principle of this Constitution that representation and taxation should go hand in hand. * * * By this rule are *representation and taxation to be apportioned.* (2 Ell. Deb., 36.)

Representation of what? Of the States. Taxation of what? Of the States. Why was there a diminished tax placed upon the population of the slaveholding States, and what was its purpose? It was to apportion it among the several States, and the direct tax and the capitation tax were to be diminished to three-fifths of the number of slaves by the operation of this constitutional rule.

Mr. Dawes said:

The rule laid down in the paragraph is the best that can be obtained *for the apportionment of the little direct taxes* which Congress will want. (Ibid., 42.)

Mr. Pendleton said:

The *apportionment of representation and taxation* by the same scale is just. (3 Ell. Deb., 41.)

Representation of what? Of the States. Taxation of what? Of the States.

Mr. Nicholas said:

The amount of the sums to be raised of the people is the same, *whether the state legislatures lay the taxes for themselves or for the General Government.* (3 Ell. Deb., 99.)

Did not this mean that the direct tax on the State should be collected by the State?

Mr. Nicholas said:

The proportion of taxes are fixed by the number of inhabitants. Each State will know from its population *its proportion of any general tax.* (3 Ell. Deb., 243.)

Does not this mean that the *tax levied on the State* by a general tax on the States would be known to the State under the rule?

Mr. Randolph said:

When *any sum is necessary* for the General Government, every State will immediately *know its exact proportion of it* from the number of the people and Representatives. (3 Ell. Deb., 122.)

The phrase:

No capitation tax shall be laid *unless in proportion to the census* hereinbefore directed to be taken—

And this necessarily meant laid *on the States* by Congress and *not on the citizen,* because to levy a capitation tax on the citizen under the apportionment rule is unreasonable, while to apportion a capitation tax on the States under the apportionment rule is reasonable—

was amended, on the motion of Mr. Read, to insert after "capitation" the words "or other direct taxes." (5 Ell. Deb., 545.)

Mr. King asked, August 20, 1787 (5 Ell. Deb., 451), what was meant by direct taxation. And he was not answered, but he might well have been answered, as far as clause 4, section 9, was concerned. It is a direct taxation on the United States, to be laid upon them severally in proportion to the rule of population by which the right of representation is fixed.

Mr. Gerry (5 Ell. Deb., 451) moved that—

From the first meeting of the Legislature of the United States, until a census shall be taken, all moneys for supplying the Public Treasury *by direct taxation shall be raised from the several States* according to the number of Representatives, respectively, in the first branch.

Does not this mean direct taxation on the States as such?

In the Secret Proceedings and Debates of the Convention, Charles Pinkney submitted a draft (S. Doc. 728, 60th Cong., 2d sess., p. 146), and provided that in fixing the power of the Congress, that:

The proportion of *direct taxation* shall be regulated by the whole number of the inhabitants of every description, etc.

And Mr. Patterson, June 15, 1787 (ibid., 150), proposed a resolution, as follows:

3. *Resolved,* That whenever requisitions shall be necessary, instead of the present rule, *the United States in Congress be authorized to make such requisitions* in proportion to the whole number of white and other free citizens, etc.

That *if such requisitions be not complied with in the time to be specified therein, to direct collection thereof in the noncomplying States;* and for that purpose to devise and pass acts directing and authorizing the same, etc.

Does not this mean a "direct tax" on the States, and not on the citizen, to be proportioned to population?

Mr. Luther Martin, in his report to the legislature of Maryland, said (ibid., 39) that he did not think the General Government ought to have been given the right to lay *"direct taxes"* in any case, and by this expression he meant *"direct taxes on the citizen,"* and that he introduced the following proposition:

And whenever the legislature of the United States shall find it necessary that revenue should be raised by direct taxation, having apportioned the same by the above rule—

Here by "direct taxation" he means taxation of the States—

requisitions shall be made of the respective States to pay into the Continental Treasury their respective quotas, within a time in the said requisition to be specified, and in case of any of the States failing to comply with such requisition then, and then only, to have power to devise and pass acts directing the mode and authorizing the collection of the same [by direct levy on the citizen, is the alternate].

He said:

Had this proposition been acceded to, the dangerous and oppressive power in the General Government of imposing direct *taxes on inhabitants which it now enjoys in all cases,* would have been only vested in it, in case of noncompliance of a State, as a punishment for its delinquency, and would have ceased the moment that the State complied with the requisition.

He uses the words "direct taxes" in that one expression in two different ways, objecting to Congress having the right to levy taxes directly on the citizen, which he enlarges upon in his report to the Maryland legislature, but being willing that they might lay *direct taxes on the State,* and that if the States did not contribute the quota of taxes directly levied on them, Congress might in that contingency exercise the right of direct taxes on the citizen; and he bitterly complained in his report to the Maryland legislature that the Constitutional Convention did not regard his views in this matter, but that they gave to Congress a complete right *"in all cases"* to levy *direct taxes upon the citizen.*

These various quotations show clearly that the direct tax intended to be apportioned was understood by the Constitutional Convention of the United States as a direct tax on the States, and on the States alone, as entities, to be apportioned among the several States as entities, to be collected by requisitions, and that clause 4 of section 9 did not mean a direct tax on citizens, which was otherwise provided for in section 8, *clause 1,* but a direct tax on the United States, to be apportioned and paid on requisitions. And this impression is confirmed, notwithstanding the Hylton decision of 1796, by the act of Congress of July 14, 1798 (1 Stat., 597).

Here Congress declares this meaning in the plainest, most emphatic terms, to wit:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That *a direct tax* of $2,000,000 shall be, and *is hereby, laid*—"

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

On whom?

"upon the United States—"

And not on the citizen—

"and apportioned to the States, respectively, in the manner following:

"State of New Hampshire $77,705.362

"State of Massachusetts ..... 260,435.312"

It is true that Congress immediately proceeded in section 2 (1 Stats., 597) to provide for the collection of such a tax by its own officers, assessing the same on dwelling houses, lands, and slaves, according to valuation otherwise provided for. But this does not make *the direct tax* of clause 4, section 9, any the less *a direct tax on the State*, which tax was duly apportioned as contemplated by the Constitution as a *tax laid on the States directly* and *not a tax directly on the citizen*. The collection of the tax from the individuals within the States was an exercise of the power of laying taxes under section 8, unequivocally given to Congress, notwithstanding this proviso of clause 4, section 9, that the direct tax on the States should be apportioned, and this interpretation of the two clauses is perfectly consistent, perfectly rational, and makes the several parts of the Constitution harmonious with each other.

Congress in this act exercised both its power of direct taxation on the States (Sec. 9., cl. 4) and its right of direct taxation on the citizen (sec. 8. cl. 1) which was illogical but not unlawful and which was a mathematical misfit, the revenue making a different sum in every case from the mathematical constitutional apportionment.

It is a matter of vast importance to the people of the United States, and it is of great importance to the Senate of the United States, to consider the meaning of the Constitution in the light of the Constitutional Convention and in the light of these acts of Congress.

The act of 1813 in like manner demonstrates that the direct tax referred to in clause 4 of section 9 was intended solely to be a *direct tax upon the United States;* and the law of 1813 says in the most unequivocal language (3 Stat., 53) that the direct tax is laid "*on the United States,*" and the conclusion follows that Congress understood such direct tax requiring apportionment to be a direct tax on the States and not on the citizen.

Everything depends upon that construction. If it is only the *direct tax* upon the United States that must be apportioned, then the pleading before the Supreme Court in the Pollock case was absolutely wrong from beginning to end, and upon a fatally weak defense it is no great wonder the court decided against it.

Listen to the language of the act of 1813, Third Statutes, 1853:

"That a direct tax of $3,000,000 shall be, and is hereby, laid *upon the United States—*"

Not upon the citizen. The act of Congress followed the meaning of section 9, clause 4, in levying the direct tax referred to directly upon the States, and immediately making the apportionment as contemplated alone by section 9, clause 4. Congress had the right otherwise to levy a direct tax upon the citizen, and has exercised it ever since the foundation of the Government.

What sense was there in forbidding the United States Government from taxing directly the citizen by uniform laws? And what does section 8, clause 1, mean in authorizing Congress "to lay and collect taxes" as well as imposts, duties, and excises if it does not mean what it plainly says?

May the United States directly tax a sovereign State and not be permitted to directly tax the citizen of the United States, whose votes established the United States?

The act of 1813 imposed the direct tax on the United States, and under clause 4, section 9, the tax was apportioned to the States, respectively, in the manner following:

"New Hampshire $96,793.37

"Massachusetts ..... 316,270.98"

and so forth. And the collection of the same was provided by federal officers, but with the express provision, section 7:

That *each State may pay its quota into the Treasury of the United States, and thereon shall be entitled to a deduction of 15 per cent* if paid before the 10th day of February next, and 10 per cent if paid before the 1st day of May in the same year.

It cost something to collect this tax. It was only reasonable that if a State should pay directly, the cost of collection should be taken out of it.

These acts demonstrate conclusively that the direct tax referred to in clause 4 of section 9 was a direct tax to be laid "*upon the United States,*" and not upon citizens, and apportioned according to population, and that it was not a direct tax on individuals in any sense that was referred to in clause 4, section 9.

The act of 1815 is in the same identical language, incapable of misinterpretation, it seems to me.

The attorneys argued in the Hylton case (1796), that the tax on carriages was a direct tax not apportioned, and hence invalid. The attorneys defending said it was an *indirect* tax on the *use*, and so forth.

The error was in conceding that a direct tax on carriages or on the citizen could not be laid without apportionment under clause 4, section 9. This was nonsense. The direct tax requiring apportionment was a direct tax on the United States following the previous plan of the Confederation of direct requisitions on the States proportioned to population.

It is perfectly obvious that you could not apportion a direct tax upon individuals according to the constitutional rule of population, but you could apportion a tax on the United States severally according to such rule.

Observe the confusion which would follow the attempt to apportion a direct tax upon the citizen according to the constitutional rule:

First, you must levy the tax directly on the citizen, upon his real estate, and so forth, at so much ad valorem; what the gross amount would be for each State could not be known until it should have been collected, and after it was collected, then, when an attempt is made to apportion it—the gross amount—under the constitutional rule, it would be found that the gross amount collected would be too much in some cases, and too small in other cases, and thereupon a rebate would have to be allowed to the individuals who paid too much and a further tax imposed on the individuals who paid too little.

The administration of such a plan is impossible. The mere suggestion of *apportioning a direct tax on the citizen* is grotesque, and can not be seriously maintained.

In my judgment Congress itself erred in collecting the *direct tax imposed on the States* within the meaning of this particular clause of the Constitution, although it had the right, under section 8, to lay taxes direct on the citizen, but it would have been more orderly in laying the tax *directly on the States* to have permitted the State to respond by requisition before enforcing payment under the direct tax authorized by *section 8*, as it did provide in the act of 1813, for example.

In my judgment it is utterly immaterial whether the income tax be regarded as a direct or indirect tax because Congress has the complete right "to lay and collect taxes" (sec. 8) on the individual, direct or indirect, and is not restrained by clause 4, section 9, which only imposes the apportionment rule on Congress in laying direct taxes on the States.

The defense of the income tax on the ground that it is indirect has been *the fatal error of its advocates* from the beginning of the controversy.

Since the entire controversy has turned on the meaning of the phrase "direct tax," as used in clause 4 of section 9, I have felt impelled to submit to the Senate my interpretation of the Constitution and the meaning of this phrase in the light of its history.

This interpretation, which I have the honor to submit, would relieve the Constitution of ambiguity, make sections 8 and 9 of Article I perfectly harmonious, and would make the income tax constitutional beyond a doubt and justifies the resubmission of this question to the Supreme Court of the United States for whose perfect integrity, for whose great ability and vast learning, I entertain the deepest respect and reverence.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I should like to make an inquiry, but first, before I ask the question, I wish to make a statement as to the status of these amendments to the pending bill as I understand it. If the Senate committee amendment to paragraph 179 is adopted, it puts a duty of 1½ cents a pound on the lead in lead ore. Then it would be necessary to amend paragraph 180 in order to fix the same duty of 1½ cents a pound on pig lead. If the Senate committee amendment to paragraph 179 is rejected and the Senate committee amendment to paragraph 180 is rejected, then the duty is the same on the lead in lead ore as it is on pig lead and bullion.

Mr. ALDRICH. If the amendment to pargraph 180 should be rejected, it would leave the matter open for further consideration. That would not make the duty 1½ cents a pound on pig lead. It would be necessary, then, if the Senate desired to have a duty of 1½ cents on pig lead, to provide it by a new paragraph. But it is a simple matter for the Senator from Kansas or any other Senator when paragraph 180 is under consideration to move to amend the Senate committee amendment, which provides for 2⅛ cents, making it 1½ cents.

Mr. STONE. Will the Senator permit me? Would not the same end be accomplished by voting down the Senate committee amendment to paragraph 179 and the amendment to paragraph 180?

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Mr. ALDRICH. Of course if the Senate thinks that there ought to be the same rate of duty on lead ore and pig lead, I take it for granted it will vote against the committee amendment to paragraph 179. I take it for granted that all those who think there should be no difference at all between the finished product and the raw material will vote against the amendment to paragraph 179. I assume that to be so.

Mr. BRISTOW. And also against the amendment to paragraph 180, would they not?

Mr. ALDRICH. That would not be necessary. If they vote down the amendment to paragraph 179, paragraph 180 would be of no use; it would drop out. I would withdraw the amendment to paragraph 180, of course, if the amendment to paragraph 179 should be voted down.

Mr. BRISTOW. That is what I wanted to get clearly before the Senate.

Now, I should like to inquire why a difference of five-eighths of a cent per pound is put on pig lead and the scrap lead, as I will call it?

Mr. ALDRICH. I should be very glad if the Senator would postpone the discussion of that until after we have decided this question. It seems to me that that is a question which ought to come up upon paragraph 180.

Mr. BRISTOW. But, Mr. President, we can not separate these questions, because if we vote down the amendment to paragraph 179, then we fix the duty the same on both these products.

Mr. ALDRICH. I do not know whether the Senator from Kansas listened to the very clear statement of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. HEYBURN] upon that subject yesterday. I have never heard a clearer statement made in this body than that Senator made upon that very question. If the Senator would read the RECORD this morning, I am sure he would find it satisfactorily explained to him.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I desire to say that I heard every word the Senator from Idaho said yesterday, and I read in the RECORD this morning every word that he said. Still I do not know why it is necessary to put five-eighths of a cent a pound additional on pig lead above that on the lead in lead ore. I should like to know the reason why that was done.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I do not know that I can make it clearer, but perhaps the demonstration by the figures that would result from it may be of some assistance. The difference of duty, perhaps, is $12.50 a ton on the bullion. All these other designations may be included in bullion, because that is what it amounts to; it is bullion; in other words, it is lead as distinguished from the lead contents in the ores. Twelve dollars and fifty cents a ton only meagerly represents the cost of converting lead in ore to lead in bullion. It is merely a question of wages and the cost of taking the lead out of the ore and making it bullion. The difference of the duty proposed is $12.50 a ton. That is wages and the investment necessary in machinery to convert the lead in ore to lead in bullion; that is all.

Mr. NELSON. Will the Senator from Idaho yield to me for a question?

Mr. HEYBURN. I am speaking in the time of the Senator from Kansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS in the chair). Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. BRISTOW. Certainly.

Mr. NELSON. I wish to ask a question for information. As I understand it, most of this lead ore comes mixed with other ore, gold or silver or copper.

Mr. HEYBURN. No; not most of it.

Mr. NELSON. Well, a good share of it. But that ore is reduced into bullion or base bullion, is it not?

Mr. HEYBURN. The term "bullion" covers it.

Mr. NELSON. Yes; bullion. You get a rate of 1½ cents a pound on that. Then by the next process you separate your bullion, you separate the lead from the silver or the other parts, and you get a rate of 2⅛ cents more. So for the whole process, from the time you take the ore out of the ground until you have separated the lead from the other metals, you get 1½ cents plus 2⅛ cents.

Mr. ALDRICH. Oh, no.

Mr. NELSON. The aggregate duty?

Mr. HEYBURN. I think the Senator is mistaken in his conclusion.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, we get no silver out of the lead ore.

Mr. ALDRICH. This is not an accumulating duty.

Mr. HEYBURN. Not at all.

Mr. BRISTOW. I should like to inquire what it costs a ton to refine lead ore?

Mr. HEYBURN. It is not termed longer "lead ore." It is an extraction of lead from the ore.

I can, perhaps, make it plainer to the Senator from Kansas. The lead contents of ore may represent 8 per cent, or it may represent more or less. Now, in the larger fields of production, or rather I will say, out of regard to the State of Missouri, in the field of production outside of the State of Missouri, it is necessary, first, to concentrate that ore and extract what you would call the "native rock," in which it is contained, to as large an extent as possible. You take 8 or 10 tons of the ore as it is mined, and by a process of concentration you eliminate from it the silica, the slate, and the granite, or whatever it may be contained in, until you have the concentrated product. That still is not bullion. Your expense in doing that, at a reasonable estimate, involves an investment of probably $150,000,000 in concentrating mills in the United States and a labor account of about 25,000 men in the United States, at a wage of about $4 a day. After the expense of mining the ore has been disposed of, that account stands between the ore and the bullion. It does not become bullion until it is smelted. It goes through two processes—concentration for the elimination of the great mass of waste, and then smelting in order to extract the lead from the concentrated product.

That represents close to $40,000,000 in wages and the incidents of labor in addition to the investment in the works necessary to perform that extraction. That is added to the cost of the finished product in comparison with the cost of the lead in the ore. It represents that value.

Now, if you are going to allow lead ore to be mined abroad and shipped in as ore, and then put no additional duty on the bullion, they will extract lead from the ore abroad and ship it into this country as bullion at this lower rate of duty, and, consequently, they will diminish our mining to the extent that they substitute it for theirs. The wages of this vast expenditure that represents the conversion of the lead in ore to lead in bullion and the cost would be paid abroad. It will not be paid in this country. The machinery for doing it will be constructed abroad, not in this country.

I would suggest to the Senator that the machinery and the appliances necessary to perform that extraction can be made abroad for one-third of the cost in this country. In other words, great concentrating works and smelters can be built in Germany or in Mexico for a third of the amount at which they can be built in this country. We therefore lose the wages represented by the construction of these works to the laborers of this country and give it to those abroad.

That is one of the very largest items that enters into this proposition. We want the wages for mining the ore paid to American miners. We want the wages and the expenditures incident to the extraction of the lead from the ore paid to the laborers of this country. In our State we purchase something like $2,000,000 worth of machinery in our country for the purpose of converting lead ore into lead bullion or into concentrates.

That machinery and those works are produced by American labor out of American material. Would you substitute the foreign labor and the foreign material for that? I think not, when the Senator comes to think of it. The whole principle of protection is that we may draw the benefits of labor and investment to ourselves, so that the money may stay in this country and be distributed according to the enterprise.

Mr. ALDRICH. Perhaps I can add a word that may enlighten the Senator from Kansas, although I am not an expert in lead producing. The average value of lead in the ore that is imported is 2 cents a pound. The average value of pig lead that is imported is 4 cents a pound, showing a difference in the cost of production of 2 cents a pound from the lead ore to the finished product or to the lead in the bullion or in bar or pig lead. I am using these figures as an average to show the approximate difference between the two.

Now, the difference in the tariff between the two is the difference between 1½ cents and 2⅛ cents, or five-eighths of 1 cent a pound, which is about 30 per cent on the cost of taking the lead ore and putting it into lead bullion abroad. I believe that if the facts should be submitted to the Senate they would show that that does not equal the cost between abroad and this country of changing lead ore into lead bullion.

Mr. BRISTOW. As I understand from the remarks of the Senator from Idaho, it costs about $12.50 a ton to take the lead out of the lead ore and make pig or bullion of it.

Mr. HEYBURN. It costs fully that.

Mr. BRISTOW. Now, this five-eighths of a cent per pound is for the purpose of making up the difference in the cost in this country and abroad, as I understand it.

Mr. HEYBURN. That is $12.50. That is what it amounts to—$12.50 a ton.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

next inquires under what circumstances the written instrument was prepared, in order to see whether those circumstances will throw light upon the question.

He then inquires how those who have been charged with the duty of acting under the written instrument have acted so as to determine what the practical construction of it has been, and, last of all, or perhaps in connection with the other methods, he inquires what conclusion has been arrived at by others, skilled in the mysteries and subtleties of language, as to the meaning.

Now, I propose to seek these four sources of information upon this subject in the effort to ascertain what is meant by the Constitution when it speaks of direct taxes being apportioned among the several States according to numbers. First of all I shall discuss the language of the Constitution itself; second, the history and the circumstances leading up to and surrounding the adoption of the taxing provisions; third, the practical construction of the language, in order to see whether or not the various acts of Congress which have been passed upon this subject throw any light upon the question; and, fourth, I shall discuss the decisions of the Supreme Court which have from time to time been handed down upon the subject of the meaning of this expression in the Constitution.

THE LANGUAGE OF THE CONSTITUTION.

There are three clauses in the Constitution which we must consider when we come to apply the first test, namely, to read and compare the various provisions in order to see wheher or not they will throw light upon what was meant by this particular provision. Those three provisions are as follows: The third clause of section 2, Article I, provides:

Representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union, according to their respective numbers.

The first clause of section 8, Article I, provides:

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

The fourth clause of section 9, Article I, provides:

No capitation or other direct tax shall be laid, unless in proportion to the census or enumeration hereinbefore directed to be taken.

It will be observed that the Constitutional Convention seemed to attach a great deal of importance to the proposition that direct taxes should be apportioned among the several States according to the population, because it is twice expressed in the Constitution, and, so far as my memory serves me, this is the only thought which is twice expressed in the Constitution. It is first expressed affirmatively that direct taxes shall be apportioned in this way, and then, apparently for fear that the affirmative proposition would not be sufficiently strong, it is expressed negatively that no capitation or other direct tax shall be laid except according to this rule.

So it is seen that the Constitutional Convention laid special stress upon this particular thing. It is insisted in this argument that the only kinds of direct taxes are a capitation tax and a land tax. I want to call attention to and put in contrast two of these provisions of the Constitution upon that question. The order in the Constitution is not the order in which I shall speak of them.

That Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises.

* * * but all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Why are taxes, the most general term used in the clause, omitted in this limitation upon the exercise of the power? Taking that provision by itself, it is seen that of the four things mentioned, three of them, namely, duties, imposts, and excises, must be laid according to the rule of uniformity. Why did the makers of the Constitution omit the word "taxes" in that enumeration? Because they recognized that "taxes" had already been provided for in another part of the Constitution, where it had been declared that direct taxes should be laid according to the rule of apportionment; and so they provided in this section that duties, imposts, and excises should be laid according to the rule of uniformity. The conclusion, it seems to me, is perfectly clear that, taking those provisions together, what they mean is that taxes which do not fall within the description of duties, or imposts, or excises, are direct taxes and come within the other rule of the Constitution.

I am not without authority on that proposition. Mr. Tucker, in his work on the Constitution, first volume, page 458, speaking upon that subject, says:

From these uses of the term "taxes" in the clauses mentioned and "direct taxes" in the two clauses mentioned, it would seem that the framers of the Constitution had in their minds certain forms of taxes which they called "direct taxes," and other forms of taxes which were the alternate of "duties." So that taxes which were the constitutional synonym of duties were to be distinguished from the taxes which were "direct taxes." In other words, it would seem to be the true construction of the Constitution that taxes which were "direct taxes" were to be laid according to the apportionment plan, which in the second case where those terms are used is connected with their use, and all other taxes which were not embraced in the term "direct taxes" and were synonymous with "duties," etc., were properly embraced within the terms "duties," "imposts," and "excises."

And again, at page 459, he says:

This conclusion results from the fact that while the Constitution limits the power of Congress in reference to direct taxes by requiring them to be laid according to the census apportionment, and that duties, imposts, and excises must be uniform throughout the United States, it could not have meant to allow any taxation which was not included within one or the other of these groups.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Will not the Senator permit me to finish this quotation, and then I will yield? Mr. Tucker proceeds:

For if it did, then it would follow that taxes which were not direct, on the one hand, or within the terms "duties, imposts, and excises," would be laid at the discretion of Congress without being subject to either of the limits prescribed for direct taxes or for duties, imposts, and excises. It would seem, therefore, to be an inevitable construction of the Constitution that no tax could be laid upon the citizen by Congress which was not either subject to the census apportionment or to the requirement of uniformity, else it would leave to Congress some unrestrained power to lay taxes which were neither direct, nor duties, imposts, and excises. All taxation, therefore, which is not direct "taxation," must have been intended to be a general term embraced in the words "duties, imposts, and excises."

Now, I will yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. As I understand the suggestion of the Senator from Utah, it is that keeping out of the clause of the Constitution the Senator has just quoted the word "taxes" indicates that there was a belief in the minds of the framers that taxes measured a different kind of charges to what duties did, and that taxes being left out, it necessarily excluded the idea of uniformity as to that. Then why did they put in the words "direct taxes" at all, if they were using duties and taxes in the sense in which the Senator suggests? Why did they not say that Representatives and taxes shall be apportioned if taxes meant something other than duties?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think it might have been expressed in that way, but in the general clause conferring the taxing power they were undertaking to confer it as broadly as language would confer it.

Mr. BORAH. But the Constitution says that Representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned. Therefore, it would seem to follow that when they used the word "direct" they were distinguishing a certain kind of tax, and that there were other taxes which were not direct taxes.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think the word "taxes" in the clause to which I have directed attention is the generic word, which includes direct taxes, duties, imposts, and excises—those four classes—and the capitation tax——

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President——

Mr. SUTHERLAND. If the Senator will permit me—and Congress carved out of the general expression "taxes" the three classes, namely, duties, imposts, and excises, which were to be laid according to the rule of uniformity, and carved out of the generic term again the expression "direct taxes and a capitation tax," which were to be laid according to the rule of apportionment.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Certainly.

Mr. HEYBURN. I would inquire of the Senator from Utah if he does not think that the difference between taxes and duties that was in the minds of the framers of the Constitution was that which had always existed? Taxes are the result of the exercise of the supreme power without considering the will of the party taxed. Duties are the result of a contract between the sovereign and the subject. That always distinguished taxes from duties. One of them was the imperial edict of the sovereign power that he taxes. Duties, I repeat, resulted from the agreement that the subject should contribute to the lord of the fee or whatever the supreme power might be. I think that was in the minds of the makers of the Constitution.

Mr. BURKETT. Mr. President——

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Permit me just a moment. Of course the word "taxes" and the word "duties" are subject to a variety of shades of meaning. I am speaking of the way in which I think the words were used in the Constitution.

Mr. HEYBURN. That is what I was speaking of.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Mr. SUTHERLAND. My idea about that is that the word "taxes" is the broadest and the most comprehensive word of all the words that were used; that the word "taxes," as I have said, is generic, and includes all the varieties by which a citizen may be compelled to contribute to the support of the Government.

Mr. HEYBURN. If the Senator will permit me, it will be apparent that a citizen can not be compelled to contribute to the support of the Government through duties, because he may perform no act, do no thing, to which a duty attaches; but as to taxes, he can not avoid them by anything that he can do. Those distinctions were carried all through the English law before we adopted it. I think the Senator will find that the reason why they left out "taxes" in the second enumeration was because it was the only one that the citizen could not avoid, but he could avoid paying any of the other duties by avoiding the transactions that carried the duty.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The Senator may be correct about that.

Mr. BURKETT. I wish to make a suggestion to the Senator in connection with this question. The question was asked at one time in the discussion of the Constitution, in the convention, What are direct taxes? and it was not answered. I have sent for the Madison Papers, and I hope I can find it. I call to the Senator's attention the discussion as to what were indirect taxes. A statement was made there that indirect taxes concerned duties, imposts, and excises. There was that definition given of indirect taxes earlier in the discussion. So far as I have listened to this debate, I have never heard that discussed. I have sent for the Madison Papers, and I think I can turn to it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. If the Senator will do me the honor to listen to me until I finish what I have to say, he will find that I shall refer to that specific matter.

Mr. BURKETT. I am not only doing the Senator the honor, but I am going to do so in justice to myself, because the Senator from Idaho raised that question.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It has been sometimes suggested by both the Supreme Court of the United States and by counsel appearing before that court, and upon the floor of the Senate, that there may be a form of tax which is not subject to either of these rules. Nobody has ever undertaken to point out what particular subject which was liable to a tax would not come within either the rule of apportionment or the rule of uniformity; but in some vague, general way it has been stated that perhaps there may be a form of taxation that would not come within either class. In the Pollock case (157 U. S., 557) the Chief Justice, speaking upon that subject, observes:

> And although there have been from time to time intimations that there might be some tax which was not a direct tax, nor included under the words "duties, imposts, and excises," such a tax for more than one hundred years of national existence has as yet remained undiscovered, notwithstanding the stress of particular circumstances has invited thorough investigation into sources of revenue.

If I am correct in the construction of these provisions of the Constitution that imposts, duties, and excises, and those forms of taxation alone, are subject to the rule of uniformity, and other "taxes," or "direct taxes," are subject to the rule of apportionment, let me inquire, What becomes of a tax which is imposed upon the corpus of personal property? Both the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Idaho insist that the term "direct taxes" shall be confined to a land tax; that a tax upon personal property is not a direct tax. Suppose a tax is laid upon all of the personal estate of a citizen. That is not a duty; it is not an impost; it is not an excise. If I am correct in saying and if Mr. Tucker is correct in saying that all taxes must be subject to one rule or the other, it must be a direct tax. The Constitution says that "no capitation or other direct tax shall be laid," and so forth.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Certainly.

Mr. OWEN. I should like to ask the Senator from Utah if he understands by "a capitation and other direct tax," a capitation and other direct tax on the citizen or on the State exclusively, which must be apportioned?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I heard the Senator's argument upon that subject the other day, and he presented the matter with great ability and plausibility, but I am not prepared to assent to his view. I think that the language in the Constitution with reference to a direct tax meant a tax levied upon the citizen, and not a tax levied upon the State. That was the very thing which the framers of the Constitution were endeavoring to get away from. Under the Confederation the tax in a way was imposed upon the State in the form of a requisition upon the State, but it was found that the States would not comply with the requisitions. So that whole system was abandoned and the power was conferred upon the Federal Congress of imposing direct taxes upon the citizens of the States.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Utah how a capitation tax, apportioned upon population, counting three-fifths of the slaves, can be other than a tax on the State exclusively?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Well, a capitation tax, of course, would not be imposed upon the slave in the sense that the slave would be compelled to pay it, because the slave was property. That was simply the rule by which the amount of the tax was to be measured. The amount of the tax having been ascertained, then it was imposed upon either the property of the State or raised by a tax upon the heads of the various citizens of the State.

Mr. OWEN. Then I understand the Senator from Utah assents to the proposition that the capitation tax referred to in the fourth paragraph of section 9 of Article I of the Constitution is not a direct tax on the citizen.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No. The Senator misunderstands me if he understands that, because the Constitution itself says that it is a direct tax. It says a "capitation or other direct tax."

Mr. OWEN. The Constitution, Mr. President, says "capitation or other direct tax," but it does not specify whether it is a direct tax on the State or on the citizen. I call the attention of the Senator from Utah to the fact that a capitation tax, a direct tax on a citizen, can not be apportioned under the constitutional rule, and, therefore, must necessarily be a direct tax upon the State. That is a proposition I wish him to answer.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, it was no part of my purpose to discuss that phase of the question; and to enter upon it would lead me entirely too far afield, if the Senator will pardon me for saying so.

Mr. OWEN. I beg pardon of the Senator from Utah. I did not wish to interrupt his argument. I thought perhaps he had considered that.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I am discussing this tax upon the assumption that the decisions of the Supreme Court in that respect are right—that it is a tax upon the citizen and not upon the State.

I was about to say, when the Senator from Oklahoma interrupted me, that the language of the Constitution is "no capitation or other direct tax." It is manifest that, according to the argument made by the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Idaho, the words "other direct tax" meant but one kind of a tax, namely, a land tax. If it had been intended by the framers of the Constitution that those words "other direct tax" should include a land tax and nothing more, it seems to me that the plain and direct way would have been for the framers of the Constitution to have said so in precise words—to have simply said that "no capitation or land tax shall be laid, except in accordance with this rule."

The Senator from Texas the other day in his discussion called attention to the language of the Articles of Confederation upon that subject, which provided for a contribution from the several States, to be measured by the value of their lands and improvements. So the framers of the Constitution were familiar with that form of expression. If they had not intended to vary the sense which was conveyed by that expression used in the original Articles of Confederation, it is somewhat remarkable that they varied the language. If they had not intended to include more than was included by the terms used in the Articles of Confederation, why is it that they did not use the same language that was used in the Articles of Confederation instead of using an expression which, at least, apparently seems to include very much more?

Upon this same subject the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] quoted from the plan of Alexander Hamilton, which was that "taxes on land, houses, real estate, and capitation taxes" should be apportioned; and the Senator argued that that was evidence of what was meant in the Constitution by the use of the words "direct tax." The makers of the Constitution had this language of Alexander Hamilton before them. Alexander Hamilton had used in his proposed plan these precise words: "Lands, houses, real estate, and capitation taxes."

Again, I inquire if the framers of the Constitution intended to limit the taxation subject to the rule of apportionment to taxes on land, houses, real estate, and capitation taxes, why did they not adopt the language proposed by Mr. Hamilton instead of taking the general expression "direct tax," which, again I say, apparently means much more than was meant by the language of Mr. Hamilton.

This construction of the Constitution, according to the plain reading of its terms, it seems to me, is fully borne out by the history and circumstances leading up to and accompanying the adoption of the Constitution.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Certainly.

Mr. CUMMINS. Before the Senator passes to a new subject I should like to know definitely whether he assents to the distinction suggested by the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. HEYBURN] between a tax and a duty.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No; I do not, as the Senator has stated it. I think that the Senator accurately stated the primitive meaning of the word "duty," but I do not believe that it was used in that restricted sense in the Constitution.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do.

Mr. HEYBURN. I think I perhaps was not explicit enough in my statement to convey the full meaning. I intended to submit the proposition that a tax can not be avoided by any act on the part of a subject, while either of the others, imposts or duties, may be avoided by the subject declining to enter into the business that carries with it that class of taxation. That is a distinction about which there can be no doubt.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I will agree with the Senator to this extent, that a direct tax does imply the idea of coercion.

Mr. HEYBURN. Sovereignty.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Of coercion upon the subject who is to pay the tax, while the word "duty," which is imposed upon articles of consumption——

Mr. HEYBURN. Which may not be consumed.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Articles which may be imported.

Mr. HEYBURN. Or which may not be imported.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The citizen may pay or not, according as he determines to use or not to use the article upon which the particular duty is imposed.

Mr. HEYBURN. Just a word, and then I will be ready to leave the subject to the judgment of the Senate or of those who may choose to consider it.

I reassert that duties may be avoided by the act of the party—that is, the act of the citizen, because he may do nothing that carries with it the duty. Imposts come within the same class exactly, as do also excises. These three, in my judgment, are distinguished from taxes because they belong to an entirely different class of burdens resting upon the citizen. There is nothing on earth that the citizen can do to avoid taxes except to die.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Then, if I understand the Senator from Idaho, he agrees with what I have said, namely, that by the word "tax" in that clause of the Constitution is meant direct taxes; and by the words "imposts, duties, and excises" are meant indirect taxes. That is precisely what I am contending.

Mr. HEYBURN. I will reply in my own time.

Mr. CUMMINS. I think the Senator from Utah will recognize that that is not the suggestion made by the senior Senator from Idaho. He did not intend to be understood as saying that excises, duties, and imposts were the only indirect taxes that could be levied by the Government. He intended to say that from the very nature of things a duty arose out of the voluntary act of the person upon whom it was imposed, and that a tax was an exercise of sovereignty imposed in an involuntary way upon the persons upon whom it rests. I want to know whether the Senator from Utah assents to that distinction?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have stated to the Senator from Idaho exactly what I did agree to, and I dislike to be obliged to say that I assent to language which has been used by others when I have undertaken to put in clear language precisely what my own view is. The Senator can himself make the comparison.

Mr. CUMMINS. Will the Senator, then, permit me to ask one further question?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Certainly.

Mr. CUMMINS. Would it make any difference in the constitutionality of the statute if the burden that is proposed to be placed upon incomes is called a "duty" rather than "tax?"

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not think it would make the slightest difference. I do not think you can change the substance of things by changing the name.

Mr. CUMMINS. Certainly in that respect I agree with the Senator from Utah, but does the Senator believe that there are any indirect taxes other than those that have historically been classified as excises, imposts, and duties?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. If I understand the Senator's question, I do not. I think that those three terms embrace the indirect taxes, and that all other taxes that do not come within one or the other of those descriptions are direct taxes.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President——

Mr. CUMMINS. Just a moment, if the Senator from Idaho will permit me.

Then it is the Senator's view that those burdens which have been heretofore called in various countries and in various States "excises, imposts, and duties" are the only indirect taxes known to the law?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Or other taxes of the same kind or description.

Mr. CUMMINS. Precisely.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I would not undertake to say that the various countries of the world have exhausted all the possibilities of the excise and all the possibilities of imposts and of duties; but either those things which have heretofore been treated as excise taxes, or impost taxes, or duties, or things of the same nature, constitute the indirect taxes.

Mr. CUMMINS. But the Senator has not yet attempted a definition that will describe the difference between indirect and direct taxes, except to suggest that excises, imposts, and duties are the indirect taxes. What is the essential difference between a direct tax and an indirect tax?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, the Senator is asking a question that has been answered in a very great variety of ways. I would not undertake to lay down a hard and fast definition.

Mr. HEYBURN. Now, Mr. President——

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think—if the Senator from Idaho will permit me for just a moment—that the division between direct and indirect taxes is rather a zone than it is a line; in other words, we may put our fingers upon a particular exaction and say this is a direct tax because it lies entirely outside of the zone upon one side, or we may put our fingers on another form of exaction and say this is an indirect tax because it lies entirely outside of the zone upon the other side; but within the zone there may be more or less doubt as to precisely whether or not a particular exaction is a direct or an indirect tax.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I would not like to be understood within the limits suggested by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], that there is only one class of taxes outside of duties, imposts, and excises, and that that is a direct tax. I believe that there is a class of taxes other than duties, imposts, and excises that is dual in character, divisible in its purpose, and that on one side of the line lie direct taxes and on the other indirect taxes, the indirect purely distinguishable from either duties, imposts, or excises. I do not like to anticipate what I will perhaps feel impelled to say in regard to the subject later, but I believe that it is within the power of Congress to levy a class of taxes—strictly taxes—that are not direct, and at a future time I will perhaps ask the Senate to listen to some suggestions on that matter.

THE HISTORY LEADING UP TO FRAMING THE CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISION.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Now, Mr. President, I come to the consideration of the second source of information which I laid down in the beginning, namely, the history and circumstances leading up to and surrounding the adoption of the Constitution. Under the government of the Confederation there was no power to lay or collect taxes; the only power was to make requisitions upon the various States.

Article 8 of the original Articles of Confederation provided that war and other expenses should be defrayed out of a common treasury.

To quote the language of the article—

> Which shall be supplied by the several States, in proportion to the value of all land, within each State, granted to or surveyed for any person, as such land, and the buildings and improvements thereon, shall be estimated, according to such mode as the United States in Congress assembled shall, from time to time, direct and appoint.

This measure of the proportion which should be exacted from each State was found to be utterly unsatisfactory, and Congress in 1783 recommended to the several States that the provision should be altered so as to provide that the common Treasury should be—

> Supplied by the several States, in proportion to the whole number of white and other free citizens and inhabitants, of every age, sex, and condition, including those bound to servitude for a term of years, and three-fifths of all other persons, etc.

It will be observed that there is no provision for, and it is not within the contemplation of this article that the contributions which are exacted from the States shall be raised by a levy upon lands and improvements and houses, but only that the value of the lands, improvements, and houses in each State shall be the measure of the amount which the State shall contribute. That measure being found unsatisfactory, another measure of the amount which the State should be compelled to contribute was formulated by the Congress, namely, that the amount should be measured by the number of population. The

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

value of lands being found unsatisfactory, it was thought that the number of people in each State would afford a better measure of the ability of the State to contribute than the value of its land.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Surely.

Mr. BAILEY. I think the Senator's statement is not exactly accurate. The change was made because in that day, as in this day, people undervalued their property for the purpose of escaping their taxes, and it was concluded that it was possible to ascertain with exactness the number of people, when it was not possible to ascertain the exact value of the land. They adopted it, not because the population was a more satisfactory method of gauging these contributions, but simply because they could make the ascertainment with exactness when counting the people, and they had not been able to make it with exactness in estimating the value of land.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The Senator from Texas simply states in another and better way than I have stated or could state what I intended to say. What I say is, that the measurement of the ability of the State to pay taxes by the value of its land was found to be unsatisfactory—I am not undertaking to go into any discussion of the reason—but it was found to be unsatisfactory, and the measurement by population was adopted as being more satisfactory.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President——

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. OWEN. Would not such a tax, whether based on the value of land or on population, being a requisition on the State to be paid by the State, be necessarily a direct tax on the State and not on the citizen?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I am not to be beguiled into a discussion of that subject by the Senator from Oklahoma. I said to him a little while ago that I did not agree with him upon that proposition. I believe that the Constitution did not contemplate a direct tax upon the States as such; but, as I have already stated, to enter upon that subject would be entirely afield from what I had intended to discuss.

THE DEBATE IN THE CONVENTION.

In the Constitutional Convention several plans of taxation were submitted. Among them was the plan of Mr. Pinckney, the plan of Mr. Randolph, and the plan of Mr. Paterson. On July 12 Mr. Morris moved to add to the clause empowering the legislature to vary representation according to the wealth and number of the inhabitants a proviso "that taxation shall be in proportion to representation." Some objection was made to this plan, and Mr. Morris admitted the force of the objection, but stated that he supposed that these objections "would be removed by restraining the rule to direct taxation, because," as he explained, "with regard to indirect taxes on exports and imports and on consumption, the rule would be inapplicable." Of course that is manifest. A duty imposed upon goods imported into this country obviously can not be apportioned among the several States at all, while a direct tax upon the capital and property of individuals of the States can be apportioned with varying degrees of fairness.

Mr. Wilson stated that he "approved the principle, but could not see how it could be carried into execution, unless restrained to direct taxation." We are then told that Mr. Morris modified his motion by inserting the word "direct," and the provision passed in the following language:

Provided always, That direct taxation ought to be proportioned to representation.

After that the Constitution was so framed as to provide that duties, imposts, and excises should be laid according to the rule of uniformity, as I have already discussed.

Taking these circumstances and all the debates together, it seems to me clear that the convention intended that every form of taxation should be subject either to the rule of apportionment or of uniformity.

In fixing the rule of population as the measurement for direct taxation, I think it is apparent from a consideration of the debates in the convention itself and of those in the various state conventions called for the purpose of ratifying the Constitution, that there was no intention to limit the rule to taxes on lands alone. I quote, first, from Mr. Madison. Mr. Madison said:

Future contributions, it seemed to be understood on all hands, would be principally levied on imports and exports.

This, by the way, was before the provision in the Constitution forbidding export duties had been adopted.

Further on he said that he would admit that the number of inhabitants was not an accurate measure of wealth. Now, observe, it is not the language of Mr. Madison that the number of the inhabitants is not an accurate measurement of the value of their *lands and houses*, but not an accurate measure of *wealth*.

And again, quoting from the debates:

He contended, however, that in the United States it was sufficiently so for the object in contemplation.

Mr. Gorham said that in Massachusetts it had been found, "even including Boston, that the most exact proportion prevailed between numbers and property."

Not—again it will be observed—between numbers and landed estates, or lands and houses and improvements, but between numbers and *property*. What property? It is not qualified in any way; therefore, *property of every description*.

Mr. HEYBURN. Would it interrupt the Senator if I should ask him a question?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Not at all.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do.

Mr. HEYBURN. I think there has been a failure to distinguish between tangible and intangible property. The value of real estate is not alone what it will bring as an income. It is the value for which you can sell it, even though it brings you no income. I have been impressed, whenever I have read the last decision of the Supreme Court, with the idea that they got away from that point, and that it is an important distinguishing point. An income tax is a tax upon an intangible thing—a thing that may vary over night or disappear in a day, a thing that may come and go. It is not the same kind of property as the thing from which an income may or may not be derived. That thought has occurred to my mind many times in considering this question.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Certainly an income from rentals, an income from landed estates, is not an income from an intangible thing.

Mr. HEYBURN. It is not an income from an intangible thing, but it is in itself an intangible, uncertain, indefinite, and varying thing. The house may be rented to-day and not rented to-morrow.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. It may burn up.

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes; as the Senator from Indiana suggests, it may burn up. But I think we must distinguish between the thing of value and the revenue which comes from it or does not come from it, according to the circumstances. I think a direct tax is a tax upon a thing of value, and an indirect tax is one upon a thing that may or may not exist.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I will undertake to show a little further along—I should be anticipating if I should discuss it now—that a tax upon the income derived from land is, in substance and effect, a tax upon the land itself.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I think that that is probably the dividing of the roads in this discussion at all times, whenever it arises.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. But I shall not turn aside to discuss that particular proposition now.

Again, referring to these debates, Mr. Wilson contended that numbers would be a fairly accurate measure of *wealth* and *ability* to contribute to the public wants.

Again, he does not compare the numbers of inhabitants with the value of their landed estates, but regards it as a measure of their wealth and ability to pay taxes.

Doctor Johnson thought that the numbers of population was the best measure of wealth.

Mr. Ellsworth offered an amendment providing that the rule of contribution by direct taxation should be the number of white inhabitants and three-fifths of others; and then added, to quote his language:

Until some other rule, that shall more accurately ascertain the *wealth* of the several States, can be devised and adopted by the legislature.

I pause to ask here, Mr. President, If it had been intended by the members of that convention that the term "direct tax" should be confined to a land tax, why do they constantly say that the rule of population is the best rule by which to ascertain the *wealth* of these States, the *property* in these States, the *ability* of these States to contribute to the General Treasury?

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I think the Senator is passing over Mr. Franklin's second suggestion as of less importance, when, as a matter of fact, it was of first importance. The subjects referred to by Mr. Franklin in the second paragraph are those that are directly before us for consideration. What do you tax? He suggests that the *per capita* tax is the safest basis until something else is discovered that may be taxed. What is it that you tax? You tax the house; you do not tax the rent that may come from it. You tax the land; you do not tax that which may be derived from it as profit.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No; either I do not interpret correctly what Mr. Ellsworth says, or the Senator does not. What he says is that the rule of contribution by direct taxation should be the number of population, until some other rule——

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes; "until."

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Until some other rule that shall more accurately ascertain the wealth of the several States shall be found.

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. He is not talking about the subjects of taxation; he is talking about the rule by which it is proposed to measure the ability of the inhabitants of the State to pay the tax.

Mr. HEYBURN. Is that all of that?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No.

Mr. HEYBURN. Will you not read Mr. Franklin's statement?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Then he proceeds:

The sum allotted to a State may be levied without difficulty according to the plan used by the State in raising its own supplies.

First of all, he discusses the rule of measuring the amount of the contribution, and then he discusses the method by which it shall be raised; and he says, with reference to the latter part of it:

The sum allotted to a State may be levied without difficulty according the plan used by the State in raising its own supplies.

Mr. HEYBURN. Did not the Senator pass over Mr. Franklin's statement in reading Mr. Ellsworth's?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No; I have not Mr. Franklin's statement at all.

Mr. HEYBURN. I had it in my mind, and therefore may myself have confused it with Mr. Ellsworth's statement.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It is reported in these debates that Mr. King upon one occasion asked what was the precise meaning of "direct taxation;" and Mr. Madison informs us that no one answered. I suggested to the Senator from Idaho when he was upon his feet the other day that if the question had been susceptible of as simple an answer as has been attempted to be made by some of the decisions of the Supreme Court and by Senators upon this floor, it is a little remarkable that somebody did not answer it.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Just a moment. Evidently it challenged the attention of Mr. Madison, because he took pains to observe and record the fact that no one answered.

According to the contention made here, a direct tax is only a capitation tax or a land tax. If it had been understood by the members of that convention in that way, is it not remarkable that somebody did not say "A direct tax is simply a capitation tax or a tax on land?" No one answered the question, however, because no one in the convention could formulate in his own mind at the moment a precise definition; and no one undertook to formulate it, although, as the debates show both there and elsewhere, the general nature of a direct tax was perfectly understood.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the junior Senator from Idaho?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I presume the Senator from Utah will concede that the framers of the Constitution recognized this matter of taxation as one of the most important subjects with which they had to deal, and one with which they had to deal with the utmost accuracy. Does the Senator from Utah believe that after the attention of the makers of the Constitution was called to the meaning of the word "direct" they still proceeded to put into the Constitution a term the meaning of which they did not understand? Does the Senator mean to say that after their attention had been specifically directed to the matter, and they did not know, they still continued to insert in the Constitution a phrase the meaning of which they did not understand?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No; I have not so said, Mr. President. I have said that the members of the Constitutional Convention did understand, but that they were not able to formulate at the moment a precise definition. My contention is that the framers of the Constitution understood by "direct taxes" taxes upon those subjects which were made the subject of direct taxation in the various States at the time the Constitution was framed. As those subjects differed in various States, they could not have undertaken to make an enumeration of them; and they were unable, as I said, to formulate a precise definition.

Mr. BORAH. In other words, if the question had been asked, "What is a duty?" or "What is an excise?" the same silence would likely have resulted, because it covered a wide range of territory, and it would have taken some time to define it.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the senior Senator from Idaho?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes.

Mr. HEYBURN. Blackstone's Commentaries were the latest legal publication at the time of the sitting of the Constitutional Convention. Mr. Blackstone defines in very explicit language what are direct taxes, and limits them to per capita and land taxes. I presume the framers of the Constitution took it for granted that a principle that was so well established and so generally recognized was sufficient, and, perhaps, settled this question by an aside, one to the other, rather than by a public discussion.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It may have been, at the time Mr. Blackstone wrote, that the only form of direct taxation which was in use in England was that form to which the Senator has directed attention. But neither Mr. Blackstone nor any other writer upon English law ever intended to say that direct taxes were confined, at all times and under all circumstances, to capitation and land taxes.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, a very familiar rule of interpreting statutes is that of taking into consideration the origin of the principle which was being adopted and formulated by the party who was enacting a law or making a constitution; and the very knowledge in the minds of the makers of the Constitution that this term had been interpreted by the English law writer of most distinction at that time would be accepted by them as we accept the decisions of the supreme courts of the States from which we take statutes.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The Senator from Idaho will agree with me that the English Parliament and the English courts have some familiarity with Mr. Blackstone and the various writers upon English law; and the English Parliament and the English courts, having all those authorities before them, and considering all of those authorities, have uniformly held that an income tax is a direct tax.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the junior Senator from Idaho?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Certainly.

Mr. BORAH. They never held that, did they, prior to the adoption of the Constitution of the United States?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No; because prior to the adoption of the Constitution of the United States no income tax had been imposed; and Mr. Blackstone could not have spoken of an income tax at the time he wrote, because if he had he would have spoken of something that did not exist. But the English Parliament and the English judges interpreted Mr. Blackstone's language defining direct taxes in a different manner from that of the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, there was no occasion for the English courts or the English Parliament to "shy off" from the question of what was and what was not direct taxation, because there was no constitutional limitation that governed the English Parliament in regard to levying a certain kind of tax or that limited them in any way.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No; but there were evidently other considerations which made it important for the English Parliament and the English courts to assign the income tax to its proper classification; and they assigned it to the class of direct taxes, and not to the class of indirect taxes, with all the information before them from Blackstone and from the other English writers that the Senator from Idaho has before him.

Luther Martin said:

Direct taxation should not be used but in cases of absolute necessity, and then the States will be the best judges of the mode.

Finally, on September 14, 1787, the provision in section 9 of Article I, "No capitation tax shall be laid, unless," etc., being under consideration, Mr. Read moved to insert after "capitation" the words "or other direct tax."

He was afraid that some liberty might otherwise be taken to saddle the States with a readjustment by this rule of past requisitions of Congress, and that his amendment, by giving another cast to the meaning, would take away the pretext.

And in that form it was carried.

Mr. OWEN. I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Utah to the report of Luther Martin to the legislature of Maryland, in which he expressly stated that this very Constitution authorized the Congress to lay direct taxes on the citizen in every case.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have the report and I shall read from it later on in my remarks.

Now, I want to call attention to the fact that in the debates of the Constitutional Convention there is no hint or suggestion

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

that direct taxes should be confined to capitation and land taxes, although the question was asked what was meant. The discussion assumed rather a wide range, but nowhere in the debates was it ever suggested that the tax should be confined to a land tax and a capitation tax.

On the contrary, the whole debate from beginning to end indicates that in the minds of the majority population was considered the fair measure, and that landed estates were not considered the fair measure of the ability of the various States to contribute, but that wealth and property generally should be the subjects from which the taxes should be gathered. Population was regarded as the measure of the amount, and the amount itself realized by taxing the wealth and property of the States, and not their landed estates only.

Mr. HEYBURN. I desire to ask the Senator if it is not apparent upon the face of the proceedings that the Constitutional Convention did not get away from the idea of a central government apportioning and levying taxes, for the State to collect and turn in, until almost the last days of the convention? It had been accustomed to it under the articles, and it was only in the latter days of the convention that it adopted the present system, which entirely eliminated the idea of imposing a tax upon the State, to be accounted for to the General Government.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It was insisted by some that the old plan should be adhered to.

DEBATES IN THE STATE CONVENTIONS.

I now come to a brief discussion of the debates and proceedings in the various state conventions upon the question of the ratification of the Constitution. I shall submit that from a consideration of the various things that were said by the members of these conventions that it was not understood by any of them that the words "direct tax" in the Constitution were used in this restricted sense.

Roger Sherman and Oliver Ellsworth, writing to the governor of Connecticut, September 26, 1787, say:

It is probable that the principal branch of revenue will be duties on imports. What may be necessary to be raised by direct taxation is to be apportioned on the several States, according to the number of their inhabitants; and although Congress may raise the money by their own authority, if necessary, yet that authority need not be exercised if each State will furnish its quota.

In the Massachusetts convention Judge Dana, after urging the necessity of Congress being vested with the power to levy direct taxes, said:

It was not to be supposed that they would levy such unless the impost and excise should be found insufficient in case of a war.

Clearly indicating that in the mind of that distinguished gentleman the line of division was between imposts and excises and that character of tax upon the one side and direct taxes upon the other.

Mr. Sedgwick, commenting upon the same subject, said:

Congress would necessarily take that which was easiest to the people; the first would be impost, the next excise, and a direct tax will be the last; for, * * * drawing money from the people by direct taxes being difficult and uncertain, it would be the last source of revenue applied to by a wise legislature.

In his mind, evidently, the impost and excise included the forms of indirect taxation; all others were direct taxes.

Mr. GORE understood the matter in the same way. He speaks of the imposts and excises being sufficient for the purposes of government in times of peace, but in time of war requisitions must be made to supply the deficiencies of this fund.

Mr. Pierce called attention to the fact that gentlemen in different parts of the House had agreed that Congress would not lay direct taxes except in case of war, for that—

To defray the exigencies of peace the impost and excise would be sufficient; and, as that mode of taxation would be the most expedient and productive, it would undoubtedly be adopted.

He went on to say, however—

But, Mr. President, if Congress had the power of direct taxes, in the manner prescribed in this section, I fear we shall have that mode of taxation adopted in preference to imposts and excises.

He was evidently against the system of direct taxation entirely, but in his mind the contrast was between imposts and excises, which he regarded as indirect taxes, and all other kinds of taxes, which he regarded as direct taxes.

In the Connecticut convention Oliver Ellsworth discussed the matter at some length. He first discussed the objection to the clause, that it extended to all the objects of taxation.

Gentlemen in that convention had insisted that the power conferred was altogether too broad; that it should have been limited. But Ellsworth pointed out that while the power had been given to Congress to levy taxes upon all subjects of taxation, it did not extend to all exclusively.

It did not say that Congress should have all these sources of revenue and the States none, but that all, excepting the impost, still lay open to the States.

He said that all nations had seen the necessity and propriety of raising a revenue by indirect taxation—by duties upon articles of consumption.

In the New York convention Chancellor Livingston, after discussing the proposed amendment, that no excise should be laid on the manufactures of the United States, said:

But if you impose upon the Union all the burdens and take from them a principal resource, what will they do when the imposts diminish and the expenses of government increase? Why, they must have recourse to direct taxes; that is, taxes on land and specific duties.

Mr. HEYBURN. What does he mean by that other expression?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not know precisely what he meant, but I am citing it for the purpose of showing that in his mind the direct tax extended to something beyond the tax on land.

Mr. HEYBURN. What does he name it?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Specific duties, he calls it. I think in all probability he did not use a happy phrase, but evidently he believed that under the Constitution direct taxes were not confined to a land tax, but extended to something else.

Mr. Jay, discussing the proposed amendment, that direct taxes should not be levied until requisitions had first been made, said:

It ought to be considered that direct taxes were of two kinds, general and specific. With respect to the latter, the objection could not apply. The National Government would, without doubt, usually embrace those objects which were uniform throughout the States.

Not that under the Constitution they were confined to such objects, but that, considering the expediency of the matter, only such objects as were uniform throughout the States.

In the Virginia convention Mr. Madison, answering the objection that 10 men deputed from that State, and others in proportion from other States, would not be able to adjust direct taxes so as to accommodate the various citizens in 13 States, said:

Could not 10 intelligent men, chosen from 10 districts from this State, lay direct taxes on a few objects in the most judicious manner?

If these direct taxes under the Constitution were confined to land, what need of 10 men to adjust the direct taxes? What need of 10 men to "lay direct taxes on a few objects in the most judicious manner" if direct taxes meant only a tax upon land?

Again, he said:

There is a proportion to be laid on each State, according to its population—

Now, mark this—

The most proper articles will be selected in each State. If one article in any State should be deficient, it will be laid on another article.

Again clearly indicating that it was not in his mind that the direct tax was confined to land, but that it would be laid in the various States upon the most proper articles, and if one article should be deficient in any State, it would be laid upon another article.

Mr. HEYBURN. Would the Senator consider an intangible sum to be derived or not to be derived as an income, as an article within the meaning of the suggestion or expression of Mr. Jay?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Incomes were taxed. Direct taxes were imposed upon incomes in one or two of the States.

Mr. HEYBURN. Would it come within that definition of an article?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It would come within that term as used by Mr. Madison——

Mr. HEYBURN. I think that Mr. Jay——

Mr. SUTHERLAND (continuing). As used by Mr. Madison in the Virginia convention.

Mr. BORAH. I presume, perhaps, the Senator from Utah is going to reach that subject. I do not know whether he is or not. But does not the argument which the Senator is now pursuing reason as strongly against an inheritance tax as an income tax?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think it does not. I think the inheritance tax proceeds upon an entirely different theory. As I undertook to point out the other day, an inheritance tax is not imposed upon property. It is imposed upon the right to succeed. It is imposed upon the devolution of the property. It is imposed in precisely the same way that a stamp duty is imposed upon a deed by which we transfer a piece of land.

Mr. BORAH. Does the Senator contend that the right to inherit property is not an article within the meaning of the phrase?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I contend that it is not an article within the meaning of that phrase.

Mr. BORAH. Does the Senator contend that the tax on the right to inherit is any more than the tax on the right to receive an income from the property?

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

The object and aim then of these long speeches which are as able as any ever delivered at any time in this body are to have the Senate reverse the Supreme Court. It is better when a decision of the court of last resort is against the judgment of counsel to present to the public what the counsel would have said if he had been a judge than to adopt the remedy which Judge Grover, of our New York court of appeals, said was the only one left for the defeated attorneys and that was to go down to the tavern and curse the court. One Senator wishes distinctly to challenge the Supreme Court with the idea that the argument and decision in the Pollock case will be reversed. Another Senator wishes to have it introduced as a principle in our political economy, even if the tariff is to be reduced in order that there may not be an excess of income over expenditures.

Unless, as in war times, there is an absolute necessity for an income tax, it is the most direct possible attack upon the protective system. The only way in which the surplus revenues it would produce, and which are not now needed, could be taken care of, would be either a horizontal reduction of the tariff to bring the revenues down to the expenditures or else to enter upon a bacchanalian saturnalia of extravagance.

No one has been able to refute the conclusions of the Finance Committee that the bill under discussion will yield several millions in excess of expenditures. It is claimed that the income tax will produce between sixty and eighty millions of dollars annually. This would create a dangerous surplus and impose a burden for no other purpose than to establish a theory. A theory which will cost the taxpayers of the country, and, in the analysis of distribution, all the people, $80,000,000 which the Government does not need and for which it has no use, is the most expensive educational propaganda ever exploited. It has been suggested by its advocates that the tariff could be reduced to meet the excess caused by the income tax, but a reduction would lead to larger importations and greater revenues and at the same time take our American market from our own workers and give it to their foreign competitors. On the other hand, if a prohibitory tariff was adopted to decrease customs revenues, that would defeat the Republican doctrine of competition with protection and create monopolies.

There is one point which strikes me in the question as to whether the fathers in forming the Constitution intended that the clause providing that direct taxes should be apportioned among the States according to population referred only to revenue from land and not income from personal property. The Constitution was a compromise between the large and populous and the small and sparsely populated States. The small States demanded that in some way they should be protected. The device to protect them was that, regardless of their population, each State should have in the Senate practically two ambassadors with equal vote and equal power. There was as great disparity then as there is now between the States of large population and those of smaller population. The taxing power and its destructive possibilities were thoroughly understood, and the great States of New York, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Georgia never intended that they should be outvoted and made to bear undue burdens because of the votes in the Senate of the smaller States. There are 15 States with 30 Senators in this body whose aggregate population differs only a few thousand from that of the single State of New York with two Senators. New York has one-seventh of the property of the country. It has one-twelfth of the population. Yet, under an income tax, it would pay 33 per cent of the burdens of the Government. It is absurd to suppose that with the States rights views that existed among the statesmen of the formative period and in the Constitutional Convention they ever intended that any system should prevail which would distribute so unequally the burdens of the Government among the various States.

There is another view which strikes me very forcibly and which has not been presented. The time has come to draw the line between the sources of revenue for the Federal Government and those which shall be left with the States. The Federal Government has unlimited opportunities for revenue through the customs and by internal-revenue taxation of almost limitless varieties and by other methods. The States must deal directly with their people. I was talking a few days since with the Hon. Edwin A. Merritt, chairman of the committee on ways and means of the lower house of the New York legislature, who expressed alarm at the inheritance and income taxes being absorbed by the Federal Government. The expenses of the States, with the public improvements which have become necessary by the extraordinary development of the last quarter of a century, are increasing in geometric ratio.

When I was chairman of the committee on ways and means in the lower house of the New York legislature, forty-six years ago, a tax levy of $8,000,000 would have led to a political revolution. The tax levy this year is thirty-seven millions, and it has increased from twenty-two to thirty-seven within the last decade. There was levied in the State of New York in 1907 by direct taxes—that is, city, village, county, and town—$180,942,341.27, and by indirect tax, $32,339,707.49, making a total of direct and indirect taxes of $213,282,048.76. A direct tax for State purposes has been abolished in our State. The State government is carried on by indirect taxation. This came because of the enormous burdens of local taxation, amounting to $181,000,000 a year. Our indirect taxation comes from taxes on corporations, organization of corporations, inheritances, transfers of stock, traffic in liquor, mortgages, and racing associations, according to the following table:

Tax on corporations	$8,581,223.44
Tax on organizations of corporations	391,423.18
Tax on inheritance	5,435,394.97
Tax on transfer of stock	5,575,986.64
Tax on traffic in liquor	9,697,504.24
Tax on mortgages	2,442,249.73
Tax on racing associations	215,925.29
Total	32,339,707.49

It is evident from this that, with the budget five millions more than the amount raised from these sources last year, the State must soon find other sources of revenue. Several States have already adopted an income tax. No one would advocate that there should be double taxation by the General Government and by the States, for the burden would be intolerable. It seems to me, therefore, that it is a fair claim on behalf of the States that this direct contact with their citizens by inheritance and income taxes should be left to their administration.

My colleague, Senator Root, clearly and ably answered the question the other day as to whether the property owners bore a substantial part of the burdens of the Government by proving what they paid and its percentage in the country as a whole. This New York tax levy, I think, is a close and up-to-date illustration of the same point from our own State. I know from personal experience with the estates for which I am counsel that real estate located in the best parts of New York City pay to-day double the taxes which they did eight years ago and without any increase in rents. The effect of this is that the income from real estate in New York is nearer 3 than 4 per cent.

The taxes on railroads in the State of New York are first upon their real estate, at full value, in the several towns, then a franchise tax, then a tax upon capital stock, then a tax upon bonded debt, gross earnings, and dividends. In the case of the New York railroads which pay dividends, this amounts to over 15 per cent of their net income. Of course this is an assessment upon the income of the stockholders to that amount.

The income and expenditures of the Government can be calculated for a series of years to come with almost mathematical certainty. I have heard no criticism which successfully controverts the conclusions of the Ways and Means Committee of the House and the Finance Committee of the Senate. Including pensions, 55 per cent of our total expenditure is on account of war. Expenditures are not likely to increase as fast as revenues, and there will necessarily come in the course of nature, now that forty-four years have passed since the close of the civil war, an annual decrease in pension appropriations. The civil expenditures are entirely in administrative control.

All European nations are burdened with gigantic national debts. These debts are the inheritances of great and little wars. Our national debt has been so reduced since the civil war that it is a negligible quantity compared with our resources. We should enlarge the national debt, not for war but for the most beneficent purposes of peace, if we are to enter upon a proper policy. We have begun on the right course in the Panama Canal by borrowing the money for its construction. It is proper that posterity should bear their proportion of a burden of which they are to be the principal beneficiaries. If we enter upon, as we will in the future, an intelligent and thoroughly prepared scheme of inland waterways, that also should be done by the issue of long-time bonds, for posterity again will be the beneficiaries and ought to bear their share of the burden.

We are all in receipt of letters and resolutions of commercial bodies in reference to the creation of a permanent tariff commission. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. Beveridge] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Newlands] have ably and eloquently presented the affirmative of that proposition. They base their argument largely upon the success of the Interstate Commerce Commission; but there is no analogy between the duties performed by and the obligations which rest on the Interstate Commerce Commission and those which would devolve on a permanent tariff body. It is the nature of a commission to seek to enlarge its powers and to exploit its beneficence. A permanent tariff commission, with a permanent lobby representing the 2,000 items in the tariff bill and backed by the influence of the

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Senators and Members from the States where these particular industries are located, would keep alive what the country most deprecates and most fears—a perpetual tariff disturbance. Pass some law quickly and adjourn is what the country wants.

I believe in the scheme outlined by our Committee on Finance of creating from the experts of the Government, who are familiar with every phase of this question and in constant touch with its administration, a body within the existing departments which can inform the President, Congress, and the Secretary of the Treasury of the inequalities as they arise in the practical application of tariff duties, so that without agitation, without an eternal tariff war and a perpetual tariff lobby, with all that means in the disturbance of business, an effective and noiseless machinery would be automatically solving problems as they arise. Such a commission would meet the criticisms upon the ambiguity of the law and the mistakes in its administration, which were so ably presented in the speech of the senior Senator from Iowa.

I noticed in the papers of this morning that William J. Bryan and Governor Johnson, of Minnesota, deplored yesterday the situation of the Republican party. They said that if this tariff bill as suggested either by the House or Senate committee became a law it would lead inevitably to the election of a Democratic House of Representatives two years from now and the Senate and the Presidency to follow four years from now. The tears which they shed should have been caught after the manner of the Pompeians, in a glass bottle, and preserved in the archives of the Smithsonian Institution. I am sorry for the progressive brethren of our own household who are lamenting with great earnestness the impending ruin which they are so fearful will follow if they fail to have their way. I say to our distinguished Democratic sympathizers with Hamlet to the ghost of his father, "Rest, rest, perturbed spirit."

Mr. President, the country wants speedy action upon this subject. In all the phenomenal times of prosperity of the past none of them equal the present in its opportunities and its promise. Large contracts for important construction are held up, the stocks of the merchants are depleted, the storehouses of the manufacturers are empty, the supplies on hand have been used up, and no new production undertaken for fear of the result of the action of this Congress.

The impatient horses attached to the car of progress and prosperity are held in with difficulty, because of their impatience to enter upon the Marathon race of production and development. The fate of parties in power depends upon the effect of their action on the country. If because of this bill, when perfected, becoming a law we enter, as I believe we will, upon another decade surpassing in its beneficent results that which began with the Dingley tariff, popularity will follow prosperity and the party can confidently rely upon the judgment of the people.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, on the 7th instant I undertook to show to the Senate that under the Constitution of the United States the direct taxes referred to in that instrument, limiting the broad right of Congress to lay and collect taxes, related alone to direct taxes upon the States of the United States and not to direct taxes upon the citizens. I desire to ask the indulgence of the Senate for a few moments only, that I may submit a few authorities with regard to that matter, in addition to what I have stated heretofore. I shall not take the time of the Senate to go into any elaborate discussion of this matter. I shall dispose of it in a very few minutes, so far as my comments are concerned.

The authority which was given to Congress by section 8 of Article I of the Constitution was the authority "to lay and collect taxes," not to lay and collect duties, imposts, and excises which should be uniform, but "to lay and collect taxes," as well as duties, imposts, and excises, for all that that means, and there was no body of men in the world more capable of determining the value of the omission of an adjective or of a limiting word than was the Constitutional Convention which drew that great instrument. They did not limit the word "taxes." They said that Congress should have the right to lay and collect taxes; and that meant taxes direct and taxes indirect, direct taxes on the United States as component parts of the preceding Confederacy and of the succeeding Union; it meant as well direct and indirect taxes on the citizen. And I wish to again call the attention of the Senate to the proof which I offered as to this proper interpretation out of the debates of the Constitutional Convention, which I shall not here repeat.

I want to call the attention of the Senate to the authorities, and, without reading them, I ask permission to insert in the RECORD the authorities to show that the power of taxation is an inherent attribute of the sovereignty of the United States.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the request will be granted. The Chair hears none.

The authorities referred to are as follows:

POWER OF TAXATION AN INHERENT ATTRIBUTE OF SOVEREIGNTY.

United States: Weston *v.* Charleston, 2 Pet. (U. S.), 449; Providence Bank *v.* Billings, 4 Pet. (U. S.), 514; McCulloch *v.* Maryland, 4 Wheat. (U. S.), 316; North Missouri R. Co. *v.* Maguire, 20 Wall. (U. S.), 46; Wheeling, etc., Transpt. Co. *v.* Wheeling, 99 U. S., 273.
Florida: Young *v.* Thomas, 17 Fla., 171; 35 Am. Rep., 93.
Illinois: Porter *v.* Rockford, etc., R. Co., 76 Ill., 561.
Iowa: Hanson *v.* Vernon, 27 Iowa, 28; 1 Am. Rep., 215; Stewart *v.* Polk County, 30 Iowa, 9; 1 Am. Rep., 238.
Kentucky: Louisville, etc., R. Co. *v.* Com., 10 Bush (Ky.), 43.
Maine: Allen *v.* Jay, 60 Me., 128; 11 Am. Rep., 185.
Missouri: Glasgow *v.* Rowse, 43 Mo., 479.
Nebraska: Tillotson *v.* Small, 13 Nebr., 202.
Nevada: Ex p. Robinson, 12 Nev., 263; 28 Am. Rep., 794.
New Jersey: State *v.* Jackson, 31 N. J. L., 189; State *v.* Parker, 32 N. J. L., 426.
New York: Guilford *v.* Chenango County, 13 N. Y., 143; Clarke *v.* Rochester, 24 Barb. (N. Y.), 446.
Ohio: Board of Education *v.* McLandsborough, 36 Ohio St., 232.
Pennsylvania: Com. *v.* Mann, 5 W. & S. (Pa.), 416; Kirby *v.* Shaw, 19 Pa. St., 258.
South Carolina: Ex p. Lynch, 16 S. C., 37.
Texas: Clegg *v.* State, 42 Tex., 608.
Virginia: Eyre *v.* Jacob, 14 Gratt (Va.), 422; 73 Am. Dec., 367.
Wisconsin: Knowiton *v.* Rock County, 9 Wis., 418; Wisconsin Cent. R. Co. *v.* Taylor County, 52 Wis., 53.

The sovereign right to levy and collect taxes grows out of the necessities of Government—an urgent necessity, which admits no property in the citizen while it remains unsatisfied. The right to tax is coequal with all governments. It springs out of organization of the government. All property is a pledge to pay the necessary debts and expenses of government. (Parham *v.* Justice, 9 Ga., 352. See also Philadelphia *v.* Tryon, 35 Pa. St., 401, in which it was said that every man holds his property subject to the taxing power.)

Mr. OWEN. I ask further authority to introduce in the RECORD the authorities bearing upon the proposition that the taxing power of the United States is unlimited unless restricted by the Constitution.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the request is granted.

The authorities referred to are as follows:

TAXING POWER UNLIMITED UNLESS RESTRICTED BY CONSTITUTION.

United States: Weston *v.* Charleston, 2 Pet. (U. S.), 449; Providence Bank *v.* Billings, 4 Pet. (U. S.), 514; Lane County *v.* Oregon, 7 Wall. (U. S.), 77; State Tax on Foreign-held Bonds, 15 Wall. (U. S.), 319; North Missouri R. Co. *v.* Maguire, 20 Wall. (U. S.), 62; Kirtland *v.* Hotchkiss, 100 U. S., 497; Hagar *v.* Reclamation Dist. No. 108, 111 U. S., 709; Railroad Tax Case, 8 Sawy. (U. S.), 248; 13 Fed. Rep., 731; Forbes *v.* Gracey, 9 Fed. Cas., No. 4924.
California: Mackey *v.* San Francisco, 113 Cal., 399.
Colorado: Hall *v.* American Refrigerator Transit Co., 24 Col., 291; 65 Am. St. Rep., 223.
Illinois: Porter *v.* Rockford, etc., R. Co., 76 Ill., 561; Greenleaf *v.* Board of Review, 184 Ill., 226; 75 Am. St. Rep., 168.
Kansas: Newton *v.* Atchinson, 31 Kan., 153; 47 Am. Rep., 487.
Kentucky: Lexington *v.* McQuillan, 9 Dana (Ky.), 516; 35 Am. Dec., 159; Cincinnati, etc., R. Co. *v.* Com., 81 Ky., 500.
Louisiana: Second Municipality *v.* Duncan, 2 La. Ann., 182.
Maine: State *v.* Western Union Tel. Co., 73 Me., 526.
New Hampshire: Berry *v.* Windham, 59 N. H., 288; 47 Am. Rep., 202.
New Jersey: Rudderow *v.* State, 31 N. J., L. 512; Standard Underground Cable Company *v.* Attorney-General, 46 N. J., Eq. 270, 19 Am. St. Rep., 394.
New York: Chenango Bank *v.* Brown, 26 N. Y., 467; People *v.* Flagg, 46 N. Y., 401; People *v.* Home Insurance Company, 92 N. Y., 328; Lawton *v.* Steele, 119 N. Y., 232, 16 Am., St. Rep., 813; Astor *v.* New York, 37 N. Y. Sup. Ct. 560; People *v.* Molloy, 35 N. Y., App. Div., 136, affirmed 161 N. Y., 621.
Oregon: Crawford *v.* Linn County, 11 Oregon, 488.
Pennsylvania: Kirby *v.* Shaw, 19 Pa. St., 260; Pullman's Palace Car Company *v.* Com., 107 Pa. St., 155.
Tennessee: South Nashville Street Railway Company *v.* Morrow, 87 Tenn., 432.
Texas: Hutcheson *v.* Storrie (Tex. Civ. App., 1898), 48 S. W. Rep., 789.
Virginia: Com. *v.* Maury, 82 Va., 888.
West Virginia: State *v.* Sponaugle, 45 W. Va., 419.
Wisconsin: State *v.* Thorne, 112 Wis., 81.

"The power to tax" says Chief Justice Marshall, "involves the power to destroy;" that is, by the levy of a tax equal in amount to the value of the property taxed. (McCulloch *v.* Maryland, 4 Wheat (U. S.), 431.

Taxation is an incident of sovereign power which acknowledges no limits except the discretion of those who use it, unless it be as to those objects of taxation which have been withdrawn from the general power. (Com. *v.* Mann., 5 W. & S. (Pa.), 416.)

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, the income tax has heretofore always been defended on the ground that it is an indirect tax. I hold that that defense is unnecessary, and dangerously weak besides. And without undertaking to pass any judgment with regard to that, I do say that the Constitution of the United States, in the only limitation upon the taxing power imposed upon Congress, where reference was made to direct taxation, meant, and necessarily meant, direct taxation upon the States, and did not mean, and can not by any imagination or ingenuity be made to mean, a direct tax upon the citizen. The limitation in clause 4, section 9, that "no capitation or other direct tax shall be paid unless apportioned," necessarily means a direct tax upon the States, because you can not lay a capitation tax upon

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

the citizen under the constitutional apportionment. You can lay a poll tax upon the citizen, but the capitation tax, under the constitutional rule of apportionment, was a gross amount fixed by population—men, women, and children, the deaf, the dumb, the blind, sane and insane, and three-fifths of the slaves—and apportioned to the several States. The direct tax limited in this clause likewise was exclusively a direct tax on the States, which alone could be apportioned under the constitutional rule, and since the direct tax on the citizen could not be apportioned, it could not have been referred to in this clause requiring the apportionment of such direct tax. A duty, impost, or excise may be either a direct tax on the citizen or indirect, depending on whether the payee is the immediate consumer. I pay a duty of 10 cents on a few cigars I smoke; it is a direct tax. I pay $100 tax on cigars I sell to my customers, charging each his pro rata; the tax or duty collected is indirect in relation to them.

Congress interpreted the limited right of a "direct tax" on the States in its immediate acts after the adoption of the Constitution. The act of 1798, the act of 1813, and the act of 1815, declared in the most specific terms that "a direct tax" is laid upon the United States—not upon a citizen—to be apportioned under the constitutional rule. Let me see you apportion a capitation tax in any other way than among the several States.

Not only must a capitation tax of necessity be held to mean a tax upon the States in gross, but the other "direct taxes" referred to in the same sentence which are required to be apportioned can not be apportioned in any other way except upon the States. The meaning of that clause is, direct taxes on the States and on nothing but the States, and the only limitation on the power of Congress to lay taxes in the broadest manner on State and citizen is that direct taxes laid on the States shall be apportioned under the constitutional rule.

There are many different kind of taxes; for example, according to method and purpose of the imposition: Federal taxes; state taxes; county taxes; municipal taxes; district taxes, and so forth; capitation taxes on States; direct taxes on State, county, municipality, or citizen; indirect taxes on citizen; ad valorem taxes; specific taxes; duties; imposts; excises; poll taxes; income taxes; occupation taxes; license taxes; personal taxes; real estate taxes; succession taxes; privilege taxes; import taxes; export taxes; commodity taxes; corporation taxes; inheritance taxes, and so forth.

When the Constitutional Convention used the words authorizing Congress "to lay and collect taxes," without limitation, it meant what it said, and the limiting clauses of the Constitution must be confined to the necessary meaning of that language, within the meaning of the language itself. The interpretation which I have given to it is sustained by the previous history and by the subsequent proceedings in Congress, as well as by the debates in the Constitutional Convention bearing upon this matter.

Mr. President, before I take my seat I wish to present an amendment upon an entirely different matter, which, with the indulgence of the Senate, I shall read:

After the last line of paragraph 471d, page 193, insert the following:

"That the rate fixed on all articles enumerated in Schedules A, B, C, D, E, I, J, K, L, M, and N of this act shall be reduced 5 per cent per annum of the rate fixed in this act, annually on June 30, for each of the next ensuing ten fiscal years: *Provided*, That if such graduated reduction shall cause a diminution of the annual revenue from any one or more of the articles enumerated therein, the President is authorized and directed to fix the rate on any such article or articles severally at the point at which any such article is found to have the greatest normal revenue-producing power, but not at a rate higher than the rate fixed in this act: *And provided further*, That such rate shall not hereunder be reduced or fixed below the point at which it would produce an amount equal to the difference in the cost of the production of any such article in the United States and abroad.

"The difference in the cost of the production of any such article in the United States and abroad shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, from time to time, upon proper evidence and duly recorded."

Mr. President, at the early convenience of the Senate I shall submit some observations in regard to the amendment now offered.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oklahoma desire his amendment to be printed, and to be considered when the portion of the bill to which it relates is reached?

Mr. OWEN. I should like to have it printed in the RECORD.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The Secretary will report the pending amendment.

The SECRETARY. The pending amendment, offered by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], is, on page 50, paragraph 151, line 13, after the words "per dozen," to strike out the words "6 cents each" and insert "50 cents per dozen;" in line 14, to strike out the word "forty" where it appears before the words "per cent ad valorem" and insert "ten;" in line 15, after the words "per dozen," to strike out "10 cents each" and insert "$1 per dozen;" in line 16, to strike out "forty" and insert "ten;" in line 17, to strike out the words "12 cents each" and insert "$1.25 per dozen;" and in the same line, to strike out "fifty" and insert "twenty," so that, if amended, it will read:

That blades, handles, or other parts of any of the foregoing knives or erasers shall be dutiable at not less than the rate herein imposed upon knives and erasers valued at more than 50 cents per dozen and not exceeding $1.25 per dozen; razors, finished, valued at less than $1 per dozen, 45 per cent ad valorem; valued at $1 and less than $1.50 per dozen, 50 cents per dozen and 10 per cent ad valorem; valued at $1.50 and less than $2 per dozen, $1 per dozen and 10 per cent ad valorem; valued at $2 or more per dozen, $1.25 per dozen and 20 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I move to strike out that part of the committee amendment beginning with the word "razors," on page 50, line 11, and ending with the words "ad valorem," in lines 17 and 18, and to insert the following:

Razors and razor blades, finished or unfinished, valued at less than $1.50 per dozen, 50 cents per dozen and 15 per cent ad valorem; valued at $1.50 per dozen and less than $3 per dozen, $1 per dozen and 15 per cent ad valorem; valued at $3 per dozen or more, $1.75 per dozen and 20 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. President, the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], which has just been disagreed to, decreases the duties as fixed in the Dingley Act and, of course, still more decreases the proposed duties as fixed in the committee amendment to the pending bill. What I am now suggesting as an amendment is simply to restore the Dingley rates.

Mr. President, as has been already stated, the increase on these articles is enormous and would be practically prohibitory. I have in my hand a letter from the President of the Simmons Hardware Company, of St. Louis, which is the largest hardware establishment in America, and therefore in the world. Mr. Simmons says:

I have been in this business fifty-three years, and during that time I believe I have bought and sold more razors than any man who ever lived in the United States. I hope I may be considered somewhat as authority on this subject.

He says further:

The rate of wages paid the workmen who make razors in this country is very little more than is paid for the same kind of labor in Germany and England, and the trouble is that we have never made good razors in this country. I doubt if you have ever shaved with a good razor made in the United States or ever been shaved by a barber with one of domestic manufacture. There is a peculiar art in making a razor or grinding it. This art has attained its highest state of perfection in Solingen, Germany, so that English manufacturers often send their blades to Germany to be ground, and then they are sent back to England to be finished and mounted.

I have letters from other large dealers, wholesale dealers, and importers to the same effect.

Mr. President, it seems to me the duty proposed by the committee is beyond all reason, and that the business men who have established a large export trade and who are handling the best class of razors are entitled to some consideration. I offer this amendment as expressive of the view and judgment of a very large class of business men.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I was temporarily out of the Chamber when this paragraph was reached and the vote taken upon the amendment I offered yesterday. If I had been in the Chamber, I should have modified my amendment so as to have conformed it very largely to the amendment now offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE].

I desire, Mr. President, now to read a few extracts from a letter from Mr. Norvell, president of the Norvell-Shapleigh Hardware Company.

Attached hereto is an article from the Iron Age, which speaks for itself. I shall ask to have it read within a few minutes.

Mr. Norvell says:

We believe in protecting the American laboring man; we believe in building up American manufactures, but we do not believe in tying up the distributers and consumers of this country hand and foot and delivering them bodily to the manufacturers to be done with as they please. * * *

To shut out the importation of razors on account of the small manufacturing industry of this country strikes us as being absurd. To advance the duty to 100 per cent, as proposed, means there will be no revenue for the Government and that the business will be turned over to the cutlery manufacturers on this side, who already have an association—

Meaning a trust, I suppose—

There is practically no competition on cutlery between our manufacturers.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator is misinformed when he suggests there is a trust in the manufacture of cutlery. There is nothing of the kind.

Mr. SIMMONS. I beg the Senator's pardon. I did not suggest that. I so understood the writer to say.

Mr. GALLINGER. Then the Senator's correspondent is misinformed, because there is no such trust or combination in this country.

Mr. SIMMONS. He does not say so in specific terms. He says "an association." I interpret that to mean in that connection a trust.

I send to the Secretary's desk and ask to have read what I have marked in brackets from the Iron Age. We have heard a great deal in this Chamber in the last two days about the high prices now prevailing in this country being the result, not of extortionate prices charged by the manufacturers, but of the unreasonable prices charged by retailers and jobbers. The article which I send up deals with that phase of this question, and I think it well to have it read to the Senate.

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

The Secretary read as follows:

There are other interests in this country to consider besides those of the manufacturers.

On many goods, especially in the hardware line, the tariff was placed so high it meant absolute prohibition. The goods stopped coming from Europe. As there were no importations, naturally it followed there was no revenue. So the Government lost out. The entire trade of the country on these lines was turned over to the American manufacturers. Many of these manufacturers formed trusts and selling combinations to protect themselves from each other. Therefore there has been no foreign competition, and there has been no domestic competition. The jobber, the retailer, and the consumer have been at the mercy of the manufacturer.

So we have had the spectacle of a number of manufacturers protected by the tariff, protected by patents on goods and machinery, protected by the copyright laws, and then still further protected by selling agreements. The result has been just what might be expected under such conditions.

Then a number of these manufacturers, having their own nests so nicely feathered, have absolutely forgotten that the jobber should have a percentage of profit on their goods that slightly more than covered the cost of distributing them. In almost every case where manufacturers have been able to bring about this condition they have cut down the profits of jobbers on their goods. This not only true of hardware, but of other lines.

These same manufacturers have then sold their goods to catalogue houses and permitted them to demoralize the retail profit, so the retailers, by reason of this competition, were cut out of their profits.

Therefore we find by this condition that the Government loses revenue, the jobber is compelled to sell the goods at about the cost of distribution, the retail merchant is cut out of his profits by the competition of catalogue houses, while the manufacturers have derived enormous profits.

We believe in protecting our manufacturers; we believe, of course, the Government must have revenue; but we believe the pendulum has swung entirely too far on the side of many of our great manufacturers. Take, for instance, a specific case.

There has been a tariff of about 55 per cent on razors. It is now proposed to advance this tariff to 100 per cent. Razor manufacturing in this country is a very small industry. Razors are made by skilled mechanics. These skilled mechanics in Europe receive good wages. Living in Europe is cheap. We are informed it is impossible to persuade these European razor grinders to come over to this country. Now it is proposed to turn the enormous razor business of this country over to a few American manufacturers. It would be impossible for them to handle the business. The price of razors is already high enough, but this change would mean the price would be doubled to consumers.

Not satisfied with this, the cutlery manufacturers of this country are trying to have a law passed that all cutlery manufactured in a foreign country should not only bear the name of that country, but the name of the manufacturer should also be stamped on the goods. This means the source of supply of every dealer in cutlery in this country would be exposed. This requirement is not made of American manufacturers. Why should it be made of foreign manufacturers or on any other class of foreign importation?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I desire to say that the committee in considering this paragraph determined that there was no doubt but that there must be an increase over the Dingley rate to even maintain the few manufacturing institutions that we have left in this country.

As I stated last Saturday, some years ago we had 67 of them. To-day there are only 5. We are manufacturing in this country to-day between 17 and 20 per cent of the razors that are used in the country. During the year 1908 there were imported 218,975 dozen razors. The valuation of the same was $463,883.79. The duties paid on the same was $263,935.11, or a total amount of $727,768.90.

I wish, also, to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that that does not include all by any manner of means. They have been sent in here as handles and as blades not assembled, but shortly after entering they would be brought together and form a razor. The reason why they were shipped in that way is because the value of the handles or the value of the blades shipped alone would bring them under the lower class or rate of duty of 45 per cent.

Mr. President, the price to jobbers of all American-made razors manufactured in this country for 1908 amounted to only $140,000. As far as the letter read from the hardware establishment in St. Louis is concerned, I wish to say that the wages of the workers in the United States are nearly three times what the wage is in Germany. Forgers in Germany receive a weekly wage of from $4.30 to $7, while in the United States they receive from $15 to $21. The dry grinders receive $4.30 to $5.70 in Germany and in the United States from $12 to $18. Polishers receive in Germany from $4.30 to $5.70 per week, while in the United States they receive from $12 to $21.

I could go through all the list and compare the wage in Germany with the wage in the United States and it is in about the same ratio.

Mr. STONE. Where does the Senator get the statistics he is reading?

Mr. SMOOT. They can be found at the Department of Commerce and Labor or in the reports made by our consuls showing the amount of wages paid to the workmen in foreign countries.

Mr. STONE. My question was where the Senator got the statistics he has read. What is the paper from which he reads?

Mr. SMOOT. This is signed by Mr. H. L. Henry for the Geneva Cutlery Company, Mr. C. W. Silcox for the Robeson Cutlery Company, and Mr. Tint Champlin for the George W. Korn Razor Company, a committee representing the cutlery manufacturers of this country.

Mr. STONE. Manufacturers of razors?

Mr. SMOOT. A part of them manufacturers of razors.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I wish to ask a question for information.

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

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. SIMMONS. Can the Senator tell us what part of a particular razor is labor?

Mr. SMOOT. I can tell just about the part there is. Out of 10 assorted grades of razors, the cost of labor was $31.11, the material was $5.72, and the total cost was $36.83. In other words, the cost of labor was $31.11, whereas the material cost was $5.72, showing that nearly 87 per cent of the cost of manufacture is labor.

Mr. SIMMONS. Do I understand the Senator to say that the labor cost is 87 per cent of the value of the product?

Mr. SMOOT. It is nearly 87 per cent of the cost of the product.

Mr. SIMMONS. The labor cost alone?

Mr. SMOOT. The labor cost alone.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will ask the Senator whether the purpose of this amendment is to increase the domestic price of razors in order to make their production profitable by American manufacturers?

Mr. SMOOT. I am very thankful that the Senator has asked me that question, because I will demonstrate to him, I think, and to every Senator here that if this duty was increased 200 per cent, it would not make one cent's difference to the consumer who buys the razor.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Will the Senator answer my question specifically, whether the purpose of this amendment is to increase the domestic price of razors in order to enable the domestic manufacturers of razors to produce them profitably?

Mr. SMOOT. This amendment, Mr. President, is intended to protect the American manufacturer of razors so that he can manufacture razors in this country as against the cost of manufacturing similar goods in foreign countries. If the Senator will allow me, I will show to him, I think, and all Senators here, that it will not cost the consumer, the purchaser of the razor, a cent more with the increased duty.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Before the Senator enters upon that, will he also answer another inquiry?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I observe that the reason why this amendment is introduced is that the importation of razors is large as compared with the domestic production.

Mr. SMOOT. That is the fact.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will ask the Senator where they find the importation of any commodity is very small as compared with domestic production, whether they regard such a duty as practically prohibitory, and therefore reduce the duty?

Mr. SMOOT. So far as I am concerned, it would depend entirely upon my judgment, I will say, as to whether it was

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

That committee can within a fortnight ascertain whether the statement made with reference to glass pitchers is true or false. That the committee can ascertain whether the statement here made with reference to Haviland china is true or false. It can ascertain whether the statement here made is true with reference to ready-made clothing, whether the retail dealers are extortionate or not. That committee, if disposed to perform its duty, can ascertain that information within two weeks.

I repeat, Is the Senator willing to have a select committee commissioned to this task, for the Democratic members of the Finance Committee have not been exhausted with these labors?

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, the Democratic members of the Finance Committee can carry on this investigation if they see fit. There is no objection to that on anybody's part that I know.

Mr. GORE. Will the Senator allow one or two good Republicans to be designated so that the manufacturers can have their friends at court? We ask for no ex parte investigation. Has the Senator recovered his——

Mr. ALDRICH. I am not sure that the Senator was addressing me. I was not paying, at the moment, attention to the remarks of the Senator as I should have been doing.

Mr. GORE. It probably would have been profitable to the Senator. I ask if the Senator is willing to have one or two good Republicans designated to cooperate with the Democrats. We do not ask, we do not desire, and we can not accept an ex parte investigation. We do not want to give this a partisan cast. All we want is the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, ascertained by men who can not be suspected of partisan purposes, bias, or prejudice.

Mr. ALDRICH. If the Senator simply desires to make a speech upon this subject, Mr. President, that is one thing. If he desires to have this information secured at some time in the future for the benefit of our successors and our children and grandchildren, and will allow the resolution to go to the Committee on Finance, the Democratic members of that committee are always vigilant in the interest of the public, and I have no doubt that some result can be accomplished in the way of a future inquiry upon the subject.

Mr. SIMMONS. I should like to ask the Senator a question. Will he allow the minority members of the committee to be present at the deliberations?

Mr. ALDRICH. We allow the Democratic members of the committee to be present at its deliberations except when we are considering matters of pure party responsibility.

Mr. SIMMONS. Not in considering matters which affect the tariff, and this does affect the tariff.

Mr. ALDRICH. I do not think there would be any trouble about having the Democratic members present. We are always glad to have the Democratic members of that committee present in our deliberations except when we are charged with the responsibility of preparing a tariff bill. I do not think that there has ever been any other meeting of the committee from which they have been excluded. If the Senator will allow the resolution, without further discussion, to go to the committee, I am sure that we will be able to arrive at some proper basis of an investigation upon this subject, if the Senator so desires.

Mr. GORE. I shall insist upon the motion to adopt the resolution.

Mr. OWEN. Will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. GORE. Certainly.

Mr. OWEN. I should like to make an inquiry of the chairman of the Committee on Finance. During the last campaign the country was informed that the Republican leaders desired only a tariff which would measure the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad. Why has not the Finance Committee furnished that report to the Senate?

Mr. ALDRICH. We are furnishing it constantly for the information of the Senator from Oklahoma and other Senators who have not the information themselves.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Oklahoma still further yield to his colleague?

Mr. GORE. Certainly.

Mr. OWEN. I call the attention of the chairman of the Finance Committee to the fact that the Senate has been furnished with no proper report upon this matter by the Committee on Finance. There is no report showing the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad. The voluminous testimony, if it might be so called, a part of which was sworn to and a very great part of which was not sworn to, is no information to the Senate with regard to these particular schedules. To invite a Member of this body to go through 8,000 pages of undigested stuff, prepared by those with a peculiar interest to serve, makes it impossible for a Member of this body to properly pass upon the very basis upon which this tariff was proposed to be written, and when I ask why it has not been done, there is no answer.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I will ask for the reading of the clipping which I sent to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no objection, the paper will be read by the Secretary.

The Secretary read as follows:

[From the Boston Traveler, May 13, 1909.]

LARGE-PROFIT TALES FALSE, SAYS FILENE—BOSTON MERCHANT TAKES EXCEPTION TO SENATOR SMOOT'S TARIFF-DEBATE STATEMENT.

Edward A. Filene, the well-known business man of this city, does not agree with Senator SMOOT in his statement that gloves costing $7.50 a dozen retail for $2 a pair.

"I am afraid that the Senator does not know what he is talking about," said Mr. Filene. "The ordinary $1 glove costs from $9 to $10 a dozen, while $2 gloves cost from $16 to $20 a dozen.

"The fact is that competition in gloves is so intense and the margin so narrow that specialty glove stores are steadily being obliged to go out of business, while even the department stores in many cases fail to make their glove departments pay."

Mr. Filene said further that retail competition is so untrammeled that it is impossible for a man familiar with the actual conditions to conceive of such large profits being made as was referred to by some of the Senators in debate.

"The average net profits," continued Mr. Filene, "of retail stores are not more than 5 per cent. I know no store that averages 10 per cent on its sales."

Relative to the alleged sale for $36 of a china dinner set that cost $10.89, spoken of in the debate, Mr. Filene said that where a unique article, on which there can be no competition, is imported, any price the whim of the customer may induce him to pay may be obtained.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. GORE. Yes, sir.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like very much to have the Senate understand that we were discussing the question of the cost of manufacturing gloves, and I have never yet said that the retailer paid only $7.40 for those gloves.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. GORE. Yes, sir.

Mr. NELSON. I suppose we are on razors, not on gloves.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator had been listening, he would know very well that the subject-matter presented here was not on razors; it was on gloves.

Mr. President, I do not want the Senator from Oklahoma to try to make it appear that I say that all the profit between the manufacturer and consumer is made by the retailer. No such statement or claim has ever been made. The only statement I have ever made referred to the great difference between the manufacturer's cost and the final price paid by the customer. That is the question and the difference that has been spoken of by every Republican Senator on this floor discussing the subject. It is not all chargeable to the retailer, and I want the retailer to understand that no one has so stated. Even as to the pane of glass that was spoken of, it was the cost of the glass as it entered this country with the duty added, and then the added cost to the consumer through the different stages of trade. That was not by the retailer only. No one stated how many hands that pane of glass passed through before it reached the customer.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish to say that I have no purpose to misstate the exact issue between this side and the other side of the Senate. I accept the suggestion made by the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT]. We do not insist, and have not suggested, that the other side charge the retail dealer as being exclusively responsible for the extortions practiced in this country. As I understand, they join in this indictment the jobbers and the wholesale dealers and the retail dealers of the country. This resolution calls in explicit terms for information upon each particular point, the prices charged by the manufacturers, the prices charged by the wholesale dealers, and the prices charged by the retail dealers. It is full and exact information which the resolution seeks, and which the committee will undoubtedly furnish when it discharges the duties imposed by this resolution.

Sir, I think the Senator from Utah mends the case but slightly when he arrays on one side the manufacturer and on the other side the jobbers, the wholesale dealers, and the retail dealers. I accept his amendment and his suggestion; but I desire to enter a disclaimer in behalf of each and every one of those indicted classes.

I remember the Senator from Utah did say that razors, which were sold to the retailer for $9 a dozen, were resold by him at $2 apiece or $24 a dozen. That, of course, was not a charge; it was a mere intimation, a mere insinuation that the retail

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

dealer was extorting unreasonable profits from his customers. We want that question investigated, and we want to know the truth and the facts.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] yesterday had an extract read from the Iron Age, which, in express terms, stated that the jobbers, the wholesale men, and the retail merchants were at the mercy of the manufacturers. That is what I believe, and I believe a majority on this side concur in that opinion. We want the matter investigated, and if they be not guilty, allow them to be vindicated. That article from the Iron Age stated and charged in express terms that the retail men, the wholesale men, and the jobbers were at the mercy of the manufacturers, notwithstanding the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] admitted that the manufacturers were not responsible, notwithstanding the senior Senator from Maine admitted that the middlemen and the wholesale and retail dealers were responsible for prices fixed to the consumer. That is the exact issue which we want determined.

I will merely add, Mr. President, that the common thief, the red-handed assassin are entitled under our form of government to a fair trial by an impartial jury. We do not ask even so much as that for the retail and the wholesale men and the jobbers; but we are willing for such a trial as we can obtain, not by an impartial jury, but by one which may have some predilections in the matter. If Senators on the other side who have made these charges are not willing to fix the responsibility for high prices where that responsibility belongs, then I want to fix the responsibility for that refusal where it belongs.

Mr. GALLINGER and Mr. ALDRICH. Question!

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion to refer the resolution submitted by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GORE. I ask for the yeas and nays on that question.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I should like to make a suggestion with regard to the manner in which, under the commercial practice in this country, prices are frequently fixed, even if it be not a uniform rule. As I understand it, it is the practice that the manufacturers determine not only their own price to the wholesaler and to the jobber, but that they go further and require the retailers not to go below a fixed price; and, if they do go below a fixed price, the jobber is compelled to cut that retailer off of his list.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

Mr. OWEN. One moment. And if the jobber does not carry out this fixed ironclad trade rule, in that case the manufacturer cuts off the jobber. I understand that to be the practice in relation to the cotton goods made in New England, for example, by the American Print Company. It may not be true, but I believe it is true. I have been informed by men capable of knowledge in the matter and in a position to know that it is true. It is well to inquire into the matter as to whether or not it is true. I do not think it is a right thing in the Senate for gentlemen in the body here without information to stigmatize the retailer as guilty of fleecing the public; and I think it is equally reprehensible as a practice to charge any man, whether he is a wholesaler, a jobber, or a retailer——

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. OWEN. I do, with pleasure.

Mr. GALLINGER. What was the exact statement the Senator made concerning the cotton manufacturers of New England?

Mr. OWEN. I said I was informed that the American Print Company imposed a rule upon the wholesaler and the jobber handling their products and upon the retailer that if the goods were sold for less than the price fixed at which the retailer should sell them he was cut off from the handling of those goods; in other words, he was blacklisted.

Mr. GALLINGER. Has the Senator any evidence of that?

Mr. OWEN. I will undertake to furnish the evidence to this committee when the committee is organized and ready for the investigation.

Mr. GALLINGER. It seems to me the Senator ought to furnish it this morning. He is making an accusation, and it is a very serious one.

Mr. OWEN. I am making no accusation. I am simply stating what has been said, and I think it is worthy of an inquiry.

Mr. GALLINGER. Of course, Mr. President, there are thousands of things worth inquiring into, but time is short and human life has its limitations.

In reference to this particular resolution, which the Senator's colleague has introduced, I think every Senator who has taken a sane view of the present situation sees that we can not go into an investigation of that kind and pass the pending tariff bill within any reasonable time.

Mr. OWEN. I ask the Senator why this investigation has not been prosecuted heretofore?

Mr. GALLINGER. I will answer that by saying that I certainly know of no reason why it should have been made.

Mr. OWEN. Does the Senator think that the proposition that this tariff should be based upon a difference in the cost of production at home and abroad affords no reason for this inquiry?

Mr. GALLINGER. I take it for granted that to ascertain the details of that matter, the State Department would have to communicate with our consular agents and other representatives abroad, and that it would be an inquiry that would take months, if not years, to conclude.

Mr. OWEN. A circular letter might do that.

Mr. GALLINGER. How long would it take the agents abroad to ascertain the cost of goods manufactured in the various industrial centers of Europe?

Mr. OWEN. Why has no effort been made in regard to the matter?

Mr. GALLINGER. Well, Mr. President, I answer the Senator by saying that I think the committee has furnished all the evidence that was available in this discussion.

Mr. ALDRICH. The consuls have been engaged in this work for two or three years.

Mr. GALLINGER. And I do think, Mr. President, that we had better turn our attention to the consideration of the schedules of this bill. A gentleman, pretty well informed, stated recently that the country was losing $10,000,000 a day because of the delay in the consideration of this tariff bill; and I have no doubt that that is an underestimate. It seems to me that we ought to give the business men of this country an opportunity to do business.

Mr. OWEN. Who is it that is losing money?

Mr. GALLINGER. The business interests of the United States.

Mr. OWEN. Does the Senator make that charge without specification and proof?

Mr. GALLINGER. I make it upon the authority of a well-known gentleman in the other House; and I think he probably had looked into the matter. He is a man who is not in the habit of making wild statements. I make the statement also upon the authority of business men in this country who are to-day hoping that Congress will be wise enough to speedily pass this bill, so that they can start up their industries and give employment to labor.

Mr. OWEN. If I understand, Mr. President, there is no adequate answer to my suggestion as to why this inquiry has not previously been made.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the inquiry itself is so absurd that it does not require an answer.

Mr. OWEN. It may be absurd, Mr. President, to the Senator who has just taken his seat, and he may regard the pledge made to the American people as ridiculous and unworthy of fulfillment, but I take it when the pledge is made that this tariff bill will be based upon the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad, the legislators in this body should have that information, and it is not absurd to ask for it.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, why do not the Senator and his associates obtain it? They have as much leisure as any of us.

Mr. OWEN. In answer to that, I will say that the minority members of the Finance Committee were not even honored with the privilege of hearing the matters presented before the majority members of the Finance Committee, and it was the pledge of the Republican platform that I am insisting is not being carried out.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, that has been thrashed over half a dozen times.

Mr. OWEN. But it has not been answered satisfactorily, and can not be.

Mr. GALLINGER. The members of the minority on that committee have found no particular fault about it, I will say to the Senator, and I do not know why he should.

Mr. OWEN. The reason why I object to this omission is because I represent a State in this body with a million and a half of people, whose interests are involved, and I have a right to know what the facts are upon which this tariff bill is being made; and when I ask for the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad, upon which the Republican party in its last platform declared they would write this tariff bill, I am told that the inquiry is absurd. It is a most unreasonable response.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. OWEN. With pleasure.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator from Delaware will permit me, the Senator from Oklahoma does not quote me correctly. I did not mean to say that the inquiry was absurd; but I say it is absurd to think that we can obtain the information desired during the pendency of this bill.

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Oklahoma. [Mr. OWEN] to the provision of this bill for a tariff commission, whose function it would be to inquire into all such intricate questions and to present the information desired, which, in my opinion, it will take a good deal of time to procure and which may be utilized for future reference.

I should like to ask the Senator from Oklahoma if he does not see that the methods of modern business have changed enormously in the last few years? As I understand, no charge has been made against the retailers or the jobbers explicitly, but the general statement has been made that the tariff per se did not necessarily increase the price of articles of necessity or otherwise to the consumer. If one considers the enormous army of runners and business agents that are traveling all over the country, the money paid for advertisements in the leading newspapers, and all those things of this generation, he can readily perceive that there is an enormous amount of money expended in those directions. Somebody has to pay for it. It is evident that the cost of doing modern business, owing to competition between the sellers, whether they be jobbers, wholesalers, or retailers, has increased immensely and must necessarily result in increased cost to the consumer.

Mr. OWEN. In answer to the Senator from Delaware——

Mr. GORE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to his colleague?

Mr. OWEN. In just one moment.

Mr. GORE. I merely want to make one suggestion.

Mr. OWEN. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The Senator from Delaware joins the Senator from Montana in suggesting that a tariff commission should ascertain this data. I want to say to those two Senators that the resolution I have offered does not call for a coroner's inquest; it does not ask for a post-mortem investigation; we do not care to inquire into the cause of death; we want a committee of safety, to anticipate and prevent dissolution. [Laughter.]

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I should like, in response to the Senator from Delaware, to ask him whether it is a fixed policy agreed upon, and he authoritatively states it, that a tariff commission will be made a part of this bill?

Mr. DU PONT. I have no information——

Mr. OWEN. The Senator made that as a preamble to his remarks.

Mr. DU PONT. In answer to the Senator, I will say that I have no information in that case further than what I have seen authoritatively stated. I do not know whether there has been any official notice of that kind, but I gather information of those things from the public press.

Mr. OWEN. I will say that the Senator from Delaware made that as a preamble for his remarks. I now ask the chairman of the Committee on Finance whether the suggestion made by the Senator from Delaware and by the Senator from Montana is true, that it is proposed to have a tariff commission provided as a part of this measure?

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, if the Senator from Oklahoma had shown his usual industry in examining the amendments suggested by the committee, he would have ascertained that fact for himself.

Mr. OWEN. Then it is a fact?

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator would know that if he had read the amendment suggested by the committee.

Mr. OWEN. I did not know it, and will carefully examine it.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. OWEN. I do, with pleasure.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator from Oklahoma, I wish to say that I am fully aware that in some cases institutions that sell the product of an author—for instance, such as a book—may have a stipulated retail price, but sometimes books are sold to the general trade, and the great department stores will make a "sale day" and sell them many times under the cost. There has been such a thing in this country as the publisher of a certain book stating that he would not sell those goods unless they were sold at a regular price.

Mr. OWEN. The suggestion which I made with regard to cotton goods was one which I thought a very important one, because it relates to a necessary of life, and it bears directly upon the question of whether or not the retailer is guilty of exorbitant charges.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I do know this——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. OWEN. With pleasure.

Mr. SMOOT. I do know that the cotton goods which are purchased from the cotton manufacturers in this country, so far as the great institutions that buy them in my State are concerned, are never limited to a price of any kind. They may sell under cost if they wish, or they may have whatever profit they can get over that.

Mr. OWEN. I think there never was a more erroneous statement in the same number of words than that made by the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. Well, Mr. President, I am perfectly prepared to prove to the Senator that that is absolutely true.

Mr. OWEN. I should like to have a committee charged to hear the evidence and give us the facts.

Mr. SMOOT. I am not talking of the committee's work at all; I am talking about the absolute facts concerning cotton goods.

Mr. OWEN. The Senator from New York [Mr. DEPEW] well stated yesterday his view with regard to the relative veracity of the testimony submitted to Members of this body, and I do not feel prepared to receive any statement made merely upon the word of some gentleman who has a purpose to serve. We are constantly being misinformed on both sides of every case. Somebody ought to digest the truth and make known the truth, so that the Senate may rely upon it. The matter about which I wished to make an inquiry was, why was it that the Finance Committee, charged with that responsibility and with unlimited means at their disposal, during all of these months have made no such inquiry and made no such digest for our information and guidance as legislators? I think it is a very serious omission. I do not mean to make that statement in a critical or unkind spirit at all, and I think I owe an apology to the chairman of the Committee on Finance in not having observed the amendment proposing a commission.

I confess I had not done so. I have had eight thousand and odd pages of miscellaneous matter laboriously to wade through in a vain effort to get something out of it that I could really regard as a finality; and obviously it is almost impossible; but I will say, with all of the traveling men in the employ of the manufacturers, with all of the information available in the business houses of our own country with regard to prices and to the cost of production of every article made in the known world, that information is available; it is not far distant; it can be obtained; and it ought to be obtained before this bill goes to its passage. It ought to be obtained in three weeks easily; and I believe it could be obtained if a proper inquiry were made.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, has the Senator from Oklahoma concluded?

Mr. OWEN. I have concluded, and yield the floor to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, one hour of the day has been spent in a characteristic discussion, and it is, I think, proper enough to make some observations upon the discussion itself and the conditions leading up to it.

For many years the Republican party of the country has been charged with maintaining a system of organized robbery under the form of a protective tariff. I at once acquit many enlightened members of the Democratic party from any responsibility whatever for this loose and unwarranted but widely-spread charge. It is astonishing, however, to perceive that in this Chamber there are still Senators of the opposition who adhere to that ancient and discredited notion. The two Senators from Oklahoma have this morning displayed a desire for information that would be very creditable to them as students in an academy, but not at all creditable to Senators of the United States.

The violent presumption may be indulged that a Senator representing a State in this Chamber is familiar with the current literature of the time relating to particular matters engrossing the attention of Congress. It must be known, and is known to both Senators, that the consular reports of the United States, issued with regularity in pamphlet form and subsequently in bound volumes, contain information from every part of the civilized world with reference to the cost of production, market relations, and even social conditions. The Senator from Oklahoma would have the Senate exonerate him

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

from any responsibility, if you please, in the matter of informing himself and pass over that responsibility to a committee composed of his fellow Senators. The Senator comes forward with the discredited charge, slightly veiled and often made, that the tariff is robbery, that it is based upon injustice, and that it exacts from the people of the country an unjust measure of their substance for the support of special interests.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. CARTER. I do.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I should like to plead guilty to the charge that I regard this tariff bill as little better than a robbery, and I shall at the convenience of the Senate demonstrate that this bill contains precisely what the Supreme Court described as "robbery" in the Topeka case. (Citizens' Savings and Loan Association of Cleveland *v.* Topeka, 20 Wallace, 655.)

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, I realize that I was not misquoting, nor did I misinterpret, the views of the Senator, but the Senator brings the charge with the same unfortunate equipment that has characterized those who have made that charge from the beginning.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President——

Mr. CARTER. Just a moment. The Senator makes the indictment, but he can not establish the venue; he can not particularize or show the character of the property nor the value involved.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. CARTER. Certainly.

Mr. OWEN. With the permission of the Senator from Montana, I shall reduce that matter to a mathematical demonstration within a very few days and submit the proof of guilt so plain that the Senator can not answer the indictment or the proof.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, I am now engaged in an earnest effort to show that the Senator from Oklahoma should do that for himself which he seeks to have the Finance Committee do for him. We can not take an intellectual spoon and feed Senators in this Chamber. [Laughter.] They must, Mr. President, inform themselves, or else hold their peace.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President——

Mr. CARTER. I know the Senator from Oklahoma can, without any difficulty whatever, frame the indictment to which he refers with as much accuracy and truth—and there is very little truth in it—as any other Senator on this floor; and I therefore point to the fact that the demand of the Senator for collated data and specific information made of the Finance Committee is a demand for that which he already has in his possession and which is available to every Senator possessed of an inquiring disposition.

Mr. BACON. Will the Senator permit me to suggest that the party with which he acts has too much need for spoons to feed infant industries to spare one for any other purpose. [Laughter.]

Mr. CARTER. I am very glad, indeed, Mr. President, that the Senator from Georgia is not one of those on this floor who needs the bottle-fed treatment, so far as information is concerned. [Laughter.]

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator from Oklahoma permit me?

Mr. OWEN. I have not the floor. I have been trying to ask the Senator from Montana a question.

Mr. TILLMAN. Well, will the Senator from Montana permit me?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. CARTER. Yes; I will yield to any Senator.

Mr. TILLMAN. I want to say that the wish or request of the Senator from Oklahoma is entirely unreasonable, because he is expecting you to furnish a rope to hang yourselves, and you will not do that. [Laughter.]

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma and the Senator from South Carolina have been speaking for a party that for a generation has made certain charges with reference to this protective tariff, and they come here as empty-handed as the day they were born, when they undertake to sustain the charges, and in that naked condition they piteously appeal to the Finance Committee for definite information with which to support their party claims. Where is the system of robbery and what are the proofs with reference to the charges heretofore made by the Senators against this bill or existing law? Why, Mr. President, the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] presents a resolution asking that a committee of Senators be now deputed to leave this Chamber, where the presence of every Senator is necessary for the proper guarding of the interests of the people or of the State he represents; that these Senators go hence into some committee room or across the ocean to get some particular fact which is unknown to the Senator from Oklahoma; to get some statement of the difference between wages in Hongkong and San Francisco, so that the Senator may be advised with reference to the difference in wages in the two places named.

The task prescribed by the resolution could not be well and faithfully performed short of two years' time. An intelligent preparation of the data called for from original sources by that resolution would require extensive travel, extensive reading, and a careful compilation of statistical matter reduced to percentages and involving a world-wide exploration of social, industrial, and economic conditions generally.

I now submit to the Senate that probably neither Senator from Oklahoma will vote right on this bill because of the lack of this information; but they ought to hold their peace, and permit Senators who do know to proceed with the public business while they are informing themselves.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. CARTER. I do.

Mr. OWEN. I should like to suggest to the Senator from Montana that one of the most valuable reasons why the Senator from Oklahoma should not hold his peace is the bringing out of the Senator from Montana, with his brilliant apologies for a very bad bill.

Mr. CARTER. I am making no apology for any bill. I have not mentioned the bill. But since the Senator does bring the matter up, permit me to call his attention to the peculiarities of the assaults made on this bill. There has been no attempt in the course of this discussion to argue the merits of the policy or principle of protection as opposed to the doctrine of tariff for revenue only, or free trade. I think the Senator from Texas very properly said that there was no such thing thought of as free trade. That was an expression cut away and downstream. The only contention existing here, according to his lucid view, was as to the application of the duties with a view to protection, or the application of the duties for the purpose of raising revenue and for that purpose only.

Outside of the Senator from Texas, we have had learned discussions from the opposite side upon special points. The inability of the opposition to assail the doctrine of protection, and their consciousness of that inability, are made manifest by the fact that side issues are industriously selected.

In the course of a discussion some days ago the Senator from Utah made the observation that the high price of articles throughout the country could not be traced exclusively to the protective tariff. Indeed, I think he alleged that it could not be traced to the tariff at all; that the retail price of articles had no special relation to the manufacturer's cost, or to the price at which the manufacturer sold. That statement by the Senator from Utah has been warped and distorted from time to time so that the senior Senator from Oklahoma would have it now read that the Senator from Utah said that the retail dealers of this country were engaged in a vast conspiracy to raise prices without reference to cost; that they were oppressing the people; and that they, and not the protective tariff, were responsible for high prices throughout the country.

I submit that the RECORD itself will show that no such contention was made by the Senator from Utah, nor by any Member on this side of the Chamber. There has been no such charge made in this body. Eulogies upon the retail dealers of the country are, therefore, supererogatory and unnecessary. We all know who the retail dealers are—the men who conduct the stores in the villages and at the crossroads of the country; an honorable, upright body of citizens, constituting at the crossroads, as the merchant does, the only exchange the farmer knows, the place where he sells the eggs and gets the coffee, where he sends the butter and the cheese to market and gets in exchange the calico and the various things the family needs at home. This retail merchant may sell some things at a high price, but he frequently sells other things below actual cost in order to keep goods from becoming shopworn.

But it is useless to go into the details of this relation of the country merchant to the farmer and his other patrons, because there has been no charge made on this floor, and no one pretends to support or suggest the charge, that the country merchants are in combination to raise prices and then to charge the raise to the protective tariff.

The country merchants of the United States as a rule are protectionists. They have observed that under the reign of the

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

protective policy trade is better, the purchasing power of the people is greater, work is more generally given to men who are willing to work, and wages are better. So that the country merchant, the beneficiary of active trade, is a protectionist in the majority of cases. As a rule, you will find that the country store is the headquarters for the protection propaganda in the neighborhood. The country merchant is not in conspiracy with anybody to create the impression that the high price of goods is attributable to the protective tariff.

On that side track we have lingered for three or four days; and every morning, I doubt not, with almost unvarying regularity, some Senator will be found to rise to defend the country merchant from a charge that has never been made. Thrash out this man of straw, and in some remote quarter it will be understood that the fight was real; that the good name of the country merchant was actually assailed; and that a bold, brave, and fearless statesman rose in his place to defend this kindly citizen, the country merchant, from a gross and violent assault. Mr. President, the side tracks will be numerous, and discussion with reference to the false issues raised will consume time, but will not enlighten anybody upon any line of information worthy of serious notice.

I am gratified to observe that the great body of our colleagues on the opposite side of the Chamber are earnestly, anxiously waiting to vote on the merits of this bill. It may be that the Senator's statement of $10,000,000 per day as a loss to the country because of our continued delay may be but a speculative estimate of an important fact. But that the country's great business interests are affected by uncertainty and doubt no one will seriously question.

No greater injury can be inflicted upon the business of any community than to involve the future in doubt or the basis of calculation in uncertainty. No merchant, no manufacturer in this broad land to-day knows what conditions will be thirty days from now as to an economic measure touching every interest in all the country, from the humblest home to the largest enterprise in all the land. It may not be ten million; it may be only five million; but it may be $50,000,000 per day of injury.

I do know that about 2,000,000 men are alleged to be idle in this country to-day, and I verily believe that the 2,000,000 men who are now idle will be employed inside of thirty days after the passage of this bill, and that, too, without reference to whether a schedule is a shade above or a shade below a given rate.

What the country wants to know is the exact condition that is to obtain for a reasonable time in the future. It wants to know where the bed rock is located, so that it can lay a foundation on it. No prudent business man will violate the old biblical injunction by building on the sand, and the present relation of these tariff schedules to the business world is precisely as the bed of sand to the foundation of the house.

What we desire is to cooperate with our good friends on the other side for a full and free debate on the merits of these policies, if that debate be deemed essential. This carping criticism with reference to a remark made upon one side or the other with a view to getting up speeches for the next campaign little befits the occasion with which we are called upon to deal.

I know that no Senator will deliberately procrastinate. I realize that every Senator on the floor is anxious that the bill be passed and passed at an early day. And I hope that with that understanding we may have universal accord with the proposals to proceed with the consideration of the paragraphs and the disposition of the bill at the earliest possible hour.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President——

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, before the Senator from North Carolina proceeds, I desire to ask the Senator from Oklahoma if he is not willing to modify his resolution so as to refer this matter to a special committee instead of the Finance Committee? A moment's reflection will convince him that it is obviously impossible for the Finance Committee to perform this work pending the consideration of this bill. We must all be here in the Chamber.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from Texas how the members of the special committee could attend to this work and be in the Chamber at the same time?

Mr. BAILEY. In view of the fact that they are not specially charged with the consideration or conduct of this bill, they would doubtless willingly perform any duty with which the Senate would specially charge them. I see no reason why a special committee might not undertake the inquiry; and without reference to the period which will be required to conclude it—that being left open—it might be a valuable one. But it is absolutely certain that the Finance Committee could not undertake it.

I therefore ask if the Senator from Oklahoma is not willing to strike out "the Finance Committee," and substitute "a special committee to be appointed by the presiding officer of the Senate," to consist of four Republican and three Democratic Senators, if he chooses to inject the element of politics into it? I see he has suggested that the Finance Committee is composed of members of both political parties. I hope the Senator from Oklahoma can see his way clear to do that.

While I am on my feet, I want merely to make this reply to the Senator from Montana: It is not our fault, nor are we in anyway reponsible for the fact, that a new rule for the construction of a tariff bill has been devised and laid down.

The Republican national convention itself has prescribed the rule according to which this bill should be framed, and I can see no reasonable ground for complaint on the part of those having in charge the measure, that Senators on this side demand of them that they at least demonstrate that the bill falls within the rule prescribed by the convention of their party. It is no hardship to require a Senator having charge of this bill to show that it falls within the requirements of his own party's platform. It is true, as the Senator from Montana says, that every Senator on this floor has access equal to that which the Senators on the Finance Committee have to these public documents, and Senators may work it out to their own satisfaction. But if Senators do not find themselves satisfied with the information accessible or obtainable, they have a perfect right to demand that Senators on the other side shall lay before the Senate and the country facts and arguments that at least will vindicate their bill according to the rule established by their own platform.

Mr. CARTER. I ask the Senator from Oklahoma to permit me to make one observation in reply to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. GORE. Certainly.

Mr. CARTER. It has been often suggested here that the Republican party platform adopted at Chicago made a new rule for the guidance of those called upon to carry the protective policy into legislative enactment. According to my conception of the fact, there never has been any other rule for the guidance of those engaged in protective-tariff legislation. There never was, according to my idea, any disposition on the part of any Republican Congress or statesman to impose a duty higher than that which made up the difference between the cost of wages here and abroad, plus a reasonable return on the capital invested. That rule, of long standing, was crystallized into a plank in the platform at Chicago for the first time, but it was like an old rule of the common law with us from the beginning as a rule of action.

Mr. BAILEY. If that rule was well established and well understood, then the Republican party was engaged in a foolish procedure to promulgate it. I thought, inasmuch as it made its appearance in the Chicago Republican platform for the first time, I was warranted in saying it was the first authoritative enunciation of the rule, although I agree, as the Senator says, that that has been the argument of Republican Senators and Republican orators and editors. But, then, they for the first time, as I understand, succeeded in forcing it into the Republican platform as an authoritative declaration.

I desire to say this, too, while I am on my feet, and then I will not trespass further upon the Senator from Oklahoma. I myself have not complained of this lack of information. I have found more matter available for my use than I have found time to use, and I myself make no such complaint. But Senators on both sides feel—and I am not perfectly sure but that they have a perfect right to feel—that members of the committee will not select from this vast mass of matter—some irrelevant and some relevant—those parts of it which will contribute to the enlightenment of Senators and the country; and I understand that to be the complaint which the Senators from Oklahoma are now making.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President——

Mr. OWEN. Will the Senator from Oklahoma allow me for just a moment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to his colleague?

Mr. GORE. Certainly.

Mr. OWEN. I should like to say, as far as my comments are concerned, that I impose no restrictions whatever on the minority members of the Committee on Finance. I understand they were not even permitted to be present when the consideration of the bill was in progress.

Mr. BAILEY. I do not want to do my adversaries an injustice. While that is true, we had a rule of the committee authorizing us to hold our own sessions, at least to employ all the experts we wanted, and we had the same rights they had. They are bad enough at best, and I am not willing to charge

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

them with being worse than they are. We could have, and did have, all the experts we needed.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I desire to say at the beginning that out of deference to the opinion of the Senator from Texas I am perfectly willing to substitute a select committee for the Finance Committee. I am perfectly indifferent as to whether it be a standing or a select committee which performs this task. I am only concerned that the task be performed, and I cherish as tender a solicitude for the health and the happiness of the Finance Committee as any other member of this body.

Now, to the Senator from Montana I desire to say that I disclaim that the charge of conspiracy or organized robbery has escaped my lips. He will search the RECORD in vain to find where I have given utterance to that charge in that form. I must confess, however, that the thought did come to my mind, and that those words came to my lips, as they came to the lips of the senior Senator from Montana, but they escaped his lips instead of mine. But, sir, the circumstances suggest robbery and suggest conspiracy, and they justify the epithets.

I appreciate the lecture read to me in this presence by the senior Senator from Montana, and I may say in my self-defense that my lack of knowledge possibly is due to the fact that the senior Senator from Montana is a Member of this august assembly. We all can have free recourse to his universal information, and I understand that he admits that he knows everything about every question. Then why should the ordinary Member like myself concern himself with these arduous inquiries?

Mr. President, in ancient times, before the Diamond Match trust was organized, the ancients kept a fire burning upon their altar, so that those who chanced to lose it in their dwellings could go to the temple and rekindle their fires. The Senator from Montana is one of those splendid luminaries who shine with original luster. The rest of us are mere satellites, which must borrow the light which we reflect. But, like the sun itself, the Senator has spots upon him. He emits darkness as well as light. In one breath he suggests that the information is before us now, and charges my colleague and myself for not taking notice of that fact. In another breath he suggests it could not be obtained in a less time than two years. Others may concern themselves about which statement to believe. There are those who will disbelieve both.

I would not say the Senator is an encyclopedia of information, nor shall I suggest that if there be any truth in the old adage that ignorance is bliss the senior Senator from Montana ought to be supremely happy.

But, sir, the Senator from Montana says that the rule adopted at Chicago was not a new rule, that it was not a new principle, that the Republican party did not proclaim a new policy when it declared for a tariff high enough to measure the difference between wages here and abroad plus a reasonable profit.

That only confirms the suggestion just made. I say to the senior Senator from Montana that it is a new rule; that it is a new principle. I say to him that the national Republican platform of 1892 declared that the tariff rate ought to be high enough to cover the difference between the labor cost abroad and at home. There the platform stopped. The permanent chairman of that convention, as I remember, was the late martyr, McKinley, and if I remember correctly, the senior Senator from Montana was the chairman of the national Republican committee which conducted the campaign upon that platform declaration. Can it be possible that the Senator does not remember the platform upon which he waged that campaign; or is it perhaps because the Republican party admonished by the defeat which it suffered in the contest, fearing a similar calamity, has added this little appendix, "plus a reasonable profit?" And if it does not precipitate an acute attack of appendicitis, the country may well marvel at its failure.

Mr. President, another remark. The senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] has suggested that the country is losing $10,000,000 daily by the delay upon the tariff bill. Whenever that Senator deliberately pronounces judgment upon a proposition I yield my assent. I regard him as the supreme judge upon the subject. For he gravely advanced here the other day the proposition that we on this side contended that the duty was added to the domestic price. In the history of the human race nobody else every thought that. Nobody ever said that in the history of the world. You may search the tariff debates from the beginning of time to the present hour, and nobody ever suggested that the duty was added to the domestic price. Nobody ever thought or ever suggested that anybody ever thought or said such a thing except the senior Senator from New Hampshire. He has a right to a copyright upon that statement and a patent upon that invention.

I will merely suggest to that Senator that it might be added as a duty to the select committee, of which the Senator should be a member, to ascertain, if this country is losing $10,000,000 a day by the pendency of this bill, how long it would be before there would not be a dollar left remaining in this country. But those who are losing a million dollars a day have a million to lose, and if it be true, I regret it as much as any man on this floor.

Mr. GALLINGER. How much does the Senator think has been and is being lost to the laborers and industries of this country by delay in the consideration of this bill?

Mr. GORE. That would be a matter of pure speculation.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator, I think, must have an opinion on that point.

Mr. GORE. I have not figured it out with such absolute accuracy as has the Senator from New Hampshire. The pendency of a tariff bill always disturbs business more or less. But I will suggest to the Senator that the people who are losing a million dollars a day are not the only ones concerned in this measure. The consumers as well as the trusts feel a slight interest in the passage of this bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the Senator has raised a question that has been frequently raised here, as to consumers. There is one manufacturing establishment in New Hampshire that employs 13,000 people. The chances are that they represent at least twice that number of persons, perhaps three times.

Several SENATORS. Four times.

Mr. GALLINGER. No; some of them are unmarried. Are not they consumers, and is it not important that they should have employment to provide for their families? Who are the consumers of this country as distinguished from the producers, including the men and women who earn wages?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, this is not the first time that question has been asked during this debate. The senior Senator from Rhode Island, the chairman of the Finance Committee, exclaimed in fine scorn a few days ago, "Who is the consumer?" Mr. President, have the consumers of this country fallen into such hands as this, that they not only have no regard for the consumer, no concern for his welfare, but they even challenge and deny his existence? Has it come to this, that a tariff measure is being revised by those who have not even discovered the consumer? I ask Senators in whose name and for whose benefit is the tariff being revised, if not for the consumer?

Now, I answer the Senator's question. The statement was made a few days ago by the senior Senator from Massachusetts, that 7,000,000 and more were concerned in the manufacturing and mechanical industries of this country and the Senator through some process of reasoning concluded that 30,000,000 were dependent upon those laborers. I would first say to the Senator from Massachusetts that his statement included not only those who were engaged in manufacturing, but those who were engaged in agricultural pursuits, including carpenters, brick masons, stone masons, and men who derive no benefit from protection, but who suffer all its penalties; men who are consumers and not protected manufacturers.

Who are the consumers? Edward Atkinson says there are only a million people in this country who are directly benefited by a protective tariff. But the census of 1900, more elaborate than the senior Senator from Massachusetts suggested, says there are a little more than 5,000,000 people engaged in manufactories in this country. How that Senator arrived at 30,000,000 dependents I have been unable to cipher out. According to that census there were 29,000,000 people engaged in gainful occupations, and there were all told 75,000,000 people in the country. I presume the Senator multiplied his 7,000,000 by 4, making 30,000,000, but if he adopts that rule, then, multiplying 29,000,000 by 4, we have 130,000,000 people in the United States, a self-evident misstatement of the facts.

I accept the census and will admit for the present argument that there are 5,000,000 people engaged in manufactories, and all those are benefited by a protective tariff. Multiply those by 2½, which is the rule we must adopt according to the census return itself. Then you have about twelve or thirteen million people who are benefited by this tariff—twelve or thirteen million out of 75,000,000. I say to the Senator from New Hampshire that the other 62,000,000 people are the consumers.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. GORE. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. During the years 1894, 1895, and 1896 there were taken from the savings banks of New Hampshire, to meet their immediate wants, $12,000,000 by the operatives, the farmers, and the laboring men who had deposited that money

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

there. What has the Senator to say about those consumers? That money was taken from the banks for the reason that the kind of tariff the Senator is advocating threw them out of employment and they had to go to the savings banks and take their earnings, which they had deposited there, a few dollars at a time, and use it to keep the wolf from the door and to keep their wives and children from suffering. Now, who are the consumers? Were those people consumers?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator has at length discovered the consumers.

The senior Senator from Montana [Mr. CARTER] stated a minute ago that there were 2,000,000 people in this country out of employment and many more million who have no accounts in the savings banks or in any other banks, under a high Republican protective tariff. I am informed Mr. Bradstreet shows that the aggregate amount of failures in 1907 and 1908 exceeded by $140,000,000 the aggregate of failures during 1893 and 1894. I would ask the senior Senator from New Hampshire if those men had been taking their savings to those banks before the Wilson tariff law passed in August, 1894? Did they not begin prior to that date?

Mr. GALLINGER. I will say to the Senator, Mr. President, that it began when disaster came to the country as the result of the success of the Democratic party in that election. I will say, furthermore, to the Senator that with the large amount of deposits in the savings banks of New Hampshire—and it is very large—the average amount is $400 to each depositor. Almost one-half of our people—men, women, and children—have deposits in the savings banks, and they are mostly credited to the operatives in our mills, to our laboring men, and to our farmers.

Mr. GORE. It is well known to that Senator and all Senators that there is an army of unemployed in this country to-day; that soup houses were opened during the last year; that benevolent people distributed bread and other necessaries of life; and that one great city passed an ordinance to give to the unemployed work upon public improvements in order to relieve the distress of their situation.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

Mr. GORE. I ask the Senator from New Hampshire this question; it illustrates his position: Suppose the panic of 1907 had been delayed for thirteen months, and a Democratic President had been chosen last November, would not every Republican editor and every Republican Senator have ascribed the panic to the election of a Democratic President?

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me, there is some difference between the recent panic and the panic to which I alluded.

Mr. GORE. I admit——

Mr. GALLINGER. During those three lean years of Democratic ascendency and low tariff our people took $4,000,000 a year from the savings banks of my little State. Last year and the year before they increased their deposits about $600,000 each year.

Mr. BAILEY. And under this bill——

Mr. GORE. That is a splendid illustration of what a protective tariff does for New Hampshire at the expense of the remainder of this country.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. GORE. Certainly.

Mr. BAILEY. I simply want to suggest that under this bill they will take that $4,000,000 out of the pockets of other people instead of from their savings bank accounts.

Mr. GALLINGER. We do not agree to that.

Mr. BAILEY. We do not agree to your statement that it was a Democratic triumph that produced the panic of 1893.

Mr. GALLINGER. We have heard of the Minnesota idea, the Iowa idea, and now we have the Texas idea.

Mr. BAILEY. It is the right idea.

Mr. GORE. The New Hampshire idea is that the community should be licensed by law to put their hands in the pockets of everybody else and increase their savings deposits at the expense of the rest of this great Republic.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. GORE. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. In another body not long ago a distinguished gentleman said:

> The tariff bill is nothing short of an outrage. The witches whom Macbeth met on the heath never brewed a hell broth half so vile as this legislative compound.

Then that gentleman plunged his hands into the caldron of broth and pulled out a prize package inscribed "Lumber" and voted for a duty on it.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I remember another passage from that high tragedy. I remember that Macbeth himself had occasion to exclaim:

> "And be these juggling fiends no more believed,
> That palter with us in a double sense;
> That keep the word of promise to our ear,
> And break it to our hope."

No one in this body is better qualified to enact that rôle than the senior Senator from New Hampshire. [Laughter.]

Mr. GALLINGER. That is precisely what this gentleman did. He was arguing against protection, but he voted for a protective duty, as the Senator will probably vote for a duty on agricultural products.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I am not deceived by that mocking, miserable sham, and I will not betray the farmers of this country with a Judas kiss. It is a glittering sham that deceives nobody. The man who believes in a tariff on corn ought not to be allowed to run at large anywhere outside of the United States Senate. [Laughter.]

Mr. GALLINGER. We will see when the vote is taken what the Senator's associates will do. I will ask the Senator if he is going to vote for a duty on hides?

Mr. GORE. I will not. Are you?

Mr. GALLINGER. I will answer that question when the time comes. [Laughter.] I am gratified to discover that there is one real free trader on the other side of the Chamber.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the term "free trader" has no terrors for me, and yet I am not, and could not be under existing circumstances, a free trader. I doubt not, unless there be a decided change in his opinions, that the Senator from New Hampshire will vote for free hides and for free coal in order to fire his factories.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator is not accurate in his statement. He ought to inform himself before he expresses an opinion as to what I will do on this bill.

Mr. GORE. I tried to do that. The Senator declined to inform me. I yield for that purpose now. [Laughter.]

Mr. GALLINGER. I will inform the Senator very promptly that I shall vote for a duty on coal. Now, the Senator stated that I would not do that.

Mr. GORE. I am glad the work of the Senator from West Virginia has had such a beneficial effect.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will answer the Senator on the other point that I propose to hear the arguments on both sides concerning the duty on hides, and I will vote as my conscience dictates at the time. I have not yet made up my mind.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, that word "conscience" comes charmingly from the Senator's lips.

Now, in passing upon this lumber duty, I know that side has had frequent occasion to chide this side for voting for a proposed duty on lumber. I shall not vote for a duty on lumber, and I will remind the Senator from New Hampshire that the present duty on lumber is 10 per cent ad valorem, and the proposed duty, I am informed, is about 5 or 6 per cent ad valorem. If that Senator desires the people of this country to construct their homes without exorbitant charges, and will include structural steel, nails, window glass, and lumber in one schedule, and fix a uniform rate of 6 per cent, I do not speak advisedly, but I believe that he would command almost the unanimous support of this side of the Chamber.

Sir, when men on this side vote for 6 per cent lumber, why should you not agree to vote for a similar rate of duty on structural steel? Either do that or else cease to banter this side of the Chamber for its support of that which you are pleased to allege is a protective tariff.

Now, Mr. President, back to the point. Senators on that side are fond of sidetracks in this discussion. Alluding to the ten millions, I want to say to the Senator from New Hampshire that the men who are losing a million of dollars in this country are not the retail merchants. My own observation and information has been that the millionaires of this country are not the retail merchants. I know very few who have amassed that fabulous sum. If I am correctly advised, the millionaires of this country are the beneficiaries of a protective tariff. Take the steel trust. We can enumerate several who have amassed millions by your protection, perhaps more than all the millionaire retail merchants in the United States combined. Take other protected interests. You will find those who by unreasonable profits have amassed millions; and the retail merchants and the consumers have been the common victims—the fellow-victims of the same conspiracy and the same robbery. I borrow the words.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. GORE. Certainly.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The morning hour has expired.

Mr. GORE. I was not aware of that.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the well-settled practice in the Senate, the resolution goes to the calendar.

Mr. GORE. I shall not insist, in view of the suggestion by the senior Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. BAILEY. I ask unanimous consent that a vote be taken on the resolution. It will require but a moment or two.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas asks unanimous consent that a vote be taken on the resolution. Is there objection?

Mr. LODGE. The motion is to refer to the committee, I understand.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion is to refer to the committee. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none.

Mr. GORE. I wish to say merely that I do not object to this proceeding. I have not witnessed it before, but I yield, sir, without complaint.

Mr. BAILEY. I supposed the Senator from Oklahoma wanted a vote on his resolution, and I tried to get it.

Mr. GORE. And I should like to have it. I appreciate the Senators' suggestion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The request was made and no objection was made. A vote will now be taken.

Mr. GORE. I wish first to offer an amendment to strike out the words "Finance Committee or any subcommittee thereof" and insert——

Mr. ALDRICH. That is not in order.

Mr. GALLINGER. That was not the agreement.

Mr. GORE. And to substitute "a select committee consisting of four Republicans and three Democrats."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. ALDRICH. The question is on the motion to refer.

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator will not make any progress by an objection of that kind, because the Senator understands that when I preferred the request for unanimous consent to vote on it I preferred it in view of the interchange that had occurred between the Senator from Oklahoma and myself; and the Senator readily acceded to the suggestion that we propose to have the investigation made by a special committee instead of the Finance Committee. The Senator from Oklahoma said that was entirely acceptable to him.

Mr. GORE. Yes.

Mr. ALDRICH. That motion is not in order.

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator from Oklahoma can change his resolution.

Mr. BACON. He can modify his resolution.

Senate resolution 45.

Whereas it has been repeatedly asserted and generally admitted in the Senate during the debate on the pending tariff bill that current prices in the United States are unreasonable and exorbitant; and

Whereas there is a radical and irreconcilable division of opinion as to who is responsible for these extortionate prices; and

Whereas there are those who believe that the manufacturers are primarily responsible, and others who believe that the wholesale and retail dealers are responsible; and

Whereas it is important that the truth should be known, that the innocent should be vindicated and the guilty alone charged with the blame and responsibility: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Finance or any subcommittee thereof, consisting of representatives of both political parties, are hereby instructed to investigate and report to the Senate at the earliest possible date—

First. The import prices of various articles of general and ordinary consumption.

Second. The wholesale prices of said articles.

Third. The retail prices of said articles.

Fourth. The prices of similar articles of domestic production as fixed, charged, and received by the manufacturers thereof and the wholesale and retail dealers therein.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending question is on agreeing to the motion to refer the resolution to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GORE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

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

Mr. RICHARDSON (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE].

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. BOURNE] is paired with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. DAVIS]; that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BRADLEY] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. SHIVELY]; and that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NIXON] is paired with his colleague [Mr. NEWLANDS].

Mr. SIMMONS (after having voted in the negative). I desire to inquire whether the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] has voted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed that he has not.

Mr. SIMMONS. I withdraw my vote.

Mr. NELSON. The junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] is unavoidably detained from the Chamber. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. SIMMONS. I have withdrawn my vote.

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 29, as follows:

YEAS—50.

Aldrich	Cullom	Gamble	Perkins
Borah	Cummins	Guggenheim	Piles
Brandegee	Curtis	Hale	Root
Briggs	Depew	Heyburn	Scott
Brown	Dick	Johnson, N. Dak.	Smith, Mich.
Bulkeley	Dillingham	Jones	Smoot
Burkett	Dixon	Kean	Stephenson
Burnham	Dolliver	Lodge	Sutherland
Burrows	du Pont	McCumber	Warner
Burton	Elkins	Nelson	Warren
Carter	Flint	Oliver	Wetmore
Clark, Wyo.	Frye	Page	
Crane	Gallinger	Penrose	

NAYS—29.

Bacon	Daniel	McLaurin	Smith, S. C.
Bailey	Fletcher	Martin	Stone
Bankhead	Foster	Money	Taliaferro
Bristow	Frazier	Overman	Taylor
Chamberlain	Gore	Owen	Tillman
Clay	Hughes	Paynter	
Crawford	Johnston, Ala.	Rayner	
Culberson	La Follette	Smith, Md.	

NOT VOTING—12.

Beveridge	Clapp	McEnery	Richardson
Bourne	Clarke, Ark.	Newlands	Shively
Bradley	Davis	Nixon	Simmons

So Mr. GORE's resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance.

IMPORTS OF TOBACCO.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of State, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 20th ultimo, a statement relative to the duties per pound which are levied and collected by foreign governments on imports of tobacco from the United States, and respecting which countries prohibit importations thereof, etc. (S. Doc. No. 50), which, on motion of Mr. DANIEL, was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED.

The following joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

H. J. Res. 54. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to loan cots, tents, and appliances for the use of the forty-third national encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic at Salt Lake City, Utah; and

H. J. Res. 55. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to loan certain tents for use at the tercentenary celebration of the discovery of Lake Champlain, to be held in Burlington, Vt., in July, 1909.

THE TARIFF.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is House bill 1438.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending question is on the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] to paragraph 151.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, before the vote is taken I desire to occupy a little while in animadverting on some matters discussed on yesterday and into which I have examined somewhat since the adjournment last evening.

However, Mr. President, before doing that I desire to say that it seems to me that the Finance Committee, and others who think as the majority of that committee do, keep in mind while framing this bill but one class of people—the manufacturers. They seem to lose sight, at least to a large degree, of all others. The manufacturers seem to be the subjects of their sole and supreme care. I am sure I am as anxious as any man to see the manufacturing industries of the country prosperous. I recognize the importance of manufacturing, and that manufacturing is one of the great arms of our national activity and industrial strength; but, Mr. President, there are others equally entitled to consideration at our hands. The wholesale mer-

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

By Mr. BRADLEY:

A bill (S. 2469) to grant an honorable discharge to Alfred Childers; and

A bill (S. 2470) to correct the military record of John Tudor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2471) for the relief of Elizabeth Bevins;

A bill (S. 2472) for the relief of the Baptist Church of Schoolfield, Ky.;

A bill (S. 2473) for the relief of the estate of Matthew A. McCain; and

A bill (S. 2474) for the relief of the estate of Richard White; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2475) granting an increase of pension to Sam M. Anderson;

A bill (S. 2476) granting a pension to Susan Jones;

A bill (S. 2477) granting a pension to Lewis W. Dillion; and

A bill (S. 2478) granting a pension to William Lee; to the Committee on Pensions.

AMENDMENTS TO THE TARIFF BILL.

Mr. BRADLEY submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes; which were ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. TALIAFERRO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. ELKINS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

CIVIL-SERVICE EMPLOYEES FROM KENTUCKY.

Mr. BRADLEY. I submit a resolution, for which I ask immediate consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 52) was read, as follows:

Senate resolution 52.

Resolved, That the Civil Service Commission is hereby directed to communicate to the Senate, at the earliest practical day, a list of the names of those now in the service charged to the State of Kentucky, including the city or town and the county which clerk or employee claims as his or her residence and the date of his or her appointment; also a statement as to the number to which said State is entitled under the provisions of the civil-service law.

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

Mr. HALE. I am not at all certain that the resolution does not in spirit countervail the order of the Senate as to legislative business, but there being, perhaps, some doubt about it, and as I can conceive of no one having any objection to the resolution, I will not raise the point of order on it.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

WAGES IN GERMANY.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I submit a resolution which I send to the desk, and I ask for its present consideration.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 51), as follows:

Senate resolution 51.

Whereas the German Government, upon formal request made by this Government, transmitted several months ago to the Secretary of State an official statement in relation to the wages paid in Germany to workmen in various occupations; and

Whereas the Senate is from day to day endeavoring to ascertain the difference in the cost of production between foreign and domestic manufactures in order to determine the just rate of duty to be levied upon foreign imports, and it is of the highest importance that the Senate should have before it at this time all facts which may aid in its deliberations:

Resolved, That the President, if not incompatible in his judgment with the public interest, be, and he is hereby, requested to transmit to the Senate the statement of the German Government in relation to the wages paid to German workmen, for the use of the Senate in connection with its consideration of the pending tariff bill.

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

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that it may be read again.

The Secretary again read the resolution.

Mr. HALE. My attention was diverted. Has the resolution the usual clause that the President shall communicate the information at his discretion, if it is not incompatible with the public service?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It has, I will state to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. KEAN. That clause is in the resolution.

Mr. ROOT. I suggest to the Senator from Wisconsin whether the recital may not be a little strong, that there was a formal request by our Government upon the German Government? I think we ought to be a little careful about committing the Senate to a recital of facts without being pretty certain whether they are accurate.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I have been informed, upon what I suppose to be very reliable authority, that the German Government furnished this information upon the request of this Government. I care nothing at all about the preamble to the resolution; I am entirely willing that the preamble shall be stricken out. I desire to secure for the Senate the information which I am certain is in the possession of the Secretary of State.

Mr. ROOT. I quite agree with the purpose of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I should like to inquire whether the Senator from Wisconsin has in mind getting information relating to the wage in other countries than Germany?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The purpose of my resolution is to secure information with respect to wages in various occupations in Germany. I am advised that the German Government some months ago transmitted to this Government a statement of the wages paid in various occupations in Germany. We are endeavoring to fix duties in this tariff bill upon a basis of the difference in cost of production of foreign and domestic manufactures. A statement by the German Government upon this subject ought to be very helpful to the Senate at this time, and I offer the resolution with a view of obtaining this important information without delay.

The Senator from Michigan will remember that we were discussing the subject of razors a few days ago, with a view of determining what duty should be fixed upon that product. In the course of that debate it was asserted by some member of the Committee on Finance that the average wages paid in Germany were from $4 to $6.45 per week in the manufacture of razors. The following morning the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] submitted a statement, which he said had been handed to him by a former Member of the House of Representatives, said to be employed at the present time by the Finance Committee. That statement represented that the German Government had transmitted information to this Government giving the wages paid in various occupations, including the manufacture of razors. It purported to give a table which showed the actual wages paid at the present time to be from 61 to 111 per cent higher than the German wage rate as stated by a member of the Committee on Finance in the course of the debate on the day before. This was a very great discrepancy, and but emphasized the necessity of the Senate's very great need of accurate and reliable information to guide us in our efforts to determine the cost of production.

It occurred to me that if there were reliable information upon the German wage rate which had come to this Government under some sort of official sanction from the German Government as to its correctness, it would assist greatly in our deliberation to have that information before the Senate. I could not conceive of anyone objecting to our having the benefit of it.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. My object in rising was simply this, that I have given some attention to the question of wages in various foreign countries, and I have particularly in mind now the wage that prevails in the iron and steel industry in Sweden. I know that that information is accessible to the Senate, if desired.

It seems to me that the preamble to the resolution indicates a desire upon the part of the Senate to proceed with legislation in the light of information that is obtained from Germany. I dislike very much to have it go out that we are leveling our attention upon the wage scale of any particular country. It seems to me that the President might properly be asked for such information as the department may have from all countries.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. If the Senator will permit me to interrupt him, I am very certain that the language of the preamble, if he observed it closely, bears no such construction as that. It simply recites the fact that such information has been obtained.

I think that perhaps the suggestion of the Senator from New York, that we should not make as a statement of fact that it was obtained upon the request of this Government, has some point to it, because on that proposition I have no official information.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I think if the Senator from Wisconsin——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. But I am entirely willing to have stricken from the resolution the preamble and allow it to be put upon its passage. There ought not to be any objection to the immediate passage of the resolution calling for this information.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I should like to see the preamble stricken out, and I should like to have the resolution call for

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

such information as is obtainable through our consular service, which, undoubtedly, the President can readily transmit.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I hope that the Senator from Michigan, if he desires that information, will call for it in a resolution which he may frame and present himself. I trust he will not delay either the passage of this resolution or the transmission of these facts to the Senate by calling for a mass of other material that might postpone a response to this resolution for some weeks.

Mr. HALE. Will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me for a moment?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Certainly.

Mr. HALE. I merely wish to suggest that the conditions as recited by the resolution perhaps apply only to Germany, and do not perhaps apply to other nations, Sweden among others. Therefore I think there can be no objection to the passage of the resolution calling upon the President, with the limitation that it is to be transmitted if it is compatible with the public service, for this particular information respecting German labor, and that it should be sent to the Senate. It seems to me that as the resolution recites a condition applicable to Germany, the Senator from Michigan should be content to let the resolution go through and then introduce any resolution touching Sweden that he finds the facts justify. I do not know that Sweden has sent in, by request, as Germany has, statements about labor, and therefore it seems to me that it is proper that this resolution should be confined to Germany; and if the Senator from Michigan finds there information from Sweden he can offer a separate resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I understand the Senator from Wisconsin proposes to strike out the preamble and let the resolution stand in that form.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes, sir.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. He prefers to do that.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I amend it in that form.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The Senator prefers to do that rather than include any other country?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Then certainly I will not object.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution as now presented by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That the President, if not incompatible in his judgment with the public interest, be, and he is hereby, requested to transmit to the Senate the statement of the German Government in relation to the wages paid to German workmen, for the use of the Senate in connection with its consideration of the pending tariff bill.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Upon the suggestion of the Senator from New York, I will amend the resolution further by inserting after the words "the German Government" the words "or its officers." The document may have come from the officers of the German Government and, technically, may not have been received from the German Government.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution as now modified.

The SECRETARY. After the words "the German Government" insert the words "or its officers," so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the President, if not incompatible in his judgment with the public interest, be, and he is hereby, requested to transmit to the Senate the statement of the German Government, or its officers, in relation to the wages paid to German workmen, for the use of the Senate in connection with its consideration of the pending tariff bill.

The resolution as modified was agreed to.

LEAF TOBACCO.

Mr. FRAZIER. I ask for a reprint of Senate Document No. 390, Hearings on the Relief of Tobacco Growers. I am advised that the print has been entirely exhausted, and there is very great demand for this document.

There being no objection, the order was reduced to writing and agreed to, as follows:

Ordered, That 500 copies of the Hearings on the Relief of Tobacco Growers before a subcommittee on internal revenue of the Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Fifty-eighth Congress, second session, February 4 and 25, 1904, be printed for the Senate document room.

COST OF PRODUCTION.

Mr. OWEN. I ask the consent of the Senate to have a report of Carroll D. Wright, on the cost of production of certain articles in the United States, Great Britain, and Belgium, reprinted as a document (S. Doc. No. 20, 55th Cong., 3d sess.).

Mr. GALLINGER. I will ask the Senator what is the date of that report?

Mr. OWEN. Eighteen ninety-eight.

Mr. GALLINGER. Eleven years ago?

Mr. OWEN. Yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. It seems to me, Mr. President, it will not be of much interest at this late day, but I will not object.

There being no objection, the order was reduced to writing and agreed to, as follows:

Ordered, That 500 copies of a report on the total cost and labor cost of transformation in the production of certain articles in the United States, Great Britain, and Belgium, by Carroll D. Wright, Commissioner of Labor, December, 1898, be printed for the Senate document room.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 9135. An act to raise revenue for the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Philippines.

TOBACCO TAX.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I simply rise for the purpose of announcing that on Friday morning next, after the regular order of business, I desire to address the Senate on the proposed repeal of the 6 cents tax on leaf tobacco.

DUTY ON IRON ORE.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, a day or two since, Col. William J. Bryan was interviewed at Toledo, Ohio, and the interview has been reported through the Associated Press. I will read a brief extract from that interview, printed in the Washington Herald:

As to the Democrats who voted for the imposition of duties, they have, as a rule, defended their conduct on the ground that the duties voted for were revenue duties, and they have not been high duties. Measured on an ad valorem basis, the duty on lumber and on iron ore are but a small portion of the price. I think that the Democrats who voted for the duty made a mistake.

Mr. President, I have had the honor and pleasure of sustaining cordial and rather intimate relations with Mr. Bryan for a good many years, and those relations still exist. I can speak, therefore, in a feeling of respect and kindliness regarding him. And at this point I might say that it has become a habit for our friends on the other side of the Chamber to speak disparagingly and sometimes almost sneeringly of Mr. Bryan. That is not a difficult or dangerous thing to do from this place of security. It does not require much courage to attack under such circumstances. I doubt whether Senators who speak in this tone would adopt it if Mr. Bryan had a seat in this body and could reply for himself.

I do not hesitate to say—indeed, I take pride in saying—that I entertain for Mr. Bryan not only a high respect, but an affectionate regard. I believe that he is one of the most masterful and commanding intellectualities who has appeared in American public life during this generation.

Moreover, there is none to question the entire integrity of his opinions, the honesty of the man, his high character, or his sincerity. But, Mr. President, all men are fallible, all men make mistakes, and Mr. Bryan makes mistakes like other men. I have not always agreed with him, but I have never doubted his sincerity. I think in this matter he is mistaken, honestly so; and when he says he thinks that the Democrats who voted against free iron ore made a mistake, I do not agree with him.

Mr. President, I am one of the 18 Democrats who voted to put a duty of 25 cents per ton on iron ore. The 18 Democrats who voted that way are Messrs. BACON, BAILEY, BANKHEAD, CHAMBERLAIN, CLAY, DANIEL, FLETCHER, FOSTER, FRAZIER, JOHNSTON of Alabama, MCENERY, MARTIN, PAYNTER, SIMMONS, STONE, TALIAFERRO, TAYLOR, and TILLMAN. Ten Democrats voted to put iron ore on the free list, viz, Messrs. CLARKE of Arkansas, CULBERSON, GORE, HUGHES, NEWLANDS, OVERMAN, RAYNER, SHIVELY, SMITH of Maryland, and SMITH of South Carolina. How the 5 Democrats who were absent or paired, and therefore are not recorded, would have voted, I do not know. Up to this time there are only two questions upon which Democratic Senators have divided to any appreciable extent—on iron ore and lumber; in fact, as a rule they have voted together and the same way. Mr. President, when the question of putting a duty on iron ore was before the Senate, I was hesitant and somewhat uncertain as to what was the right and proper thing to do; but in the end the best judgment of which I am capable, not only as a party man, but as one desirous of promoting the best policy for the public welfare, I conceived it to be my duty to vote as I did. I believe in the doctrine of a revenue tariff, and this whether considered from the standpoint of the constitutional power vested in Congress to levy tariffs or from the standpoint of economic policy. I believe that tariffs should be levied with the primary object of producing a needed public revenue, and that the duties should be as widely distributed and laid upon as many articles as possible, always, of course, having in view the needs of the Government; and I hold that the burden should be made lightest upon articles of common use and heaviest upon others.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

I have talked much longer than I expected, and longer than I wanted to, and I know I have very imperfectly covered this question, because it is very intricate.

I have studied it as best I could in the leisure moments I have had during the last month, since the consideration of this bill was begun. I am here asking the Senate not to injure a legitimate American enterprise, not to destroy any American institution that has been built up under the protective policy, not to antagonize the findings of the Committee on Finance; but to change this phraseology, thereby permitting the American market to be opened somewhat to the sugars that might come in from other countries, or in competition with the sugar refineries. So I yield the floor, believing that the Senate will recognize the force of these facts which I have so imperfectly presented, and hoping that this reduction will be made.

Mr. President, I ask leave to print some tables that I did not read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kansas? The Chair hears none.

The tables are as follows:

Production of cane sugar in the United States.

	Short tons.
1857–1858	160,985
1858–1859	216,547
1859–1860	133,325
1860–1861	137,362
1861–1862	269,915
1862–1863	51,520
1863–1864	42,530
1864–1865	5,600
1865–1866	10,340
1866–1867	25,200
1867–1868	25,760
1868–1869	50,401
1869–1870	52,416
1870–1871	89,152
1871–1872	78,176
1872–1873	67,416
1873–1874	54,320
1874–1875	71,120
1875–1876	86,246
1876–1877	99,680
1877–1878	79,521
1878–1879	125,440
1879–1880	103,939
1880–1881	142,651
1881–1882	85,537
1882–1883	159,373
1883–1884	151,472
1884–1885	112,981
1885–1886	151,377
1886–1887	95,641
1887–1888	187,952
1888–1889	172,378
1889–1890	152,883
1890–1891	248,585
1891–1892	185,290
1892–1893	231,634
1893–1894	305,413
1894–1895	364,696
1895–1896	271,817
1896–1897	322,088
1897–1898	353,976
1898–1899	278,829
1899–1900	167,094
1900–1901	306,017
1901–1902	364,325
1902–1903	372,903
1903–1904	258,812
1904–1905	340,768
1905–1906	300,376
1906–1907	248,326
1907–1908	388,640

NOTE.—From Statistical Abstract, 1907, page 163.

Sugar production.

Fiscal year.	Hawaii.	Cuba.	Porto Rico.	Philippines.
	Short tons.	*Short tons.*	*Short tons.*	*Short tons.*
1898–1899	283,896.72	385,691.20	60,285	104,160
1899–1900	289,543.52	345,568.16	39,200	70,319
1900–1901	360,037.44	712,158.72	89,600	62,048
1901–1902	355,610.08	952,202.72	95,200	88,073
1902–1903	437,989.44	1,118,743.36	95,200	100,800
1903–1904	367,476.36	1,165,055.36	145,600	91,080
1904–1905	426,245.12	1,302,848.96	162,460	119,700
1905–1906	429,212.00	1,320,198.88	238,560	162,998
1906–1907	440,015.52	1,598,993.76	235,200	162,960
1907–1908	521,122.56	1,344,000.00	243,040	168,000

Hawaii.—Figures, 1898 to 1902–3, compiled from Willett & Gray, December 10, 1903, page 3; 1902–3 to 1908, compiled from Willett & Gray, November 25, 1908, page 409.

Cuba.—Figures, 1898 to 1903–4, compiled from Farmers' Bulletin No. 30, 1904, page 80; 1903–4 to 1908, compiled from Farmers' Bulletin No. 52, 1908, page 46.

Porto Rico.—Figures, 1898 to 1903–4, compiled from Senate Document No. 250, Fifty-ninth Congress, first session, pages 11–12; 1903–4 to 1908, compiled from Farmers' Bulletin No. 52, 1908, page 46.

Philippines.—Figures prior to 1903–4 are exports. (Figures compiled from Willett & Gray's Sugar Journal.)

Sugar imported into the United States from Hawaii, Porto Rico, Cuba, and the Philippines.

Fiscal year.	Hawaii.	Porto Rico.	Cuba.	Philippines.	All other countries.
	Short tons.	*Short tons.*	*Short tons.*	*Short tons.*	*Short tons.*
1898	249,883	49,209	220,113	14,745	811,009.99
1899	231,149.94	53,601.3	331,771.83	25,812.64	1,347,789.58
1900	252,355.55	36,279.09	352,727.96	24,745.27	1,392,934.4
1901	345,440.42	68,600.9	549,702.18	2,346.67	1,435,454.07
1902	360,276.68	91,908.52	492,107.54	5,712	1,515,957.94
1903	387,412.71	113,076.75	1,197,983.89	9,386.67	990,706.49
1904	368,246.05	129,615.8	1,409,778.86	23,514.95	957,842.47
1905	416,360.69	135,659.99	962,421.16	27,499.99	774,705.86
1906	373,301.32	205,272.3	1,261,295.25	25,362.34	578,675.63
1907	410,507.41	204,074.99	1,583,081.99	35,253.15	548,183.12
1908	538,785.32	234,602.54	1,231,031.95	14,731.4	524,279.6

NOTE.—From Senate Document No. 15, Sixty-first Congress, first session, pages 2–3, letter from Assistant Secretary Commerce and Labor.

Figures, 1898, from Statistical Abstract, 1907, page 719, also 1904; figures for 1901, Porto Rico, Statistical Abstract, 1907, page 719; Porto Rico, 1899–1900, Statistical Abstract, 1904, page 351; Cuba, 1899–1905, Statistical Abstract, 1904, page 351; Philippines, 1899–1903, Statistical Abstract, 1904, page 353; other countries, 1899–1904, Statistical Abstract, 1907, page 719.

Consumption of sugar in the United States.

	Calendar year—			
	1908.	1907.	1906.	1905.
Total consumption of sugar in United States, long tons	3,185,789	2,993,979	2,864,013	2,632,216
Compared with preceding year (increase), long tons	191,810	129,966	231,797	134,946
Compared with preceding year (increase), per cent	6.406	4.538	8.806	4.876
Consumption consisted of:				
Domestic cane (Louisiana and Texas), long tons	390,888	264,968	267,947	334,522
Domestic beet, long tons	493,200	375,410	300,317	220,722
Maple, long tons	11,000	10,000	6,000	9,000
Molasses sugar, long tons	5,910	6,249	8,150	11,880
Total domestic, long tons	900,998	656,627	582,414	576,124
Hawaii (cane), long tons	453,250	418,102	343,857	376,497
Porto Rico (cane), long tons	185,085	212,853	193,978	124,928
Philippine Islands (cane), long tons	45,089	10,700	41,900	14,673
Cuba (cane), long tons	916,742	1,340,400	1,165,994	1,101,611
Total on which tariff concession allowed, long tons	1,600,166	1,982,055	1,745,729	1,617,709
Foreign raw cane, long tons	543,518	347,509	357,057	412,560
Foreign raw beet, long tons	139,363	6,780	175,827	22,161
Foreign refined beet, long tons	1,687	949	2,734	1,844
Foreign refined cane, long tons	57	59	252	1,818
Total foreign on which full duty assessed, long tons	684,625	355,297	535,870	438,383
Amount refined by—				
American Sugar Refining Co., long tons	1,364,286	1,401,061	1,408,503	1,325,692
Independent refiners, long tons	1,147,712	1,064,827	1,031,831	939,557
Beet-sugar factories, long tons	492,969	375,358	300,059	200,477
Hawaiian cane factories, long tons	15,442	1,674	16,964	17,292
Foreign refiners, long tons	1,744	1,008	2,986	3,662
Total amount refined sugar, long tons	3,022,153	2,843,928	2,760,343	2,506,680
Per cent refined sugar manufactured by—				
American Sugar Refining Co	45.14	49.27	51.03	52.89
Independent refiners	37.98	37.44	37.38	37.48
Beet-sugar factories	16.31	13.19	10.87	8.79
Hawaiian cane factories	.51	.06	.61	.69
Foreign refiners	.06	.04	.11	.15
Consumed in raw or plantation state, long tons	163,636	150,051	103,670	125,536
National Sugar Refining Co. production (included with independent refiners), long tons	315,000	306,000	326,000	296,000
Average difference between raw and refined, per pound	$0.884	$0.863	$0.829	$0.978

NOTE.—From Willett & Gray's Weekly Statistical Sugar Trade Journal, January 9, 1908, page 10; January 7, 1909, page 2.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., May 26, 1909.

DEAR SIR: I regret that the table showing the average yield of sugar per ton of beets in the various beet-producing States, submitted with my letter of the 24th instant, requires correction in the last five years. By a clerical mistake, the statistics showing the "average sugar in

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

beets" were inserted instead of the "average extraction of sugar based on weight of beets." A corrected table is herewith inclosed.

Very respectfully,

JAMES WILSON, *Secretary.*

Hon. JOSEPH L. BRISTOW,
United States Senate.

Average yield of sugar per ton (2,000 pounds) of beets in the principal beet-growing States.

(Figures in italics incorrect.)

Year.	California.	Colorado.	Idaho.	Michigan.	Nebraska.	Utah.	Wisconsin.	Other States.	Total, United States.
	Lbs.	*Lbs.*	*Lbs.*	*Lbs.*	*Lbs.*	*Lbs.*	*Lbs.*	*Lbs.*	*Lbs.*
1899-1900....	244.4	(a)	(a)	163.7	(a)	(a)	(a)	184.0	205.7
1900-1901....	265.4	219.7	.....	210.7	146.4	219.7	.....	153.6	212.1
1901-1902....	216.0	219.7	.....	211.2	214.7	217.4	207.1	207.9	214.4
1902-1903....	248.3	244.7	.....	212.8	215.6	225.9	204.1	221.0	231.8
1903-1904....	249.4	215.9	210.5	220.0	253.4	236.5	215.7	233.1	230.5
1904-1905....	*314.8*	*312.8*	*297.6*	*302.6*	*301.6*	*295.4*	*290.8*	*313.0*	*306.6*
1905-1906....	*345.4*	*294.2*	*289.4*	*313.0*	*246.0*	*280.6*	*300.0*	*315.6*	*306.6*
1906-1907....	*334.0*	*294.0*	*338.0*	*290.0*	*274.0*	*290.0*	*272.0*	*288.0*	*298.0*
1907-1908....	*358.0*	*306.0*	*356.0*	*302.0*	(a)	*326.0*	*302.0*	*302.0*	*316.0*
1908-1909....	*363.2*	*277.0*	*316.8*	*342.2*	(a)	*282.0*	*334.4*	*304.4*	*314.8*
Correction.									
1904-1905....	250.0	222.0	240.0	234.0	232.0	236.0	218.0	246.0	233.8
1905-1906....	287.4	209.4	213.8	246.4	193.2	217.4	229.8	230.0	234.8
1906-1907....	276.2	224.8	248.0	220.0	230.6	211.2	222.0	180.8	228.4
1907-1908....	301.2	222.2	311.0	243.2	(a)	252.0	247.0	227.4	246.0
1908-1909....	277.8	220.6	254.4	279.0	(a)	234.0	266.0	244.4	249.4

(a) Not separately shown.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate for a few moments only. On Monday I called the attention of the Senate to a critical, painstaking review of the frauds which have been perpetrated upon the people of the United States by the American Sugar Refining Company. It was an account of the recent frauds, in which they confessed themselves guilty of having stolen not less than $2,000,000, and paid it to the Treasury of the United States, having been detected in this fraud and corrupt conduct which has extended over a period of years. I called attention to this account, which stated on its face that this great corporation, engaged in this fraudulent course of cheating the United States of revenues during a period of years, had kept a daily record of the fraudulent weights by which they had defrauded the people of the United States. This account shows that this was the seventh different way in which they had defrauded the people of the United States, those different methods being:

First, by throwing water on the platform of the scales when the tare weights were being calculated.

Second, to have the checker put his foot upon the beam of the scales, by which a fraudulent weight was given.

Third, after the Government detected a fraud in the trucks which were used and caused new trucks to be made and painted red, so that they might be identified, these trucks were immediately afterwards changed in weight, so as to perpetrate a fraud in the weights of the sugar imported into this country.

Fourth, by the action of the extra-paid hired weighers of the sugar trust in moving the balance ball on the scales.

Fifth, by the hanging of a weight in the scale house, so as to give a fraudulent weight.

Sixth, by taking the sweepings right under the nose of the government officials, as the account states, and not weighing them at all.

Seventh, this last process of the needle made of a corset steel and injected into the scales through a hole bored in the standard, by which the scales were made to falsely register the weights, and by which over $2,000,000 was confessedly stolen. And when this account was presented, I desired of the Senate committee that the diagram showing these scales might be made a part of the RECORD. I regret to say that that diagram was not put in the RECORD. I now ask the consent of the Senate that this diagram go into the RECORD.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I desire to inform the Senate that the Committee on Printing, at a meeting held a month or more ago, decided that all cuts, diagrams, and photographs should be eliminated from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. A resolution was presented in the committee, which was accepted; and a number of Representatives, as well as Senators, have asked since that time to have diagrams placed in the RECORD. They have been refused, and that is only in accordance with the resolution passed by the committee. I have in mind a request of the Senator from Washington [Mr. PILES] to print diagrams of some shingle mills and other objects affecting his speech on the lumber question. He wanted those inserted in the RECORD, but it was refused, and refused only upon the ground that the committee thought it was a very unwise thing to do. And I wish to say to the Senator from Oklahoma now, that so far as I personally am concerned, I would not have cared one whit whether the diagram to which he refers went into the RECORD or not; but if we yield in this one instance, I do not know when we can stop. I call to mind now at least half a dozen Representatives who have made similar requests, and they have all been consistently refused.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I acquiesce in the wisdom of the view of the Committee on Printing that, as an ordinary matter, the RECORD ought not to be encumbered with various diagrams which are not of great importance, because they are somewhat difficult to put in the RECORD. It takes some time to have the diagrams prepared, and for that reason, and because of the cost, I agree with the committee that it is not wise, as a rule, to use such diagrams. But here is a case where there has been a wholesale fraud upon the United States which ought to be understood, and this diagram shows in the clearest possible way exactly how it was committed. I desire, therefore, that this shall be an exception to the usual rule, and I ask unanimous consent that it be permitted.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not think there is one member of the Committee on Printing who doubts for a moment that these frauds have been committed.

Mr. OWEN. Oh, I suppose not.

Mr. SMOOT. I for one say now that I condemn them just as strongly as does the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. OWEN. It is not a matter of condemnation; it is a matter of publicity.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course it is in the power of the Senate to instruct the Committee on Printing to have the cut inserted in the RECORD. But the very next Senator or the very next Representative who has something that seems especially important to him will make the same request, and I certainly hope the Senate will stand by the action taken by the Committee on Printing.

Mr. OWEN. I ask unanimous consent.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. GALLINGER. I object.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Objection is made by the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Has not the Senator from Oklahoma, in view of the objection, a photograph of the scale which he could pass around, so that Senators could see it?

Mr. OWEN. I do not have a photograph. I submitted the cut, and the cut which was submitted, I thought, ought to have gone into the RECORD, because it ought to be given publicity, which the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD alone can give. If the Senator from New Hampshire thinks it ought not to be given such publicity, he has a right to object.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma will not put me in that attitude if he tries to do it. I think I have quite as great an interest in the public welfare as has the Senator from Oklahoma. I am a member of the Committee on Printing, and I agree with the other members of the committee that we should not go into the matter of illustrating the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and for that reason I objected.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The senior Senator from Oklahoma still has the floor.

Mr. OWEN. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. GORE. I merely suggest to my colleague that possibly the rule of the Committee on Printing does not extend so far as to include the printing of such matter in a public document, and publicity might be secured in that way.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think that is a wise suggestion, and I certainly would have no objection to that if the Senator desires to have it printed as a document.

Mr. OWEN. I ask, therefore, that the account which I submitted on Monday, with the illustrations, shall be printed as a document (S. Doc. No. 60).

Mr. SMOOT. I have no objection whatever to that.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oklahoma? None is heard.

The order was reduced to writing and agreed to, as follows:

Ordered, That there be printed as a Senate document the article entitled "The Chase of the Sugar Smugglers," etc., appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under date of May 24, 1909, together with the illustrations.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I have but one more word to say. I do not intend to detain the Senate, but I call attention to this fraud upon the people of the United States by the American Sugar Refining Company, because it has the most important bearing upon the words "not above No. 16 Dutch standard in color," in paragraph 213. These refiners are the only beneficiaries of those words. It enables them to take advantage of the consumers of the United States without benefiting the producers of either cane or beet sugar in the United States; and it is a question whether or not this corporation, making, as it does, out of the people of the United States, in any contingency, un-

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Mr. BACON. You would not need any unanimous consent if you do it by vote.

Mr. LODGE. If I understand the distinction which the Senator makes, that you can do anything by unanimous consent, I quite agree.

Mr. BACON. If the Senator will pardon me, we have unanimous consent to do a thing when it is not in order to do it by a majority vote. That is when we ask consent.

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. BACON. Otherwise we do it by vote.

Mr. LODGE. You could not exclude these motions if you did not have unanimous consent. They are all privileged.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. NELSON. I was about to say, Mr. President, that I expect my colleagues here regard me as a kind of heretic on a great many of these tariff schedules; but, if it is permissible for a heretic to speak on this occasion, I want to suggest this thought to Senators: No man in this Chamber, no matter how ardent a friend he may be of an income tax, can ever guarantee to us what the Supreme Court may do. The Supreme Court, if the question is put up to them again, may decide as they did in the last decision; and what would be the effect?

If we frame this bill on the theory of supplying a part of our revenues from the income tax and the Supreme Court should decide against it, it would leave the country entirely without sufficient revenue. So, Mr. President, while, as a general proposition, I am in favor of an income tax, it seems to me that the only safe way to proceed in this case to guard against any contingency that might happen by an adverse decision of the Supreme Court is to proceed with the tariff bill and complete it on the theory that that bill will supply us with sufficient revenue.

I may add as a postscript—and then I will sit down—that I was very warmly in favor of an income tax, but it has occurred to me since the vote on the lumber schedule that there is less reason for an income tax than ever before, and that we probably shall have revenues enough without it. [Laughter.]

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I do not know whether the Senator from Rhode Island has withdrawn or not his motion to postpone.

Mr. LODGE. No.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is pending.

Mr. NEWLANDS. But what I have to say will apply to the situation, whether the pending question be the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island or the amendment of the Senator from Texas.

I wish to state briefly my views upon the question of an income tax. I shall favor an income tax, and I shall vote for any amendment for an income tax, whether it be a graduated tax or a flat tax, or a tax limited in its operations. I shall vote for any income tax that does not violate the essential principles of what an income tax should be.

As to the necessity for an income tax, I wish to call the attention of the Senate briefly to the fact that there is to-day a deficiency which it is hoped to remedy by economy in administration. The country is intent upon constructive work in the future, constructive work which as yet has not been undertaken in any comprehensive way. The country has already undertaken the constructive work of irrigation, and has provided a fund for that purpose derived from the sales of the public lands. It has entered upon the constructive work of the Panama Canal, and has provided for that work by the issue of bonds. The country is determined to enter upon other constructive work, the development and the improvement of the waterways of the country; and there is a popular demand, voiced by both parties, that that work shall be entered upon in some scientific and comprehensive way, and that there shall be a total annual expenditure upon it of at least $50,000,000.

In addition to this the country will doubtless enter upon constructive work on its public buildings in some orderly way under a bureau of construction and arts, utilizing the talents of the great architects and artists and the great constructors of the country, and there will be a demand that at least $30,000,000 annually be spent in this work.

We have there before us at least $80,000,000 of constructive work annually, which must be provided for.

While I should, if necessary, vote for bonds to carry out a part of this work—that relating to the waterways—I think it is incumbent upon us to provide in our general scheme of taxation for ample revenue that will cover this great constructive work which must be conducted by the country, in addition to the constructive work of our navy, in addition to the constructive work of our fortifications, in addition to the constructive work of our irrigation system, and in addition to the constructive work of our Panama Canal system. Eighty million dollars, therefore, in addition, must be provided. I believe that there is but one way of providing for it, and that is by an income tax; and, regardless of the revenue afforded by this bill, which will all be used for administrative purposes, there will still be the ever-present demand for $80,000,000 annually in order to meet the great constructive work of the future.

As the administrative expenses of the Government, amounting to over $600,000,000 annually, are to be paid by taxes on consumption, derived from internal revenue and customs, it is but fair that the additional burden, made necessary by needed public improvements, should be imposed upon wealth; and a tax on the surplus incomes over and above $5,000 annually, gradually increasing with the income, is a tax upon that form of wealth which can best stand the burden. I believe we should test this question now, in the light of the new views presented in the recent debates, and not leave the present decision to get the sanctity which age will give it. I believe that unless the Nation now asserts its right to this form of taxation the States will gradually adopt it; and then, when a time of emergency comes, the objection will be made that we ought not to reach out for fields of taxation already occupied by the States. In time of emergency, such as war, this tax may be required to save the life of the Nation; and we should assert now the right of the Nation to this form of taxation, or it may be forever lost.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. ALDRICH. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. ALDRICH responded to his name.

Mr. BACON. I think, Mr. President, where there has been a debate on a question that, whenever a motion is to be put to the Senate, it ought to be stated what the motion is. The Chair puts the question, and the Secretary, without giving an opportunity for any Senator to even ask that the question be stated, begins to call the roll. That seems to have become the invariable practice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair stated that the question was on the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. BACON. Yes, sir; but I desire to know what that motion is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That motion, as the Chair understands, is to postpone the consideration of the amendment presented by the Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] until the 10th day of June. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary resumed the calling of the roll.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. MCLAURIN]. If he were present, I would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DANIEL. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. MARTIN] is paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. BOURNE]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 33, as follows:

YEAS—50.

Aldrich	Crane	Gamble	Penrose
Beveridge	Crawford	Guggenheim	Perkins
Bradley	Cullom	Hale	Piles
Brandegee	Curtis	Heyburn	Root
Briggs	Depew	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Brown	Dick	Jones	Smoot
Bulkeley	Dillingham	Kean	Stephenson
Burkett	Dixon	Lodge	Sutherland
Burnham	du Pont	McCumber	Warner
Burrows	Elkins	McEnery	Warren
Burton	Flint	Nelson	Wetmore
Carter	Frye	Oliver	
Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Page	

NAYS—33.

Bacon	Cummins	La Follette	Smith, Md.
Bailey	Daniel	Money	Smith, S. C.
Bankhead	Dolliver	Newlands	Stone
Borah	Fletcher	Overman	Taliaferro
Bristow	Foster	Owen	Taylor
Chamberlain	Frazier	Paynter	Tillman
Clapp	Gore	Rayner	
Clay	Hughes	Shively	
Culberson	Johnston, Ala.	Simmons	

NOT VOTING—8.

Bourne	Davis	Martin	Richardson
Clarke, Ark.	McLaurin	Nixon	Smith, Mich.

So Mr. ALDRICH's motion was agreed to.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. ALDRICH. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After eight minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, May 28, 1909, at 10 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 27, 1909.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Capt. Herbert Winslow to be a rear-admiral in the navy from the 27th day of May, 1909, vice Rear-Admiral Edwin C. Pendleton, retired.

Commander William Braunersreuther to be a captain in the navy from the 27th day of May, 1909, vice Capt. Herbert Winslow, promoted.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 27, 1909.

PROMOTION IN THE ARMY.

GENERAL OFFICER.

Col. Richard T. Yeatman to be brigadier-general.

POSTMASTER.

Henry W. Driggers, at Punta Gorda, Fla.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *May 27, 1909.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 24, was read and approved.

THE TARIFF ON COTTON BAGGING AND TIES.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to print in the RECORD certain telegrams which have been received relative to the matter of the tariff on cotton bagging and ties and the costs to the producer. I do not desire to make any speech, but simply to print this information.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to print in the RECORD certain telegrams touching the tariff upon cotton bagging and ties. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in reply to efforts being made to have cotton bagging and ties placed on the free list, some have contended that the cotton planter is paid for same at the price received for the cotton, without deduction for the bagging and ties, and that the cotton spinner does not allow for the tare, as represented by the weight of the bagging and ties. This contention, I knew, was not capable of being sustained by proof. To show what the truth is, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] and myself have sought and obtained the information contained in the telegrams which we have received, and which are as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 25, 1909.*

Hon. W. W. GORDON,
Savannah, Ga.:

Opponents free bagging and ties claim producer is paid for same at price of cotton by spinner without deduction for tare. Please wire what deduction is made for bagging and ties, and in what way and how considered in fixing price. Does rule apply to both foreign and domestic spinners?

C. L. BARTLETT.

SAVANNAH, GA., *May 26, 1909.*

Hon. C. L. BARTLETT,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Offers from Europe name a price which includes cost of freight, marine insurance, and 6 per cent tare on a 500-pound bale. Six per cent would be 40 pounds, which covers 16 pounds for 8 yards of bagging, 8 pounds for 8 ties, and 6 pounds for natural drying of cotton and consequent shrinkage in weight; nominally, the farmer is paid for bagging and ties, but the spinner can't spin them. He sells them for junk; consequently the price he offers is a figure arrived at after deducting what his loss will be on the bagging and ties; also is true that farmer in reality is not paid for bagging and ties. American spinners usually get 28 pounds tare, and also deduct from price they pay for cotton the loss they will sustain on the bagging and ties.

W. W. GORDON.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *May 26, 1909.*

Hon. A. S. BURLESON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Your contention in dispatch concerning tare on cotton is true. When the farmer buys bagging and ties he pays therefor some 9 cents per bale more than he would pay if free. When the spinner buys from the farmer he deducts from the worth of the cotton the amount of his loss by bagging and ties. Therefore the spinner does not pay the tariff profit that goes to the manufacturers of bagging and ties and the farmer does. But even if spinner did pay, antagonists' argument is not strengthened, because spinner would add excess to manufactured product and thus increase the cost to consumer. In either case the trust collects the profit and the people pay.

W. B. THOMPSON,
President New Orleans Cotton Exchange.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *May 26, 1909.*

Hon. A. S. BURLESON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

It is a well-known fact that all buyers on both sides of the Atlantic allow in the prices they pay fully enough, if not more than enough, to offset the weight of bagging and ties on a bale. As a general thing 6 per cent is allowed for tare by foreign spinners. While all spinners practically buy on the basis of tare, care is generally taken that allowances always equal and frequently exceed actual tare.

HENRY G. HESTER.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *May 26, 1909.*

Hon. A. S. BURLESON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Referring to my previous dispatch for your information, Carolina mills have a rule that they will not allow for more than 24 pounds bagging and ties on a compressed bale and 20 pounds on an uncompressed bale. If bagging and ties exceed that in weight, the seller must refund the difference.

C. LEE MCMILLAN.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *May 26, 1909.*

Hon. A. S. BURLESON,
Washington, D. C.:

Cotton exporters calculate 6 per cent tare for bagging and ties; eastern spinners, 23 to 25 pounds per bale. Carolina mills' rule 4 reads: "On compressed cotton the tare should not exceed 24 pounds, and on uncompressed cotton, 20 pounds per bale." Cotton producers pay for their bagging and ties. Any spinner will give more for 500 pounds net cotton than for a bale weighing 500 pounds gross, including bagging and ties.

C. LEE MCMILLAN.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *May 27, 1909.*

A. S. BURLESON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

All cotton sold for export deducts 6 per cent tare for bagging and ties; domestic mills claim 4 to 5 per cent tare.

NORMAN EUSTIS,
Acting Chairman Cotton Factory Association.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *May 27, 1909.*

A. S. BURLESON,
Washington, D. C.:

Cotton sold for export carries 6 per cent deduction for tare; domestic mills calculate about 5 per cent.

NEW ORLEANS COTTON BUYERS AND EXPORTERS' ASSN.,
A. J. WEST, *President.*

These telegrams are from gentlemen of the highest character and standing in the business world, whose word will be accepted by all who know them as absolutely the truth.

Gen. W. W. Gordon, of Savannah, Ga., is a prominent cotton merchant, a buyer and exporter of cotton for many years, and who is in every way qualified by information, knowledge, and experience to give testimony on this subject; and there can be no question that his statements contain the absolute truth.

The other telegrams are from the president and secretary of the New Orleans Cotton Exchange and other prominent and reliable merchants, cotton buyers, and exporters of that city. No one who is familiar with the facts and who has the proper regard for the truth will assert that the cotton planters are paid for the bagging and ties at the price paid for the cotton when it is bought by the spinners. Such a statement does not convey the truth, and those who oppose placing the bagging and ties used in baling the South's cotton on the free list must find some other pretext, because the assertion that the former is paid for the bagging and ties when he sells his cotton is absolutely without foundation, and these telegrams prove this without question.

JOHN RIVETT.

Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill H. R. 9609, and it will be necessary to ask for a suspension of the rules.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following House bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9609) to grant to John Rivett privilege to make commutation of his homestead entry.

Be it enacted, etc., That John Rivett be, and he is hereby, granted the privilege, at his option, to make commutation of his homestead entry of the southwest quarter of section 28, township 22 north, range 50 west, sixth principal meridian, in the State of Nebraska, as provided by law for the making of commutation of homestead entries; and that private act No. 167, for the relief of John T. Rivett, approved February 24, 1909, be, and the same is hereby, repealed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

the largest employer of foreign labor. While these manufacturers claim protection for their industry, they insist upon free trade in the foreign laborers who are engaged in that industry, and they employ children who ought to be at school. So the profits of the manufacturers are increased, and the Republican party, engaged in paternal legislation, engaged in legislating in the interest of a certain class and of a certain industry, upon the hypocritical pretense that it has the cause of the laboring man at heart, looks with contentment upon the employment of children and upon free trade in foreign labor in this country, so that these industries are mainly absorbed by foreign employees.

Mr. President, I was just showing how much the total subsidy given to these factories amounts to. I was showing that the billion dollars' worth of cotton production in this country as contrasted with a similar amount of production in foreign countries and demanding admission to our markets would be worth, the former a billion dollars, the latter $700,000,000; and you put a duty of 45 per cent upon it in order to bring its value up to a billion dollars and to exclude it from your markets. You do it effectively, too. For of the seven hundred millions of foreign products of a similar kind seeking admission to our doors, only thirty-three millions in value are admitted. So, clearly, you collect from the consumers of cotton products in this country the difference between $700,000,000 and $1,000,000,000, the total value of the domestic product. Three hundred million dollars are collected in tribute from the American consumers and paid over to the American manufacturers, and of the $300,000,000 the paltry sum of about $14,000,000, according to these schedules, gets into the Federal Treasury.

Are you aware that the $300,000,000 more than pays for all the wages paid by all the manufacturers of cotton goods in this country? The schedule furnished us by the committee shows that the total wages paid to all the employees by all the manufacturers of cotton goods in the country aggregate $217,000,000, nearly $100,000,000 less than the subsidy which you give the manufacturers. And yet in the face of this we find the lowest wage scale; we find child labor; we find foreign laborers employed to the exclusion of our own, who, under the protective system, should be maintained upon a proper American wage scale.

This $300,000,000 is taken in by somebody. Only $14,000,000 is taken in by the National Government. Two hundred and eighty-five million dollars is taken in by the manufacturers, and their total wages amount to only $217,000,000.

These are questions which the dominant party will have to answer before the people at the next election. I may add, I have no partisan purpose here in what I have to say or what I have to do. I wish to relieve the American people from these excessive duties, because they encourage monopoly and because they maintain exaggerated prices, because they raise the cost of living throughout the entire country; and I am willing, so far as our action here is concerned, that that action shall conform to the standard established by the Republican party in its platform and declared by its candidate for the Presidency. Apply that standard to this very schedule, and it will involve an average reduction in duties of from nearly 50 to at least 25 or 30 per cent; and it devolves upon the progressives upon the other side of the Chamber, with the addition of only five votes from those who have thus far voted against them, to carry enough weight, with the Democratic side added, to absolutely secure these reductions and to redeem the pledge of the Republican platform. I ask them to study these schedules and point out the way, and, whilst I have no authority to say so, I have no doubt the Democrats will follow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, which will be stated.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Aldrich	Clay	Gore	Owen
Bacon	Crane	Guggenheim	Page
Bailey	Crawford	Hale	Penrose
Beveridge	Culberson	Heyburn	Perkins
Borah	Cullom	Hughes	Piles
Bradley	Cummins	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Brandegee	Curtis	Johnston, Ala.	Shively
Briggs	Dick	Jones	Simmons
Bristow	Dillingham	Kean	Smith, Md.
Brown	Dixon	La Follette	Smith, Mich.
Bulkeley	Dolliver	Lodge	Smoot
Burkett	du Pont	McEnery	Stephenson
Burnham	Elkins	Martin	Stone
Burrows	Fletcher	Money	Sutherland
Burton	Flint	Nelson	Tillman
Carter	Foster	Newlands	Warner
Clapp	Frazier	Nixon	
Clark, Wyo.	Frye	Oliver	
Clarke, Ark.	Gallinger	Overman	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum of the Senate is present.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, last night I respected the desire of the chairman of the Committee on Finance not to be interrupted with any questions, but there were questions I desired to ask with regard to this schedule, and I call attention now to paragraph 316, in which the committee amendment proposes that cotton cloth, valued at over 12½ and not over 14 cents per square yard, shall pay 5½ cents per square yard; valued at over 14 and not over 16 cents per square yard, 6½ cents per square yard; valued at over 16 and not over 20 cents per square yard, 8 cents per square yard; valued at over 20 cents per square yard, 10 cents per square yard, or, approximately, 50 per cent, but not less than 40 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. President, this proposition on the part of the committee, I take it, is based upon evidence in the hands and knowledge of the committee, and I desire therefore to ask the chairman of the Committee on Finance what is the relative labor cost on these goods?

Mr. ALDRICH. Paragraph 316 is not yet before the Senate. When it is, I will be very glad to answer any questions with reference to it.

Mr. OWEN. I wish to say to the Senator from Rhode Island that his refusal to answer this question is based upon the fact that he can not answer it without stultifying the committee itself. I will say to him that the labor cost on these materials does not exceed 25 per cent in this country; that the difference in the cost of production of these goods in this country and abroad is a negligible quantity—and he is in honor bound, as the chairman of the Finance Committee and as the representative of the Republican party and its platform, to write the schedules in the light of the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad. There is imposed upon him that duty.

I have demanded in vain, at the hands of the committee and of various members of it, some information with regard to this matter.

But there is not lacking information with regard to it. I have in my hand the report of the Commissioner of Labor, Carroll D. Wright, who gives the percentage of labor in goods of this kind in this country and in Great Britain and in Belgium, and the rates approximate 35 per cent. In his table, presented at the request of the Senate and by direction of Senate resolution, I find No. 178 twills; 37 inches wide; picks per inch, 80 by 60; warp yarn, No. 12, 1.73 yards per pound; total cost of labor in transforming materials, 23.75 per cent. Twills; 39 inches wide; picks per inch, 96 by 104; warp yarn, No. 34; weft yarn, No. 45; 3.80 yards per pound; cost of labor in transforming materials, 39.06 per cent.

Four-leaf twills; 39 inches wide; picks per inch, 76 by 76; warp yarn, No. 28; weft yarn, No. 40; 4.25 yards per pound; cost of labor in transforming materials, 33.51 per cent.

Four-leaf twills; 43 inches wide; picks per inch, 68 by 68; warp yarn, average number, 28.05; weft yarn, average number, 37.78; 4.30 yards per pound; cost of labor in transforming materials, 35.64 per cent.

Five harvers Albert twills; 36 inches wide; picks per inch, 76 by 68; warp yarn, No. 30; weft yarn, No. 40; 5 yards per pound; cost of labor in transforming materials, 37.10 per cent.

Twills or drills; 29 inches wide; picks per inch, 72 by 48; warp yarn, No. 12; weft yarn, No. 18; 2.85 yards per pound; cost of labor in transforming materials, 25.50 per cent.

Twills or drills; 30 inches wide; picks per inch, 68 by 48; warp yarn, No. 14; weft yarn, No. 14; 2.85 yards per pound; cost of labor in transforming materials, 28.25 per cent.

Tables 185, 186, 187, and so on through this list, prepared by the Commissioner of Labor, show these costs, and when a comparison is made with the cost of similar cloth in Great Britain, the labor cost is found, for instance in table No. 198, 35 inches wide, to be 29.97 per cent. So the difference in the labor cost of transforming these materials in this country and abroad does not provide any justification whatever for a tariff rate of 40 per cent or 50 per cent, and the chairman of the Finance Committee does well to refuse to answer this reasonable question, because he can not answer it, because he can not justify himself by the reason which underlies this rule. The only justification of these amendments in raising the rates instead of lowering the Dingley rates is that all competition shall be cut off from abroad and a complete monopoly given to those engaged in this manufacture here.

This very schedule shows in paragraph 316, to which I called attention, that cloth exceeding 3½ and not exceeding 5 square yards to the pound brought to the United States Government the munificent revenue of $237 for 90,000,000 people; practically exclusion; practically cutting off all competition, either actual

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

or potential, so as to establish here beyond the peradventure of a doubt a complete monopoly of these goods. And having pointed out to the Senate and to the people of the United States that the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad is not guiding the committee or this body in drawing these proposed amendments and that the pledges of the Republican national platform is being willfully betrayed, I content myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee, on which amendment the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, before voting on this amendment I want to have the attention of the Senate for a minute or two. I am not going to discuss the schedule, but I wish the RECORD to show why I am going to vote for the committee amendment.

I am not going to vote for this committee amendment upon some of the grounds that have been stated by Senators on this side. I do not realize the necessity for entering into this close analysis of the cost of the articles under this schedule abroad and at home. I would always make a market for the cotton products of the South in this country in preference to making a market for their products abroad. We will take care of all the products of cotton that the South have to produce at just as good prices on this side of the water; and after the admission, as I understood it, by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] and by other Senators on this side that it will not raise the cost of the manufactured products to the consumer, it makes no difference to me, and I do not care how much money the middleman makes, because he is an American and is engaged in the business of manufacturing this cotton through the various intermediate steps of turning it over for ultimate use.

That is the reason why I shall vote for this schedule, not because of any comparison between what European nations might be forced to do in order to get into our market, but because of what people will do of their own will for the sake of building up the enterprise and furnishing the commodity here, so that we will depend upon competition among Americans rather than competition between Americans and foreigners. That is the doctrine of protection I adhere to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. ALDRICH answered in the affirmative.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I insist upon it that Senators have a right to address the Chair without being cut off by precipitate action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair will suggest that no Senator was on his feet.

Mr. BACON. We are not a lot of acrobats.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not the province of the Chair to invite Senators to speak.

Mr. BACON. It is not the province of the Chair to invite Senators to speak, but it is the province of the Chair, I respectfully submit, to give ear to Senators if they desire to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is recognized and will proceed.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I want to raise a point of order, or, rather, I will make an inquiry. The Chair stated that the yeas and nays had been ordered. I would inquire when?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two or three hours ago.

Mr. BACON. This morning?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This morning.

Mr. BACON. I do not think that is a compliance with the rule. I may be in error about it, but my opinion is that the contemplation of law is that those who are present to vote at the time the roll is called are the ones to require the vote to be entered upon the record. The language of the Constitution is as follows:

> The yeas and nays of the Members of either House on any question shall, at the desire of one-fifth of those present, be entered on the Journal.

Mr. President, I am not going to insist upon that, because at the time I made the inquiry I thought it was last night that the yeas and nays had been ordered, and I was going to make the point that that was not a legitimate call for the yeas and nays on a vote to be taken to-day. But as the yeas and nays were ordered this morning, I will not now present the point.

Mr. HALE. Let me say to the Senator that when the yeas and nays were ordered, it was expected that a vote would be taken at once.

Mr. BACON. Exactly. And believing that those present now are practically those who were present at that time, I do not wish to raise the point; but I would raise it if there had been a recess, or if the call had been ordered last night. I know that there was yesterday, if not an order for the yeas and nays, at least a partial order. I trust the Chair will understand the reason why I was somewhat earnest about the matter.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, I wish to suggest to the chairman of the committee, in view of what has occurred, the advisability of his not insisting that the roll call under these circumstances shall proceed. I appeal to Senators on the grounds of propriety. The Senator from Iowa, who has addressed the Senate twice, notified the Senate twice that he intended to offer an amendment to the committee's amendment. He remained here for that purpose, but he has just gone down to get something to eat. Now, all at once, at a time when I am sure several Senators now absent who have been here did not expect it, and before any Senator had arisen to his feet, the Chair very properly ordered the roll to be called. The clerk quickly began to call it, and the Senator from Rhode Island answered to his name. Under the rules the roll call must go on and not be interrupted, but under such a situation, brought about no doubt by the observance of parliamentary usage and the praiseworthy vigilance which the Senator from Rhode Island always exercises, the Senator from Iowa, who could not have anticipated that this situation would arise, went to get something to eat without offering his amendment; and any Senator who might want further to discuss the bill or to ask the Senator from Rhode Island, the chairman of the committee, any questions, as no Senator had arisen to his feet and gotten the recognition of the Chair before the Senator from Rhode Island answered to his name, is absolutely estopped. It is a form, in effect, of cloture under such circumstances which works to the denial of substantial rights of Senators who had served notice that they intended to be here to offer amendments.

Now, this can not be stopped by anything else except an appeal to the Senators in charge of the bill upon setting forth the situation and an appeal to the proprieties. I am sure it is not the intention of the Senator from Rhode Island, by the calling of the roll, to shut off anybody, and especially a Senator who had been speaking for a long time, and who then left the Chamber to get something to eat. I am sure he does not intend to proceed in this manner, the Senator not having answered any question, which he invited us last night to ask and said he would answer this morning. I suggest, under the circumstances of the case, while the right does not exist from a parliamentary point of view, the propriety and advisability of not insisting that the roll call shall proceed on this amendment.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa gave notice of his purpose to offer an amendment to paragraph 312, which has been agreed to by the Senate. The pending amendment is an amendment of the committee to insert certain words in paragraph 313. It does not involve the question of ad valorems at all. If this question is disposed of, that question comes up immediately upon the next amendment of the committee, which is involved in this same paragraph. It is simply a matter of waiting for a few minutes before all this can transpire. There are no rights of anybody involved in it at all. The amendment of the Senator from Iowa is to paragraph 312. It is not involved in the question now before the Senate.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. ALDRICH. Certainly.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. While that might be true, I would suggest that some Senators who are earnest about the matter may feel that their rights are involved; and would it not be a better course to withdraw the roll call and let Senators do what they think is proper about it? Would not that be the fairer and the more generous course?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair suggests to Senators that the discussion is proceeding by unanimous consent.

Mr. ALDRICH. As this vote is only one of a number of votes which must be taken upon this subject, and does not involve at all the question of ad valorems which is involved in the next amendment of the committee, I can see no reason for not proceeding now with the roll call.

Mr. DOLLIVER entered the Chamber.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator from Iowa then will be in a position where he can offer his amendment to the amendment of the committee and raise the whole question which he proposes to raise by his amendment. I do not think that I am taking any advantage of anybody by asking that the roll call shall proceed.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I offered an amendment or indicated that I would propose an amendment to paragraph 312. It is logical that we should dispose of paragraph 312 first. Then we could proceed to paragraph 313, voting for or against the committee's amendment, with the matters that are involved by the amendment I have to paragraph 312 out of the way. As it would re-

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

lieve I voice the feeling of a large majority, if not of all, Senators on this side—that in casting that vote we are not actuated by any desire to maintain the Dingley schedules. Speaking for myself, there are few schedules in the bill that I would not be glad to reduce, and for a reduction of which I would not vote; but whenever it is impossible to make a reduction as low as I would desire to make it, reducing the duty to a revenue basis, and I am compelled to choose, as we have been frequently compelled to choose during the consideration of this bill, between high protection and moderate protection, I take moderate protection as the least of the two evils.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, I do not desire to say anything bitter or to hurt anybody's feelings, but I am very, very tired of the sham battle, or what appears to me to be one, on the other side. Last night the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] proved to his entire satisfaction, and, apparently, to the satisfaction of the Macedonian phalanx which he has organized and holds together, that there is no increase of duty in the Senate amendments. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] yesterday and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] to-day have proved, almost from the same sources of evidence—the same witnesses, and so forth, Mr. Parkhill being a star witness on both sides—that there is a material increase; and when the debate is about to close, those of us on this side who want to get what we can out of this so-called "tariff revision" in the way of relief from the burdens imposed by the Dingley schedules are told by the Senator from Iowa that he is not endeavoring, and has never had any view or purpose to do more than to keep the Dingley Act just like it is; to prevent any increase and to make certain of one thing—that if there were any forgotten provisions or paragraphs in the Dingley Act which permit of the frauds of which the Senator from Rhode Island told us last night, he will put out a dragnet of 25 per cent ad valorem to catch them all.

So far as I am concerned, I earnestly want the Senator from Rhode Island to get together his big band, his Macedonian phalanx, as I have said, soldered together by lead, stuck together by beet sugar, riveted together by steel, and hooped together by iron, and by all the other villainies that are in this bill—the combination of greed in the West and in the East and in the Middle West, holding this man and that man and the other man in line to vote as he is ordered—because we have all seen practically that the Senator from Rhode Island is the Senate on this question. [Laughter.] I want him to quit. Why does he not press things to a vote, ring down the curtain on the farce and get through, and let us go home? That is what I want to know.

We have had enough exposure of the how not to do it programme of reform. It amounts to nothing so far as the Democrats are concerned, unless it be to some of us on this side who are trying to pick up a crumb here and there for some little local interest.

The Senator from Rhode Island last night was very persuasive and eloquent in his plea to the South to take care of its own cotton, for it would undoubtedly be a great industry there. It is already a great industry there, and it will be a greater. Speaking for myself, for my own State, for instance, where the industry of manufacturing cotton is advancing by leaps and bounds, we have, say, 80,000 or maybe a few more people—men, women, and children—who are engaged in the cotton-mill industry. We have 600,000 white people and 800,000 negroes who can not get any benefit from that except by the general building up of an industry in our midst which draws from the fields some of the population that otherwise would be compelled to continue to grow cotton as a raw product.

I have as much concern in the welfare and in protecting the interests and rights of the 600,000 as I have in the 80,000 who may be spinning cotton, but no more. The Senator from Rhode Island does not care a snap for them; for, when we plead with him to give us free bagging and ties, in order to relieve us in ever so small a degree from a burden imposed by this trust or that—the steel trust on ties, the bagging trust on bagging, and so forth—he refuses. Yet he appeals to the South to help him to take care of our own country simply because New England is more deeply interested.

I believe in equal rights for all and special privileges for none. That is one of the fundamental principles of Democracy, which I sucked with my mother's milk, and I will be unfit to be called a Democrat when I depart from that doctrine.

I believe in equality of opportunity and equality of burden, and we are not getting it and there is no pretense here of trying to give it to us. We are allowed the poor privilege of voting not to have duties go up, but not the privilege of having them go down, unless we bring in an amendment of our own, with our 27, or 28, or 29, or 30, according to how many of our men you have seduced over to your doctrine to be overwhelmed by a solid Republican vote.

Therefore I say this sham battle ought to cease. The discussion has gone far enough to demonstrate that there are plenty of iniquities in this bill, plenty of iniquities in the doctrine of protection as you illustrate it. If the people of America are satisfied with it, they will continue to vote you into the House and into the Senate. If they are not satisfied with it, they will vote some of you out and send others here to take care of their interests.

You have been charged to-day by one of your leaders—a leading man; he may not be a leader in the party, but he is a leader in his own State—with being hypocrites. You are not all hypocrites. But you are the boldest band of buccaneers that I have ever seen got together. [Laughter.]

Now, if I have said anything this evening that in the slightest wounds anybody, I want to say in advance I did not intend it, but after six days of this kind of humbug, sham, pretense of an effort to relieve the consumers, I have blowed off steam, and now I want to add to the literature of this debate by having printed from a Boston paper a comment on this cotton schedule, and on a speech of their own Senator [Mr. LODGE.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina ask that it be printed without being read?

Mr. TILLMAN. Oh, no; I want it read. It is too sweet and nice to go in without reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Secretary will read, as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

DEFENDING DECEPTION—SENATOR LODGE ABANDONS ALL PRETENSE OF MAKING A FAIR REVISION OF THE TARIFF.

[From the Boston Traveler, Wednesday, June 2, 1909.]

Senator LODGE made what is described as the best speech of the session yesterday on the cotton schedules. He began by saying, in effect, that while the Nation may have been fooled into the belief that the Republican party contemplated an honest revision of the tariff, in the only way it would do the consumer any good—downward—neither he nor any of the other leaders of the Chicago convention had made that direct promise, which convicts Mr. LODGE of a carefully planned attempt to deceive.

He made an impassioned plea for the mill operatives of New England, who "must not be deprived of their right to work and wages," and for the manufacturers who must be protected against "cheap labor abroad." The mill operatives, for whom the Nahant Senator's eloquence was unloosed, are practically all Greeks, Syrians, Poles, Armenians, and Italians, who have driven out every other kind of labor, because, under present wages in the cotton mills, to bring up a family under American conditions is absolutely impossible.

Senator LODGE denied that the cotton mills paid unduly large dividends, and attempted to explain away some specific cases where the dividend for one year was over 60 per cent. Apropos of this, there came to our table yesterday a pamphlet from a reputable Boston brokerage house which flatly contradicts Mr. LODGE, and shows that practically all the cotton mills have been paying high dividends, many of them in a few years returning to shareholders an amount equal to the entire capital invested.

Mr. LODGE'S defense of the cotton manufacturers, whose mills are filled with aliens on starvation wages, is paralleled in history only by the arguments made in Parliament at the time England was attempting to abolish the slave trade, that if the bringing of black people from Africa to America and elsewhere was prohibited shipowners would not find any use for their vessels, and that these slave ships furnished the only market for decayed fish and other putrid food, on which there would be a dead loss if the slave trade was outlawed.

To prove that revision was "downward" in some cases, Senator LODGE proudly called attention to the fact that on Monday the Senate made an important reduction on the duties on salt, which is fitting and proper. Salt is used to make things more palatable and not infrequently to disguise the taste of rotting food.

More than any utterance of this session, Senator LODGE'S speech puts President Taft in an awkward position, because the candidate evidently was not trusted sufficiently by the party leaders to be informed of the deception attempted by the Chicago convention, and openly, on several occasions before that convention and subsequently during the campaign, declared himself in favor of a revision "downward." Inasmuch as Mr. Taft has the final say on what the tariff shall be, the people will know eventually whether he really meant what he said, or, like LODGE and the rest, was only playing politics to get votes.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, I reassure the Senate at once by disclaiming any purpose to detain it for any length of time.

I feel under lasting obligations to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] for the manner in which he brought this discussion to a close this afternoon. I have been perplexed and mystified by the intricacies of the cotton schedule. I have not pretended at any time to be a master of its mysteries, nor do I now pretend so to understand it as to be able to instruct anyone. I did believe, from the length of the discussion and the vehemence with which it was prosecuted, that a great overwhelming issue was somewhere involved in the mysteries concerning which this discussion proceeded.

From the Senator from Iowa I gathered, and I hope I correctly understood him, this definite conclusion: That all of this week's discussion has been centered about a line of importations not exceeding $350,000 per year.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Mr. DOLLIVER. If the Senator will permit me, if he gathered any such impression from this discussion, it was owing to his occasional absence from the Chamber.

Mr. CARTER. The Senator stated and repeated the statement that the Senator from Rhode Island was manifestly in error in assuming, as his submission of an article from a newspaper indicated he did assume, that $500,000 of claims would be asserted against the Government in consequence of a recent refusal of the Supreme Court to grant a writ of review for a certain case. The Senator, I understood, argued that the total amount involved did not exceed $55,000, and quoted Treasury statistics in support of his statement.

But, Mr. President, the Senator made the further statement that certain articles or fabrics partially made of linen and partially of cotton were by the Dingley Act placed in the schedule relating to flax and linen—that is correct—and at 69 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I do not desire to interrupt the Senator, but he must remember that the Senator from Rhode Island and I agree perfectly that the principle involved in this first paragraph, which does include only a small portion of the imported cotton cloths brought into the country, is exactly the same as the principle involved in all the succeeding paragraphs containing the assessments upon countable cotton. Therefore I see no reason why the Senator should undertake to minimize the importance of this discussion, in view of the fact that it covers the whole field involved in the amendments.

Mr. CARTER. It is true, no doubt, as the Senator from Iowa stated, that the paragraph upon which this 60 per cent rate was based was embraced in what is known as the "flax schedule." As the art progressed the fabrics originally constructed chiefly of linen were in due time made more and more of cotton. The Treasury officials, intending, as they understood their duty to be, to apply the duty to the article or fabric, applied the 60 per cent duty, which was made applicable to this particular fabric, whether made of linen or of cotton. In that ineffectual effort the Treasury ceased to collect certain revenue which was being collected under that construction or the application of that section; and the articles were thenceforth admitted at the lower rate of duty—for a time at 45, and finally down to 25 per cent ad valorem.

It has not been charged or asserted or claimed in any manner here that the admission of this class of goods at the lower rate of duty has cheapened a single one of these goods in the markets of the United States. I do not understand that there is any pretense that the consuming public of this country were given the benefit of the reduction of duty. Mr. President, it can not therefore be reasonably pretended or claimed that if we raise this duty to what was originally intended any increase of price will follow that rate; and then the whole matter resolves itself into this, to wit, that, according to the Senator from Iowa, the Treasury of the United States will benefit at the rate of $55,000 a year at least, if we raise the duty to where it was and where the committee thinks it ought to be. According to the Senator from Rhode Island, the increase in Government revenues will be very much larger than $55,000 a year.

Mr. DOLLIVER. If I understand the situation correctly, the committee do not even make the pretense that they are going to restore the 60 per cent in the cases where the courts or the appraisers have denied the application of that rate. They have omitted those articles altogether.

Mr. CARTER. No law can be here passed that will change the application of existing law up to the date this bill is passed. The law now on the statute books will be the law, despite any effort of Congress, until this law of Congress is made a substitute for it. So, of course, no action of Congress can impair the existing rights of parties as fixed by the law, now construed by the courts to be according to the 25 per cent rate.

These rights are fixed and can not be disturbed. That, of course, is elementary. But, from the day the bill passes, the higher rates will be collected; the price of the article to the consumer will remain the same; and the extra money will go into the Treasury of the United States instead of into the pockets of the importer. That seems to be the end and the whole substance of this controversy.

Mr. OWEN. I should like to ask the Senator from Montana whether he thinks this schedule should be written in the light of the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad? It is a novel question which I should like him, as a great expert, to answer.

Mr. CARTER. The Senator manifestly failed to hear my disclaimer of any expert knowledge.

Mr. OWEN. I now concede it.

Mr. CARTER. I believe the Senator is prepared to concede it, and was before he asked the question. I do not know that at this hour, just upon the eve of a vote, it would be either instructive or agreeable to the Senator from Oklahoma or to the Senator from Montana, or to the Senate at large, to go into a general discussion of platform pledges and the manner of their execution.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the Senator from Montana [Mr. CARTER] complains of the conflicting figures submitted by various Senators with reference to the amount of duty involved in the cotton schedule. That Senator submitted, a few days ago, a golden rule by which we could extract the truth from conflicting and contradictory statements of this kind.

It is true that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] stated last night that the duties involved amounted to $500,000, and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] stated to-day that it involved only about $55,000. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] suggested this morning that it involved $400,000 of duties. The Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] made a statement which I did not fully understand; but, so far as I could gather, his contention was that it embraced about $900,000 of duties.

There ought to be no difficulty in resolving these conflicting official statements into the absolute and infallible truth by merely applying the golden rule furnished to us a few days ago by the senior Senator from Montana. He suggested to us a formula as to how we could cast these conflicting statements into the crucible and take out the pure truth. I suggest to that Senator, that if he will take the statement made by the Senator from Rhode Island last night, the statement made by the Senator from Iowa this morning, the statement made by the Senator from Idaho this afternoon, all of which were official and from the same undoubted authority, and join to these the inspired guess of the Senator from Utah, add the four together and then divide the sum by four, he will have the exact and the infallible truth.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, if I believed that the amendment upon which we are about to vote involved only a remedy for the obvious defects in the Dingley law, I would not find it necessary to say a single word or to prolong by a single moment this discussion. The Senator from Montana, evidently misapprehending the amendment upon which we are about to vote, suggests that it is hardly worth while to take up our time over so small a matter as $55,000 a year. I do not so understand this amendment, and I intend in the very few moments that I will ask your indulgence to treat it in the same admirable spirit that was manifested last night by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH].

I listened to his address with as much intentness as I ever bestowed upon any address, and I believe that I understood what he said. In so far as I am concerned personally, I believe the Dingley law, whether as originally interpreted or as recently interpreted, ought to be reduced.

I believe that upon the chief articles—not upon some of these fancy articles which have consumed so much time here, but in the main—the duties are too high, and I should like to see them reduced; and if we could find on this side of the Chamber those five patriots suggested by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS], I would like very much to find them. But we have looked in vain for them, and we shall be content—at least, I shall be content—if we can hold the Dingley law as it is. It does not satisfy me, but we are in such grave peril of losing it that I am solicitous about holding on to what we have rather than attempting to secure that which we know is impossible.

Now, I address myself largely to the Senator from Rhode Island or any other member of the committee, and I desire to say to the Senate and to the members of the committee that I want to be interrupted, and I will yield for a question or an answer at any time any Senator thinks he can enlighten me or the Senate with respect to these questions. If I understood the discussion last night, the Senator from Rhode Island announced four propositions. I do not attempt, of course, to put them in his exact words, but I paraphrase them.

He first announced that it was necessary to change the Dingley paragraph 304, in order that there might be embraced within it an adequate duty upon higher-priced cloths with a count of threads of 50 or under per square inch. The Senator assents to the proposition, and I assent to the necessity for a change in paragraph 304. It has been only a question as to what duty should be placed upon those high-priced cloths that were obviously omitted from the protection of the statute in old paragraph 304, the present paragraph 312. I pass, therefore, from that, because there is no controversy there. We must not confuse this issue.

His second proposition was that it was necessary to count the threads of a superimposed figure, and thus put certain cloth into the proper paragraph, in order that it might be suitably assessed.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

duce that inclusive duty contained in the last proviso of the paragraph:

That none of the articles or fabrics provided for in this paragraph shall pay a less rate of duty than 47½ per cent ad valorem.

That seems to have been calculated to a very great nicety in 1897, but I can not find any reason for maintaining a higher ad valorem duty on those goods in the present state of the manufacture, which is now very highly advanced, than is provided for the highest classes of manufactured cotton cloths.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is much more expensive to make these plushes, velvets, velveteens, and so forth, than the ordinary cotton cloths. They have always had a higher rate in all the tariff bills, and the rate is only 2½ per cent higher than that on the ordinary common cloth. I think the rates can not be reduced without affecting seriously the manufacture in this country.

Mr. DOLLIVER. But the highest rate provided for the highest style of cotton cloth, cloths exceeding 300 threads to the square inch, is limited by a minimum of 40 per cent ad valorem, while twelve years ago the manufacture of many of these cloths, plushes, and so forth, was a comparatively new industry. The price of these cloths has not been in excess of the price of highly wrought cotton cloths. For instance, corduroy is a very common article of clothing, and, I think, not so expensive as the high grades of cotton cloths. The manufacture is very well advanced in this country, and I would be very much pleased if the twelve years of progress in the art of weaving this cloth under ample protection could be followed by a slight reduction of the Dingley schedules, although I do not propose to offer an amendment to that effect.

Mr. ALDRICH. I will say to the Senator from Iowa if I did not feel that the rates suggested are necessary for protection I would not resist his suggestion. I am perfectly sure, because I am quite as familiar with this industry as any article of the cotton schedule, that these rates are not high. They are articles of luxury. Some of these velvets are high priced and I should be very sorry to see any reduction of the rates.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the Committee on Finance.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, before the paragraph is disposed of, it seems to me that this is an opportune time in which to request the chairman of the Committee on Finance to explain "the difference in the cost of the production of these articles in this country and abroad." I have waited in vain for an explanation on paragraph 316, which was kindly promised by the chairman of the Committee on Finance. I hope it will not be regarded as intrusive if I should suggest that the platform of the Republican party pledged the leaders in the Senate to write this paragraph among others in the light of "the difference in the cost of production in this country and abroad."

Cotton goods as a general rule do not exceed in labor cost, counting the labor as compared with the gross value, approximately 30 per cent for the entire amount of labor. Indeed, the textile schedule, as shown by our census, does not exceed 19.5 per cent of the value of the product for the labor cost. But here the difference between the cost of production in this country and abroad is put at 47½ per cent. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Rhode Island what is the difference by percentage in the cost of the production of these articles in the United States and abroad.

Mr. ALDRICH. Does the Senator wish an answer to his question?

Mr. OWEN. I have addressed an inquiry to the most learned expert on the question of the difference in the cost of production in this country and abroad that can be found on the floor of the Senate, and wish a plain answer.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, I appreciate fully the recurring and I was almost going to say spasmodic thirst for knowledge of the Senator from Oklahoma. It is shared more or less by other Senators sitting upon the other side of the Chamber. I have no doubt that if we had a combination in this respect in which this thirst could be pooled it would be extremely valuable and it would answer in the new State of Oklahoma.

But the Senator from Oklahoma could not have listened to my speech the other night, to be serious about this matter, because I explained the difference between the cost of production here and in competing countries abroad upon these articles in the cotton schedule. That speech I have not had a chance to read yet, but it will be published in to-morrow morning's RECORD, and I will suggest that the Senator should devote his spare time to a perusal of it.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I shall defer this matter with great pleasure until to-morrow morning, but I wish to advise the Senator if his printed remarks are no more satisfactory than his explanation of paragraph 316, which took place after the passage of that paragraph, and in such an indiscernible and invisible manner that it never reached my ears nor appeared in the RECORD, that I shall again make the inquiry of the Senator from Rhode Island as to the difference in the cost of production.

If it would not greatly inconvenience the Senator at this time, I should like to know the percentage of labor cost in these articles in the United States.

Mr. ALDRICH. I stated in a general way that the cost of labor in the United States was about twice what it is in competing countries, that is, about 50 per cent difference. The difference in this paragraph is 47½ per cent.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, in determining any mathematical equation where x is the unknown quantity, to double the value of x is not very elucidating.

Mr. LODGE rose.

Mr. OWEN. I should like to have the Senator from Massachusetts inform me with regard to the difference of the labor cost of these articles.

Mr. LODGE. The statement read by the Senator from Rhode Island the other night gave the figures of the British Board of Trade collected in the various countries of Europe and in the United States. I suppose the Senator from Rhode Island thought that the British Board of Trade would be considered a disinterested witness. Those figures represent the difference of cost very accurately. I can not repeat them from memory, but I can get the report of the board of trade and submit it here.

I know what an investigation showed made by Carroll D. Wright, who was a statistician, I think, whose reputation is unquestioned. It was made when he was chief of the bureau of labor statistics in my State. The inquiry extended over a number of years, and the result was that in 90 industries of Massachusetts and England the wages per hour were 77 per cent higher in Massachusetts than in Great Britain. He gave all the details involved, making up five volumes.

Mr. OWEN. After the side remarks of the Senator from Massachusetts I would now like an answer to my question. I have access to those statistics.

Mr. LODGE. I have given the Senator an answer. I can not make him understand it, of course.

Mr. OWEN. The Senator from Oklahoma is entirely capable of comprehending anything that will emanate in the English language from the Senator from Massachusetts. But when the Senator from Massachusetts talks about the difference in the amounts paid to the labor of Great Britain as shown by the reports referred to which are in my possession, and from which I have made a compilation, he does not answer the question as to the percentage of labor cost in the materials mentioned in this paragraph.

Mr. LODGE. I beg the Senator's pardon; I did not understand that that was his question. I thought he was asking what the difference in labor cost is.

Mr. OWEN. The question was that which I have last stated.

Mr. LODGE. Now I understand that what the Senator wants is the amount of labor cost of the material.

Mr. OWEN. The percentage of labor cost.

Mr. LODGE. The percentage of the labor cost, as distinguished from the material used, I can not, in this particular paragraph, give without an opportunity of inquiry. I can get it by inquiry. I can not answer it offhand.

Mr. OWEN. Then I move that this paragraph be passed over until that information be furnished.

Mr. GALLINGER. I object, Mr. President.

Mr. OWEN. I have sought in vain to obtain from any member of the Finance Committee the percentage of labor cost in any of these items. Not in a single instance has an answer been made, and I venture to say that no answer will be made while this debate is pending.

Mr. ALDRICH. I said the other night that in a fabric costing $1 a pound—and the same rule applies to all these articles—not over 20 per cent was the cost of the material and 80 per cent was the cost of labor. Of course I would be glad to accommodate the Senator from Oklahoma, but if we wait until every Senator is satisfied about something which he may have in his mind with reference to these matters it will take a long time, especially if we get to a point where he is sure that he understands it.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senator from Rhode Island to the report of Mr. Carroll D. Wright, published in Senate Document No. 20, Fifty-fifth Congress, third session, a gentleman whose ability in the matter of making such inquiries has been complimented by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

190. Cloth manufactured in the United States. Cotton cloth, 38¼ inches wide; picks, per inch, 64 by 64; warp yarn, No. 30; weft yarn, No. 36, 5.15 yards per pound. The cost of labor in transforming these materials is not 80 per cent, but 33 per cent, and the cost of the material not 20 per cent, but 66 per cent.

In case No. 181, four-leaf twills, 43 inches wide; picks, per inch, 68 by 68; warp yarn, average number 2805; weft yarn, average number 3778; 4.30 yards per pound. The labor cost is 35 per cent, and 64 per cent of the whole value is the cost of the material. So it goes with numerous other particular cases enumerated by him. I think, therefore, it is very much in point to know what is the percentage of labor cost in these articles, and also what is the percentage of labor cost of these or similar articles in Great Britain.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, I do not know whether the Senator is interested on account of the Chicago platform in these propositions or for some other reason. I will give the Senator from Oklahoma one answer which applies to practically every schedule and every paragraph in the bill. The total cost of production in the United States is a labor cost; practically entirely so.

Mr. OWEN. Upon what evidence is that based?

Mr. ALDRICH. Common sense.

Mr. OWEN. That is not sufficiently accurate as an answer to my question, statistically.

Mr. ALDRICH. That may not be good authority to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. OWEN. It depends by whom the announcement is made.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator, and every Senator, must know that the cost of production of every article produced in the United States is in its last analysis a cost of the labor that goes into it. The only exception to that must be, of course, ore in the earth undisturbed and lumber in the primeval forest undisturbed. Every other element of cost is a cost of labor in one form or another. So if a piece of cotton cloth costs a dollar, it practically represents a dollar labor cost.

Now, as a general thing, wages in Great Britain are about one-half what they are in the United States, and the cost of production of an article in Great Britain is about half what it costs in the United States. I mean the total cost from one end to the other and the long line of development and manufacture.

Mr. BACON. If the Senator will pardon me——

Mr. ALDRICH. The cost in Germany is 40 per cent. I will not stop to question small refinements of difference, but in the main it is about 40 per cent what it is in the United States.

Mr. BACON. I ask the Senator a question for information, with his permission. When the Senator says all the labor cost, does the Senator mean that the capital is but the result of labor, the previous labor accumulating?

Mr. ALDRICH. Undoubtedly.

Mr. BACON. He does not, then, separate the labor immediately employed from capital?

Mr. ALDRICH. Not at all. I do not think it is fair to make a comparison of that kind. It is never fair to make comparisons of the cost at a single stage of this long process of manufacture.

Mr. BACON. I am speaking about the capital employed.

Mr. ALDRICH. You can not say, for instance, that if it costs 10 per cent to transfer yarn into the next step that the total cost is 10 per cent. That is absolutely plain, I think, to everybody.

I repeat for the benefit of the Senator from Oklahoma that the labor cost of all articles produced in the United States will be at least 90 per cent of the total, and he can figure the difference himself, whatever it may be.

Mr. OWEN. I have figured it from our own census, and I find that the statement of the Senator from Rhode Island, in its application to the point at issue, is not true, and it is not approximately true. I will state what I find with regard to the textiles, for instance. I do not wish to say anything which is discourteous; I do not mean what I say in that way, because I am not now dealing with the Senator from Rhode Island personally, but I am dealing with a public question upon which it is my duty to speak, and to speak as plainly as I understand it.

I have examined the census reports. I have taken the gross amount of the products of American manufacturers by the census of 1900, and I have taken the gross amount of wages paid. The gross amounts of those products when estimated by the wages, show that the total amount paid to labor out of some $13,000,149,159 in value in products (Ab. Census 1900, Table 156) of manufactures is $2,320,938,168, and the general average of actual labor cost is 17.8 per cent of the gross value of the product, and no more. So the percentages do not comport with the view of the Senator from Rhode Island that 90 per cent of the product is the wages of labor. While it is true that a large part of the gross value of the products, to wit, $7,343,627,875, are materials and enter into the calculation, and while it is relatively true that those materials are also originally sprung from the hand of labor, and a large part of them may be classsed in this confused way as the result of labor, still as far as these manufacturers are concerned that material, which is raw material for the factory, must be considered as material alone, and the labor cost of putting those materials so manufactured into their merchantable form does not exceed 17.8 per cent, and in the group of textile industries only 19.5 per cent, the gross product being $1,637,484,484 and the total wages $341,734,399. I call attention to this fact, because I think it is very important.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator from Oklahoma is new, reasonably new, anyhow——

Mr. OWEN. Very new, Mr. President.

Mr. ALDRICH. In these tariff discussions. It is a matter that has been gone over a thousand times, I take it. I suggest to the Senator that if he takes this proposition over night and will study it, he will find that the cost of production in the United States of any article that he may choose is 90 per cent of it at least labor, and he will find if he reads the statistics and digests them carefully that the cost of that labor in the United States is vastly in excess of what it is in any other country.

Now, he can figure for himself, he being a bright mathematician, what the various problems are with reference to any particular item, and there can be no other answer given to the Senator from Oklahoma. He may have a judgment about it which is entirely different from mine, but that is a matter of theory, and I presume, if I should take the next six weeks in discussing it with him, he probably would not agree to my judgment in regard to it.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. OWEN. I will in just one moment. If the Senator from Rhode Island would show me the authority upon which the difference in the cost of production is based in these paragraphs, and if the rates proposed really represented the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad, I should agree with him and vote for the schedule. But I can demonstrate the contrary and have done so in the Carroll D. Wright report in 446 instances, as well as by the census table 156 (Ab. Cen., 1900).

Mr. BACON. Will the Senator permit me to ask the Senator from Rhode Island a question?

Mr. OWEN. I will yield for a moment to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. Just a moment. I will ask the Senator from Oklahoma if he thinks the rates named in the bill are too high?

Mr. OWEN. I do.

Mr. GALLINGER. If they are lowered, it will increase the importations, will it not?

Mr. OWEN. I should think so, Mr. President.

Mr. GALLINGER. Now, Mr. President, we imported between three and four million yards of the articles in this paragraph last year at a cost of between one and two million dollars. Does the Senator from Oklahoma want to import some millions more of those goods and deny the privilege to the American manufacturer and the American workingman to produce them in this country?

Mr. OWEN. No; Mr. President, I do not feel willing to deny the American manufacturer any just provision which would put him upon a perfect equality with other manufacturers of the world.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; but if the Senator will permit me, we imported between three and four million yards. If we reduce the rates we will, perhaps, import as much more, possibly even a larger amount than that; and that, of course, will displace to that extent employment to American workingmen and the opportunity of American manufacturers to do business in this country. Now, if the Senator wants to accomplish that result, of course these duties ought to be reduced.

Mr. OWEN. In response to the Senator from New Hampshire, I will say that the importations of the goods to which he has referred is due to the fact that they fill a matter of want and a matter of taste of the American consumer, and therefore are brought into this country. I believe that the goods which are produced in America will find an equal foreign field, due to the same question of taste or same question of foreign desire to have that which is made in our country. I do not believe that the Americans are peculiar in that respect, but that they, like all other purchasers, follow the line of their taste in such matters. I do not believe that if we were to absolutely close

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

our ports to all foreign importations we would thereby benefit our own manufacturers. I believe we would do them a harm, because just as soon as they had supplied this market they would then close their factories; they would no longer need to employ labor; they would no longer have occasion for any other market than that which would be afforded here.

I do not think that is a wise policy. The United States exports and imports are less per capita than any other civilized nation in the world, and it is because of the narrow policy which excludes foreign imports and compels foreign people to avoid purchases from our country.

The only question in this matter which I am constrained to insist upon is that the pledge which was made to the American people shall be faithfully complied with, and that is why I have called attention time and time again to the percentage of labor cost in these articles, in order to elicit the fact that "the difference in cost of production at home and abroad" is not the basis upon which these schedules are being written. It can not be emphasized too strongly before the Senate and before the people of the United States as to the pledge made to them in the past, even if it is explained on the floor here, that it was not intended to write this tariff down; the people of the United States ought to understand that the pledge made to them is not being carried out; and when I call for "the difference in the cost of production" the Senator from New Hampshire rises in his place and says that the inquiry is absurd.

Mr. GALLINGER. Oh, no; I did not say that.

Mr. OWEN. I so understood the Senator.

Mr. GALLINGER. I beg the Senator's pardon, I did not make any criticism of that at all. I simply interrogated the Senator as to whether if the rates were reduced the importations would not be increased. I find no fault with the Senator's effort to get the information that he is seeking, but I am at a loss to understand why the Senator can not get that on his own account quite as well as to demand that any other Senator shall get it for him.

Mr. OWEN. I am abundantly supplied, and I shall furnish the Senator with that information in my early convenience. What I am pointing out is not my lack of information. I am pointing out that when I call on you gentlemen who are representing the party in power to give the percentage of labor cost in these articles you make no answer, but on the contrary you indulge in general discussion and talk about the labor cost of Europe and the labor cost here, and do not come down to the real issue. That is what I am calling attention to.

I will furnish the Senate with the percentage of labor cost. I have already pointed out to the Senator from Rhode Island that the total labor cost, as shown by our own census, is 19.5 per cent of the value of the gross product in the textile industries of the United States and 17.8 per cent of the gross value of all products of all the industries. That is a fact of vital importance recorded in our census reports, and it is not to be set aside by informing me in a high-handed way that common sense will tell me that 80 per cent of any product is labor. The census is to the contrary, and the inquiry is not to be dealt with in that manner. I have a right to ask these questions, and I have a right to a frank answer showing what the percentage of labor cost is in these articles, and showing what the percentage of labor cost is abroad; and then we can calculate the difference in the percentage of labor cost in this country and abroad and thereby determine the tariff rate. Without that data you can not do it. I have a right to demand the tariff be so written as the Republican party is pledged. I do demand the requisite data, even if I receive no answer.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the paragraph as amended.

The paragraph as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The next paragraph passed over will be reported.

The SECRETARY. Paragraph 324. "Curtains, table covers, and all articles manufactured of cotton chenille," etc.

Mr. ALDRICH. For the committee I offer an amendment which I send to the desk. The effect of this amendment is to quite largely reduce the rates of the paragraph, and make it more consistent, and make it apply surely to the articles which it was intended the paragraph as originally drawn should apply to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 15, page 112, paragraph 324, after the words "chief value," strike out the remainder of the paragraph and insert:

Tapestries, and other Jacquard figured upholstery goods, weighing over 6 ounces per square yard, composed wholly or in chief value of cotton or other vegetable fiber; any of the foregoing, in the piece or otherwise, 50 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I should be very glad to have an opportunity to look at the amendment for a moment.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. We might pass on to the next paragraph, I suggest.

Mr. ALDRICH. We might take up the next provision I think.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Is it the Senator's purpose to have the amendment printed and go over until to-morrow?

Mr. ALDRICH. I do not object to having it go over if it is the desire of Senators.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I should be very greatly obliged if that course is pursued.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask that that be done.

Mr. ALDRICH. We can take it up this evening possibly. It was offered by me several days ago.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I had not seen it.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator will find it already printed. I will have it taken up this evening at the evening session.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] a few moments ago took occasion to make an inferential criticism against those of us on this side who could not see our way clear to place lumber on the free list, and delivered his opinion to the effect that a Democrat is bound by the declaration of the Democratic party in national convention. To that statement, so far as it relates to a principle, I thoroughly and cordially subscribe, but I have said on another occasion that I do not believe that a convention of delegates selected wholly without reference to these matters of legislative detail have any power to bind the judgment and the conscience of legislators with respect to them. The convention goes to the full extent of its authority when it names a candidate and adopts a platform declaring the principles of the party. That rule has been generally accepted by men of all parties, but this acceptance has found a very distinguished exception in the person of the gentleman who now criticises the Democrats and whose criticism the Senator from Missouri has echoed.

In 1892 the Democratic national convention expressly and emphatically declared without reserve or qualification in favor of a law to repeal the tax of 10 per cent on the issues of state banks, or rather, the tax of 10 per cent on institutions which paid out the notes of state banks, which was in effect exactly the same thing. At that time there sat in the House of Representatives the Hon. William J. Bryan, representing a Nebraska district, and, when the Democratic party in the House of Representatives attempted to fulfill that pledge of the national convention, he refused to be bound by it, and voted against that specific, direct, and positive pledge which the Democratic party had made to the people of the United States and on which it had won a great triumph. I have no criticism to make of him further than to repeat against him and his friends the criticisms against us in which they now indulge. You will find upon an examination of the RECORD that Mr. Bryan not only refused to be bound by that declaration, but asserted the doctrine that a congressional district had the power to bind its representative against the authority of the party in national convention assembled; and though Mr. Bryan voted and spoke against the redemption of that pledge, he has been three times nominated by the Democratic party since then for the Presidency of the United States.

More than that, Mr. President, the question of whether or not that law, which imposed a tax of 10 per cent upon the issues of state banks, should be repealed, involved, at least in the opinion of many of us who then sat in the House of Representatives, a question of principle and not of policy. Two of the distinguished judges who heard and decided that case in the Supreme Court of the United States held the law which we sought to repeal invalid upon the ground that it invaded the power of the State to organize corporations and to endow them with such faculties as, in the judgment of the legislature, might be proper.

Speaking for myself, that was the principle upon which I voted. I have never believed in bank money, whether issued by the banks created by the General Government or issued by a corporation created by a State. I have always believed that the power to issue money is a sovereign power and can not be properly delegated to individuals or to corporations; but I also believe that the States of this Union have the right and have the power under the Constitution of the United States, if they see fit, to create a corporation and authorize it to issue its promissory notes. Those notes can not be made by any law of any State a legal tender.

No man can be compelled to receive them in the transaction of his business, and if he does accept them, he accepts them simply as he would accept my note or the note of another individual or the note of a corporation. He takes them voluntarily, and at their value, under no compulsion of any law. I have

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

never seen the time that, as a member of the legislature of Texas, I would have voted to create a bank corporation and authorize it to issue its promissory notes; but, as a Member of Congress, feeling that the Federal Government had no just constitutional power to destroy a corporation which the State has the power to create, I voted to repeal that tax of 10 per cent. It seemed to me to involve a principle. Yet, at other gentlemen who thought otherwise I have not deemed it necessary to level my criticisms. But when I, and when the majority of Democrats are arraigned by implication because we do not choose to surrender our conscience and our judgment on a detail that was in violation of a principle of the Democratic party, I do not think anybody here or elsewhere can fairly be heard to assail us.

Mr. President, to illustrate—and I did not say it the other day because I did not care to say it—to illustrate the folly of allowing a convention to instruct legislators as to details, I only need to call attention to the fact that that platform pledged us to put logs on the free list when logs were already on the free list. Obviously they did not know what it is necessary to do, and I do not think they knew what ought to be done.

Mr. MONEY. Mr. President, I want first to indorse what has been said by the Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] as to the freedom of a Senator obeying his own conscience and his own interpretation of the Constitution in matters of legislation. I happened to be a Member of the Congress to which he referred and voted as did the Senator from Texas for the reasons which he has so clearly and strongly expressed. I recollect very well that Mr. Bryan not only voted against that bill, but I remember the reasons which he gave for doing so. I am not stating this in criticism of Mr. Bryan, but to continue what has been so well said by the Senator from Texas. I recollect that in his speech Mr. Bryan stated that the platforms of parties bound only the candidates who were running upon them and did not bind any Representative in Congress. I think I am correct about that.

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator from Mississippi is exactly correct. That was his statement.

Mr. MONEY. Will the Senator from Texas please find the passage and read it in my time?

Mr. BAILEY. Yes, sir; I will. It is as follows:

> It has been stated that every Democrat is in duty bound to vote for the repeal of the state-bank tax, because of the plank relating to that subject adopted by the last Democratic national convention. A platform can only bind those who run upon it.
>
> President Cleveland is, of course, pledged to the repeal of the tax, because he accepted a nomination and an election upon the national Democratic platform of 1892. Those also are pledged to repeal whose nominating conventions indorsed the national platform, and those are perhaps bound also who ran as Democrats without expressly repudiating that part of the national platform. In my own case I was not only nominated before the adoption of the national platform by the Chicago convention, but I expressly repudiated in my canvass the plank which declared in favor of repealing the state-bank tax.

Mr. MONEY. Mr. President, that is about as I recollect it. It was not worth while on my part to call it to the attention of the Senate, but since the subject has been introduced, I want to supplement what the Senator from Texas has said.

I want to say further to the Senate that I have no criticism to make of any member on this side or on the other side of the Chamber. I shall certainly exercise the right for myself to construe the Constitution and the platform and everything else by my light, and not by the light of any other man here or elsewhere; and I freely accord to others the privilege which I shall always exercise.

I want to say further, Mr. President, that there is hardly any man here or elsewhere who does not like approbation. The sweetest plaudit that can meet the public servant is the declaration "Well done" from his own constituency; but above all is the approval of his own conscience, the maintenance of his self-respect and of his intellectual integrity. If he has these, he can defy criticism and censure from any quarter whatever. It is to be noted—and I did not intend to enter into any such discussion or to bring it before the Senate, but I will say it, now that I am up—that the criticism which has been severest upon the Democratic part of the Senate for voting a small duty of 25 cents per ton on iron ore and $1 a thousand feet on rough lumber, and so on, came from Democratic papers that never did indorse or support the candidacy of Mr. Bryan at any time and never approved a thing in his platforms except this part of this one.

I want to say further—it is not necessary to say it, because I am committing myself probably to a position which will elicit more criticism, to which I am indifferent—but I will say that there are other things in that platform which, if embodied in a bill brought before the Senate, I would never vote for. Not only would I not vote for them, but I would not vote for them if they had been proclaimed in every convention from the time of Thomas Jefferson to Jeff Davis, because they are not what I believe to be necessary in a platform. In my opinion, a party platform should be a plain, clear, explicit declaration of principles and great policies, and should never enter into details of legislation, and not have any arguments or illustrations. It is not necessary. The fewer holes the fewer pegs you will have to put in them of doubt, misgiving, and misconstruction.

So long as I shall be the servant of the people of Mississippi, I shall obey but one command, and that is of the legislature of my State. When that legislature sends me a message, a command which I can not obey, I will tender them my commission and let them put a man here who will do so; but until that time I declare now my absolute independence of everybody and everything. I am always glad, however, to go with those who agree with me, never conceding it to be possible at any time that I can forsake the Democratic party, for there is nowhere else on earth for me or anybody like me to go.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I disclaim any purpose in what I said to-day to criticise, inferentially or otherwise, anything done by any Senator here. The Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] says that he denies the right of any convention by a declaration of party policy to bind the judgment or conscience of a Senator.

Mr. BAILEY. Will the Senator permit me——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCUMBER in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. STONE. I do.

Mr. BAILEY. Of course the Senator desires to state me accurately.

Mr. STONE. Certainly.

Mr. BAILEY. I said to bind the conscience or judgment of a Senator upon the details of legislation, not upon the policy of the party.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, undoubtedly, whether stated in one form or another, that is a question which addresses itself to every Senator. If a declaration should be made in a party platform that a Senator's judgment and conscience could not approve, and he should refuse to subscribe to it, I do not consider it within my province here to call him to account. I have not attempted, nor shall I now attempt, to censure or criticise what other Senators may say or do. I shall do as I think right, and I assume that others will do the same.

Mr. President, I have no commission to speak in defense of Mr. Bryan or in eulogy of him. I have the honor of being his friend, but not any more than I have the honor of being the friend of Senators upon this floor.

I agree to what the Senator from Texas said about the repeal of the state bank tax. If I had been in the House of Representatives at that time I would have acted in concert with that Senator, and for the same reasons he has given.

Mr. Bryan was not in my thought when I had the floor a little while ago. Mr. President, although I am Mr. Bryan's friend and greatly admire him, I do not think that his record as a party man—and I am going to state this deliberatively—gives him license to read lectures to Democrats who on this floor or in the House of Representatives may act on their own judgment and their own consciences, even though they may not strictly observe the declarations of a party platform. He has not been overcareful in that respect himself. But sir, I am not controlled in my judgment or utterances by Mr. Bryan or by any other man, and I do not quite fancy an intimation that I am. I think, speak, and vote on my own responsibility.

Mr. President, I was on the committee that made the Denver platform last year. When the platform was in process of formulation I opposed putting into it a declaration about a mere detail of legislation.

I thought it was unwise and impolitic, and I have not changed my opinion about that; but the platform was made and promulgated by the supreme tribunal of the Democratic party, and, while I do not criticise what others may do, and had not that in mind when I was speaking this afternoon, I can not retreat now from the position I then took—that, in my opinion, the declaration of a national convention as to party policy and principle is entitled to and should receive the support of Senators and Members of the House who have been elected by that party. But what I had in mind when I was talking at that time was not the thing to which the Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] or the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. MONEY] referred; but I had reference particularly to the controversy that was raging on the other side about the Chicago platform.

The Republican party had declared in its platform adopted at Chicago in favor of constructing a new tariff law on the basis of the difference in the cost of production in America and

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

above-named articles, 35 per cent ad valorem; valued at above 60 cents per pound, 45 cents per pound, and in addition thereto, 40 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, I desire the Senate to understand distinctly that this amendment is the prevailing phraseology of paragraph 355 of the Allison-Aldrich bill of 1888. I desire to say further that the Senator from Rhode Island is in error when he says that there was any difference in the wool duties on the scheme and schedule of that bill as compared to the McKinley Act or the present proposed bill that would explain this variation in the duties on blankets and these cheap cloths.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator from Iowa is mistaken in his last statement. The duty on wools of the third class by the act of 1888 was 2½ cents a pound.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Exactly; but——

Mr. ALDRICH. Any Senator at all familiar with the classification of wools knows that third-class wools then, as now, enter largely into the manufacture of blankets—more largely than any other class of wools.

Mr. DOLLIVER. That is true, possibly, of some kind of blankets, and especially horse blankets; but the duty on first and second class wool——

Mr. ALDRICH. On all blankets.

Mr. DOLLIVER. It is exactly now as in 1888.

Mr. ALDRICH. On the first and second, but not on the third class.

Mr. DOLLIVER. The duty on all these noils, wastes, and by-products is exactly the same.

Mr. ALDRICH. Oh, no.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I beg the Senator's pardon; I have the bill before me.

Mr. ALDRICH. So have I.

Mr. DOLLIVER. On top waste, roving waste, slubbing waste, garnetted waste, 30 cents per pound, just as that duty, although they did make a small concession in behalf of woolen rags, making them 10 cents, as I desired to do yesterday, but I encountered a storm of indignation from the Senator from Utah and the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. SMOOT. The duty on woolen rags is 10 cents a pound now. What the Senator from Iowa wanted was 6 cents.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I think I ought to have had it.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator was not stating the facts as they were; that is all.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Now, Mr. President, the act of 1888 received at the hands of the wisest and best men we had then not a few days' attention nor a few weeks, but attention month after month, day and night, as the Senator from Rhode Island will testify. What I ask now is that he permit me to make the same criticism of the bill that is pending here that he and Mr. Allison made of the Mills bill, that it put the heaviest duties upon the blankets and clothing of the humble people of the United States who were not able to bear them. That is demagogy now, and a man almost gets out of his party for saying that now. Yet the criticism hurled by the Senator from Rhode Island on the Mills bill was that by making uniform rates of duty it bore with such hardship on the poor that the Senate had rendered the country a real service when they modified those rates.

But I do not care to debate it. I simply desire the yeas and nays on the proposition to go back to the Allison bill rather than to some subsequent or previous measure.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On this amendment the Senator from Iowa demands the yeas and nays.

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

Mr. FLINT (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON].

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. FOSTER (after having voted in the affirmative). I inquire if the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER] has voted?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed that the Senator has not voted.

Mr. FOSTER. Then I withdraw my vote.

Mr. FLINT. I am paired with the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. DIXON] and vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—29.

Bacon	Clay	La Follette	Rayner
Bankhead	Cummins	McLaurin	Simmons
Beveridge	Davis	Martin	Smith, Md.
Bristow	Dolliver	Nelson	Taliaferro
Brown	Frazier	Newlands	Taylor
Burkett	Gore	Overman	
Chamberlain	Hughes	Owen	
Clapp	Johnston, Ala.	Paynter	

NAYS—43.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Gamble	Perkins
Borah	Crane	Guggenheim	Piles
Bourne	Crawford	Heyburn	Root
Bradley	Cullom	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Brandegee	Curtis	Kean	Smith, Mich.
Briggs	Depew	Lodge	Smoot
Bulkeley	Dick	McEnery	Stephenson
Burnham	Dillingham	Nixon	Sutherland
Burrows	du Pont	Oliver	Warner
Burton	Flint	Page	Warren
Carter	Gallinger	Penrose	

NOT VOTING—19

Bailey	Elkins	Jones	Smith, S. C.
Clarke, Ark.	Fletcher	McCumber	Stone
Culberson	Foster	Money	Tillman
Daniel	Frye	Richardson	Wetmore
Dixon	Hale	Shively	

So Mr. DOLLIVER's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The paragraph is agreed to.

The Secretary will read the next paragraph.

Mr. OWEN. Before the paragraph is agreed to, I desire to offer an amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is offering an amendment to paragraph 375?

Mr. OWEN. Yes, sir.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will regard the paragraph as open.

Mr. SCOTT. I thought paragraph 375 had been adopted. It will have to be reconsidered if the Senator wants to move to amend it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will regard the question as open.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from Oklahoma rose before the agreement was announced.

Mr. OWEN. I do not think it is absolutely essential for a Senator to rise in his place instantly in order to offer an amendment, and I do not agree to the rule of the Senate suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. I quite agree if it had been agreed to it ought to be left open, and I think the Senator was before the time.

Mr. OWEN. I was simply answering the suggestion of the Senator from Massachusetts that it might not be offered even if it had been agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. I did not mean to suggest that at all.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma will be read.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add at the end of paragraph 375 the following:

That the rate fixed on all articles enumerated in this paragraph shall be reduced 5 per cent per annum of the rate fixed in this act, annually on June 30, for each of the next ensuing ten fiscal years: *Provided*, That if such graduated reduction shall cause a diminution of the annual revenue from any one or more of the above enumerated articles, the President is authorized and directed to fix the rate on any such article or articles at the point at which such article or articles severally are found to have the greatest normal revenue-producing power, but not at a rate higher than the rate fixed in this act: *Provided further*, That the rate shall not be reduced or fixed below the point at which it would produce an amount equal to the difference in the cost of the production of any such article in the United States or abroad.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I shall not ask for a yea-and-nay vote on this proposed amendment. I shall be content with its being voted down by the majority, by the usual majority supporting the committee.

Mr. ALDRICH. I think it is desirable to have a yea-and-nay vote on the proposition. I would be very glad to have a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. OWEN. I have no objection to a yea-and-nay vote. Before that is taken, I shall therefore briefly explain its purport.

The theory of the majority, as expressed by the platform of 1904, is as follows:

The measure of protection should always at least equal the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad.

The platform of 1908 asserts that—

In all tariff legislation the true principle of protection is best maintained by the imposition of such duties as will equal the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad, together with a reasonable profit—

And so forth.

Now, Mr. President, in the particular paragraph on blankets and flannel for underwear, paragraph 375, the rates run from 107.60 per cent on blankets valued at not more than 40 cents per pound up to 165 per cent on blankets more than 3 yards in length valued at more than 40 cents per pound.

I wish to call the attention of the Senate and of the country to the actual labor cost in blankets. The report of Carroll D. Wright, to which I have heretofore called attention, on the matter of blankets in case No. 390, puts the labor cost at 15 per cent of the value of the product, and yet this bill puts the tariff at over 100 per cent on the bald pretense of protecting American labor.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

In case No. 391 of blankets the total cost of labor in transforming the materials is 15 per cent, and yet the pending bill puts this rate at exceeding 100 per cent on the pretense of protecting American labor.

In case No. 392 the total labor cost is 18 per cent, and yet this bill puts the rate at over 100 per cent on the pretense of protecting labor.

The Senator from Rhode Island, representing the Committee on Finance, on last Monday stated on the floor of the Senate that the labor cost was 80 to 90 per cent of all these products in the face of this official report in answer to a resolution of the Senate saying that the labor cost of these blankets is 15 per cent, and yet a rate of 165 per cent is put upon the blankets in order to give a monopoly to those who manufacture blankets in this country and enable them to levy a tax upon people who must use blankets for their protection against the inclemency of winter's weather.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. OWEN. With great pleasure.

Mr. CARTER. I ask the Senator whether in his judgment the proposal presented by his amendment could not be made applicable to every paragraph in this bill; that is, vest in the President discretion to reduce duties below the rate fixed in the paragraph when in his judgment the revenue would not thereby be impaired and the best revenue-producing point could be reached?

Mr. OWEN. Undoubtedly, Mr. President, that could be done.

Mr. CARTER. Then, Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator if it would not be more simple to make the tariff bill consist of about three sentences, providing that the ad valorem rate on all articles presented to the custom houses for entrance into the United States should be fixed at, say, 200 per cent, provided that the President may reduce the rate below that amount when in his discretion the public revenues will thereby be benefited?

Mr. OWEN. Has the Senator concluded?

Mr. CARTER. I have concluded. Why engage in these multifarious paragraphs and subdivisions if we could prescribe a maximum ad valorem duty for the admission of all articles at the custom-houses, leaving the discretion with the President to reduce the duties when in his opinion such reductions would not impair the revenue, but would reach the best revenue-producing point upon each article?

Mr. GALLINGER. A sliding scale.

Mr. CARTER. A sliding scale. In other words, we could not tell from day to day what the duty would be next week on any particular article unless we were advised of what the President's opinion might be at that future date.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President——

Mr. OWEN. I will answer the Senator from Montana first and yield to the Senator from Indiana second.

In answer to the suggestion of the Senator from Montana, I reply that legislative power can not be vested in the Executive.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President——

Mr. OWEN. Excuse me, Mr. President. I will answer the Senator from Montana first and yield to the Senator from Montana second.

Executive power is vested in the executive and legislative power is vested in the legislative branch of the Government. No one understands that more distinctly than the Senator from Oklahoma.

But it is not vesting in the President of the United States legislative power when he is directed by the legislative power to do a certain thing in a certain contingency. I will place in the RECORD the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States on that point for the information of the Senate and, incidentally, for the information of the Senator from Montana.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. OWEN. I yield, with pleasure.

Mr. CARTER. If a legislative power can be vested in the President, as this amendment proposes, why not a considerable amount of legislative power or all legislative power?

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I will answer the Senator from Montana by calling his attention to the fact that this very bill proposes to vest in the President the right to reduce a proposed additional 25 per cent tax upon all goods at his discretion, and if the objection to my proposed amendment of the Senator from Montana is well taken, it is equally well taken to the 25 per cent maximum and minimum amendment of the committee itself.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Will the Senator permit me?

Mr. OWEN. I will, with pleasure.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Does not the Senator make this distinction, that in the case of the maximum and minimum provision to which he is now calling attention, as in the case of the maximum and minimum provision in one section of the present law, the legislature fixes its will and the Executive becomes the instrument of the legislature in applying that will under certain contingencies, whereas in the amendment the Senator proposes the President is not directed to fix any specific rates, thus carrying out specifically the legislative will as its executive instrument, but is authorized to fix rates of his own? The Senator observes that distinction.

Mr. OWEN. I do not.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Then of course——

Mr. OWEN. There is a distinction without a difference, Mr. President. The spirit and purpose of both is substantially the same, that the legislative will is recorded and the Executive is required to carry it out. Every Executive must exercise some degree of discretion.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. But the first thing I observe in the Senator's amendment is that from line 7 to the semicolon on line 11 it authorizes the President to perform all the legislative power which we might perform ourselves. Of course, the Senator can perceive that fixing the tariff rates at whatever we like is purely a legislative power. This authorizes and directs the President not to apply a definite and specific rate fixed by ourselves, but any rate that he sees fit to fix in his discretion. In other words, the executive mind is directed to perform the functions of the legislative mind.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President——

Mr. OWEN. I will yield with pleasure to the Senator from Montana when I have answered his colleague from Indiana. In this particular paragraph, item 1, blankets not more than 40 cents per pound, the legislative will is 107.6 per cent ad valorem. The legislative will under my proposed amendment next year would be 5 per cent less, which is as absolutely and mathematically an expression of the legislative will as it is possible to give. So, in each succeeding year the diminution is mathematically accurate, with a proviso, however, that when it goes below the maximum revenue-producing point it shall no longer be lowered, but the legislative will requires it to be definitely fixed at the maximum revenue-producing point found by means of this series of successive reductions. Therefore the Executive would be merely carrying out the legislative will and he would be an Executive and not a legislator. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE] presents the facts upon a minimum rate with which the discretion of the President may operate; the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] presents a maximum rate, and leaves the President with unrestrained discretion down to nothing or a complete abolition of duty altogether. I will say to the Senator from Oklahoma that, in the case of the reciprocity agreement, it will be remembered that a treaty was required in order to put the new rate into effect. The Constitution provides that treaties shall constitute the supreme law of the land; and I doubt very much whether, without consulting Congress or framing a treaty, it will be competent for the President of the United States, even under the minimum and maximum provisions, to change a rate of duty where the Constitution vests the supreme power in Congress in this matter of taxation.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I will now, with the permission of the Senator from Montana, ask him a question. How does he justify 165 per cent ad valorem when the cost of labor in the material is but 15 per cent?

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, I was one of the auditors of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] last night, and heard him remark that the cost to the manufacturer of agricultural implements had increased, as far as steel products were concerned, over 100 per cent since the Dingley law went into operation. I could have assisted him somewhat on that in another illustration. The cost of wool has increased during the operation of the Dingley law 260 per cent, and measured by the price of wool to-day it has increased 275 per cent. The increase in the cost of the raw material was the difference between the conditions, doubtless, to which the Senator refers and conditions that have come to pass under the present law.

Mr. OWEN. I do not know whether or not the Senator from Montana intends to be humorous, but I should like him to make an answer to my question.

Mr. CARTER. I should like to know what the Senator from Oklahoma refers to specifically. I undoubtedly assume that the Senator has in his mind some peculiar phase of industrial life,

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

where a particular by-product, or some article, is produced at 15 cents, for instance, and that the duty, according to his method of calculation of the matter, amounts to what—60 per cent?

Mr. OWEN. To 160 per cent.

Mr. CARTER. To 160 per cent; or the duty, for instance, on wool at 11 cents.

Mr. OWEN. The Senator evidently did not hear my question.

Mr. CARTER. I wanted to say to the Senator that the duty on wool, as the price stood with us in 1897, is now in the neighborhood of 200 per cent, and yet it is a perfectly fair duty and the country has prospered under its operations. In the case doubtless in the mind of the Senator the application of a duty of 100 per cent instead of 60 per cent would, by its fruits, justify the levy.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Montana, in fixing the rates on the paragraph in question, not to be guided by the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad at all?

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, the highest markets this country has ever been inflicted with, so far as the consumer is concerned, have been the markets when controlled by the foreign manufacturer and jobber. The Senator from Oklahoma well knows that when we shipped in iron rails here of English manufacture we paid $130 a ton for them and more.

Mr. GALLINGER. We paid $170 a ton at one time.

Mr. CARTER. Yes; at one time we paid $170 a ton. We did not manufacture a single steel rail in this country. To-day, under this "oppressive tariff" to which the Senator refers, we are buying the best steel rails manufactured in the world for about 15 per cent of the cost of the old iron rails.

Mr. OWEN. And about $8 a ton more than the manufacturers sell the same rails to foreigners, Mr. President.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President——

Mr. OWEN. Our people pay about $8 more than the foreigners pay for the same rails. The Senator from Montana, however, has not answered my question. I ask him whether or not he thinks the difference in the cost of production in this country and abroad shall control in these matters, and I have illustrated it by pointing out that the labor cost on these woolen goods is only 15 to 20 per cent, and yet the tariff is put as high as 165 per cent.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, undoubtedly the purpose of legislation on the protective basis is to equalize the difference in the cost of production here and abroad.

Mr. OWEN. Now, Mr. President, I call the Senator's attention to the fact that the cost of labor in these blankets is from 15 to 20 per cent; and I ask him how he justifies putting upon them, over and above the total cost of American labor, an additional tariff of from 80 to 140 per cent ad valorem up to 100 to 165 per cent duty?

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma is calculating the hard-time wages of 1897 and 1898 as the basis of the American wages, and comparing them with the wages abroad of to-day.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, on the contrary, I am agreeing, so far as this calculation is concerned, that the labor cost of the European product is absolutely nothing, and I call the attention of the Senator from Montana that the increase of wool price since 1898, the date of Commissioner of Labor Wright's report, up to 1907 has not been greater than the reported increase of labor, so his percentages are not affected by such changes.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, it was pretty nearly nothing in this country on the date the Senator's figures were made. In 1897 there were men in the country who could not get a day's work if they were willing to take a plate of soup as compensation.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, that does not answer the question at all, because the labor wages of that time—in 1897—are clearly shown; and while it is true that in 1896 the market price of the whole world was at a low tide because of the preceding panic of 1893, it is not true that the cost of labor in percentages to value of product is now above what it then was.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, in the production of a blanket the Senator wishes to make the comparison with the last man who touches the blanket in the factory. In order to estimate the cost of production it is necessary to go back to the sheep herder on the plains. That sheep herder in our competing country in South Africa receives $3.66 a month, while out on the plains in this country he receives $40 a month. Down in South Africa he receives a sack of corn and a sheep to board him for a month, while out in our country he must have as good a bill of fare as they give in the ordinary hotel in Washington, or he will not stay by the job. These differences from the beginning must be computed and considered, in order to ascertain the elements of cost.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, they were considered as far as justified by common sense when the calculation was made by Carroll D. Wright. He puts the labor cost of producing yarn, for example, to which I call the Senator's attention, and which bears directly upon this matter—because I call his attention to the fact that even as to woolen yarn Carroll D. Wright, in Table 430, puts the cost of the labor of transforming materials at 2.6 cents per pound for No. 1 yarn and 45.22 per cent for the cost of material, less than 6 per cent of the cost of the finished product being for labor.

Mr. BACON. Will the Senator from Oklahoma permit me to ask the Senator from Montana one question, not to interrupt further than a question?

Mr. OWEN. With pleasure.

Mr. BACON. Does the Senator from Montana think that, in order that the sheep herders of Montana shall be furnished with board on the scale of a Washington hotel, the price of wool should be raised to all the consumers of the United States, so that that purpose may be effected?

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, if you eliminate the sheep herder of the country altogether and cut out the 311,000,000 pounds of wool we contribute to the factories of the country, you will pay more for your wool than you are paying for it to-day.

Mr. BACON. But the Senator from Montana does not deem it wise to answer that question yes or no.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia proposes to settle a great, far-reaching economic question with the answer "yes" or "no." That, I think, is one of the elementary difficulties with the Senator's school of political economy in dealing with these questions. Each matter is taken in an isolated state, without any reference whatever to the surrounding conditions and circumstances; for instance, the standard of living, the standard of civilization, the education of the people, the manner of feeding and clothing them in this country, we think ought to be maintained. The maintenance of the standard, however, embraces certain costs in every avenue of life and endeavor which do not apply to the rice-eating millions of China; yet, if the Senator's theory should be carried into effect, the cotton of Georgia and South Carolina, instead of being manufactured in that country into merchantable shape, would be shipped to China, where the labor determines the element of cost to the best possible advantage of anywhere in the world.

Mr. BACON. The Senator from Montana well knows the fact, Mr. President, that the labor employed in the production of cotton does not receive the hundredth part of a mill of benefit from the protective tariff.

Mr. CARTER. I refer to the cotton mills, Mr. President. It is not a new idea. As a matter of fact, the cotton of the Mississippi Valley has been for over ten years in process of shipment up along the Mississippi River to St. Paul; thence across the country to Seattle; thence across the ocean to Japan, where cotton fabrics are being manufactured by labor so low that it is appalling to contemplate the reduction of American workmen to the standard; and if you take down the barriers and consider these workmen separate and apart from the civilization and conditions under which we live, of course you would, as a pure matter of economy, leave the southern people to raise the cotton, dismantle the factories in the South and in New England, and ship the cotton to the Orient, where it can be manufactured cheapest.

Mr. BACON. Is that the Senator's answer to my question whether or not the sheep herder of Montana should be furnished Washington City hotel board at the expense of the people of the United States?

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, that sheep herder is entitled to good treatment. He is a part of a mighty system; he is a part of the economy of the country. It is believed that, in order to maintain a supplemental food supply to put the country where it can raise its own clothing, and thus maintain a certain coveted measure of industrial independence, that even at the expense of paying our sheep herders more than the South African native gets, we ought still to keep them employed.

Mr. BACON. If the Senator from Oklahoma will pardon me—and I will not trespass further on his time—I want to say to the Senator from Montana that it is indeed a mighty

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

system which is so compact and so powerful that it can levy taxes upon 85,000,000 people in order to benefit less than 5,000,000.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, may I now ask the Senator from Georgia a question?

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Montana to ask a question of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. CARTER. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma. I inquire of the Senator from Georgia whether he would, in order to get wool cheaper, reduce the American sheep herder to $3.66 a month in open competition with the South African native?

Mr. BACON. I would put the Montana sheep herder exactly where the Georgia cotton laborer is—making his living by the sweat of his brow, and receiving pay according to the value of his labor. I do not propose to ask that the people of Montana shall be taxed for the purpose of paying the wages of the Georgia cotton laborer, nor do I desire that the people of Georgia shall be taxed in order to pay the wages of the Montana sheep herder.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, I hope the Montana sheep herder will never be compelled to work for the wages paid the Georgia cotton-field hand. I wish his wages could be better; but the cotton production is, I think, the greatest monopoly of all the crops in the world, and I am glad we have the monopoly in the United States.

Mr. BACON. "Monopoly," Mr. President, when it has to meet in the markets of the world the prices of the world! The Senator does not weigh his words.

Mr. CARTER. The area within which cotton——

Mr. OWEN. I decline to yield further to this interesting colloquy of the Senators from Montana and Georgia.

Mr. CARTER. The area within which cotton can be grown is so circumscribed on the globe that the monopoly is a natural one.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oklahoma declines to yield further.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator from Oklahoma allow me to ask the Senator from Georgia a question?

Mr. OWEN. With great pleasure.

Mr. ALDRICH. I am afraid this great proposition of the Senator from Oklahoma is getting obscured in this debate, and I am anxious——

Mr. OWEN. It will not remain so.

Mr. ALDRICH. And I am anxious to know whether the Senator from Georgia is engaging in this debate for the purpose of supporting the Senator from Oklahoma or for other reasons? We are not able to distinguish.

Mr. BACON. I did not hear the question.

Mr. ALDRICH. I was wondering whether the Senator from Georgia was opposing or supporting the proposition of the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I was not paying attention particularly to the debate that was being maintained by the Senator from Oklahoma, but I did catch——

Mr. ALDRICH. I was a little afraid the Senator was ignorant——

Mr. BACON. But I did catch the most remarkable proposition which was made by the Senator from Montana [Mr. CARTER], that the sheep herders of Montana were entitled to be paid wages which would enable them to get board equal to the board of any hotel in Washington City, and I knew that if that was done my people would have to pay part of the expense. That was what I was protesting against.

Mr. ALDRICH. I may not be a good judge of these propositions, but I think the proposition of the Senator from Oklahoma is much more strange than the one suggested by the Senator from Montana.

Mr. BACON. The Senator from Oklahoma is quite capable of dealing with this question himself without my interposition, and I do not intend to interpose. I was simply struck by that remarkable proposition of the Senator from Montana. I am glad the Senator has made it, because it illustrates more perfectly than I have heard in this debate the iniquities of a protective-tariff system, by which in one State the laborer shall be paid wages which would give him board at the New Willard, and the people of the United States shall be compelled to pay a high price for wool in order that that end may be accomplished. That is the argument reduced to a nutshell; and it applies in greater or less degree to the proposition of the protective system as to other industries—to tax the people of the country at large to sustain private enterprises and increase their profits.

Mr. ALDRICH. I was anxious to ascertain whether this proposition of the Senator from Oklahoma was presented after conference with his associates upon the other side of the Chamber, because it looks to me like an entirely new departure in tariff legislation, and it might revolutionize parties if it should be adopted. I am anxious to get a vote upon it as soon as possible.

Mr. OWEN. Before the vote is taken I will pursue the inquiry which I made of the Senator from Montana and which he so skillfully side stepped that he got into the Chinese labor question and the sheep herders of South Africa before it ended. I now desire to ask a question of the Senator from Rhode Island, who is the chairman of the Committee on Finance, who knows all about cost, and who was kind enough last Monday night to advise me that the labor cost of materials was between 80 and 90 per cent, and kind enough to invite me to take the matter into prayerful consideration and go home and study it over and overcome my being new in the discussion of the tariff. He suggested that I was very new to the tariff debate, and therefore must be excused if somewhat irrational. I agree with him in his compassionate regard for a new Member, and hope that if anything I say seems to be unlearned or unsound, it may be considered as due to my inexperience in the discussion of the tariff.

Mr. RAYNER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. OWEN. Excuse me, Mr. President.

Mr. RAYNER. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. OWEN. I would prefer not to yield now, but I will yield to the Senator.

Mr. RAYNER. All that I desired was this: I dislike to disagree with the Senator from Oklahoma, but his amendment strikes me as absolutely invalid. I think it goes directly——

Mr. OWEN. I decline to yield for a speech by the Senator from Maryland.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oklahoma declines to yield further.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, the Senate has fallen into a practice, when a Senator is making an argument and trying to establish a proposition, of incursive discussion that leads the speaker far afield from that which he is attempting to establish. I should like to courteously suggest that, as a rule of propriety, this practice would be "more honored in the breach than the observance." I do not think it is courteous to Senators on the floor, when they are trying to establish a proposition, to introduce a side issue leading them far away from that which they are discussing. While I am always anxious to be perfectly considerate of every Senator while I am on the floor, and will always yield for any reasonable question, I do not think that the practice to which I have referred ought to be pursued in the Senate. I have often felt like entering protest against it, and I do so now.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to his colleague?

Mr. OWEN. For a question.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I think it would be material if the Senator from Montana or the Senator from Wyoming would state what the price of wool was last September. The Senator from Montana has stated that it is 200 per cent more now than it was in 1897. I should like some one to state the price of wool in Wyoming and Montana last September.

Mr. CARTER rose.

Mr. OWEN. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, I can not definitely state what the market price was last September, but my recollection is that the market price was about 18 to 20 cents per pound; it is about 24 cents now. The price in 1896 and 1897 ran down to about 6 or 8 cents per pound.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, just a word.

Mr. OWEN. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. GORE. I happened to be in Wyoming last September, and was informed by people engaged in the growing of sheep and wool that the price was less than 14 cents. I do not think it was one-third of that in 1897, though in 1894 and 1895 it got down pretty low.

Mr. CARTER. There are certain clips of wool of inferior kind that always sell some cents below the regular market price.

Mr. OWEN. Now, Mr. President, coming back to my question to the Senator from Rhode Island, he advised us that the labor cost of materials in the United States ran from 80 to 90

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

per cent. I call his attention to Carroll D. Wright's Table No. 430, on woolen yarns:

No. 430.—Woolen yarn: United States; 1897–98; unit, 1 pound; No. 1 yarn.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	$0.0260	5.44
Cost of materials and all other items except labor	.4522	94.56
Total cost	.4782	100.00

That does not correspond with the view of the Senator from Rhode Island as to 80 per cent being the labor cost, and I should like to have him explain it.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma entirely misapprehended my statement. I will repeat it for him. I said the cost of every material and of every product is from 80 to 90 per cent labor, I care not what it is—I mean in the last analysis. In making that computation, you have to commence, of course, with the ore in the ground, with the elemental unit of production, whatever it may be. Everything beyond that is cost of labor. That is the proposition that I make; and I think the Senator will have great difficulty in arriving at any other conclusion if he investigates the subject carefully, as I am sure he will.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, the answer of the Senator from Rhode Island that every product is substantially composed of labor is true in a broad sort of fashion. That everything used by man is the result of his labor is generally true, but it has no bearing upon and no relation to the question of the labor cost in yarns. According to this table, the labor cost in yarns is 5 per cent, and the Senator from Rhode Island stands here and demands 145 per cent tax upon yarn on the ground of its labor cost. Granted that 100 per cent of the cost of yarn was labor, granted that capital has no interest in it whatever, still that 45 per cent above 100 per cent is an excess even on the ridiculous theory of the Senator from Rhode Island. But it is not true, as a matter of fact, that yarn has over 5 to 10 per cent of labor cost as compared with the cost of the material and the other items entering into the cost of the gross value of the product.

Mr. ALDRICH. I heard the Senator a few moments ago make the statement that if the cost of the foreign product was nothing, then——

Mr. OWEN. Excuse me; the Senator did not apprehend what I said. I said if the labor cost were nothing.

Mr. ALDRICH. Well, I understood the Senator to say if the cost of the foreign product was nothing.

Mr. OWEN. I said the labor cost.

Mr. ALDRICH. One proposition is just as good as another for my purposes.

Mr. OWEN. If one proposition is just as good as another for the Senator's purposes, he can state any proposition he pleases, but he must not make me responsible for it.

Mr. ALDRICH. If the Senator will wait patiently, I will give him a concrete illustration.

Mr. OWEN. I have great patience, and will wait.

Mr. ALDRICH. If the labor cost is nothing abroad and 10 cents in this country, what rate would have to be put upon the foreign value to equalize that condition? That is a mathematical problem which I should like to have the Senator work out.

Mr. OWEN. That is a mathematical problem which is very easily ascertained and worked out.

Mr. ALDRICH. What percentage would the Senator put upon the labor cost to equalize conditions?

Mr. OWEN. It is perfectly easy to determine the value of the labor cost in the United States; it is perfectly easy to determine the ad valorem which shall equal that cost.

Mr. ALDRICH. In case it cost nothing abroad, what would it be in figures?

Mr. OWEN. That is a question broadly stated, applying to four or five thousand items, which the Senator well knows is impossible of mathematical answer, and therefore he asks somewhat triumphantly a question which no man can answer. It reminds me, I was going to say, of an ancient adage——

Mr. ALDRICH. I will give a concrete illustration. Suppose that an article cost nothing abroad and 10 cents here, what percentage of duty would the Senator put upon the foreign article to equalize conditions in the United States?

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, take the question of yarn, for example. Supposing that the total labor cost in the United States was 2.6 cents a pound, which is shown in Table 430 of Carroll D. Wright's report on labor cost; there is a cost of 2.6 cents a pound. If the value of the yarn was 26 cents, 10 per cent ad valorem would precisely equal that cost. There is a specific answer to the Senator from Rhode Island, mathematically.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator make that statement over again? My attention was diverted for a moment. I shall be glad to hear what he said.

Mr. OWEN. I will restate it with great pleasure. Carroll D. Wright's table, No. 430, shows that the total labor cost in a pound of No. 1 yarn is 2.6 cents a pound. If the wool entering our ports was valued at 26 cents per pound, 10 per cent ad valorem would meet the labor cost in the United States, granting that the labor cost in England was nothing; and 10 per cent is somewhat lower than 145 per cent, fixed in this bill as the tariff rate by the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator does not understand my question or else certainly what he says now is not an answer to it. I will repeat what I said the other day. If the Senator had been familiar with tariff discussions, he would have been aware of the fact that this question of labor cost has always been injected and occupied a great deal of space in such discussions.

I want to say to him now that the labor cost at any single stage in this long process of manufacture has nothing whatever to do with duties, and can not be made to have. For example, take a jackknife. Jackknives are made abroad largely by farming out the different operations to people engaged in one particular process. For instance, one party might be grinding the blade, and it might cost a cent on that jackknife in one country and half a cent in another. That has nothing to do with the duties on jackknives. We are not dealing with a single part of or one process in this long series of operations any more than we are in yarns. It costs to pack yarns into boxes, for instance, a fraction of 1 per cent. Are you going to regulate the duty upon the cost of packing? Certainly not. It costs something to run the wool through the different processes, from one to another. Are you going to take one of those and talk about the labor cost involved?

The whole scheme is ridiculous. It does not get anywhere practically. What we want to compare is the total cost of production in one country and the other and equalize conditions on the total cost of production; and that total cost of production, in the last analysis, as I have stated, and I will repeat it, is based upon the cost of labor. If labor costs 50 per cent more in this country than it does in another country, or double what it costs in another country, that relative cost of production in the two countries is governed entirely by the scale of wages all through the production and all through every part of the life of the Nation. If you pay in Washington $3 a day for a policeman and they pay $1 in London, that difference of $2, or $1, or whatever it is, appears in additional taxes. It appears in the scale of living. It appears in the ultimate cost of production for every article; and the Senator will get back, I think, in the end to the proposition which I made the other day, that the ultimate cost of production of every article is 90 per cent labor; and if we live on a higher scale here, paying higher wages, we certainly, in the comparative cost of production, have to take all the wage scales of the United States into consideration. That is my answer to the Senator.

Mr. OWEN. I have a certain intellectual sympathy with the Senator from Rhode Island in his effort to defend the indefensible.

Mr. ALDRICH. There is no intellectual effort involved in it at all. It is just simply a plain statement of facts. I do not think it requires any intellectual effort either to make the statement or to understand it.

Mr. OWEN. The cost of production involves primarily as its chief factor, upon which the most part of all the debate has turned and the main discussion has occurred, the cost of labor and difference in the cost of production. I therefore, in the attempt to bring this matter to a clear comprehension of the relative cost of production, take the primary factor of the relative cost of labor, which can be presented plainly. The Senator from Rhode Island naturally and ingeniously obscures the issue by going into broad generalities and talking about the question of labor generally and the difficulty of determining the factors in manufacturing the thousands of involved items which enter into the general schedules, and he thereby skillfully obscures the issue, so as to make it incomprehensible to the ordinary investigator. But when I call his attention to the fact that Carroll D. Wright's table shows that in woolen yarn No. 1 the percentage of labor cost is almost a trifle less than 6 per cent of the value of the product, he explains it by a generality and

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

waves it lightly aside and imputes to me a lack of understanding as explaining why I ask the question.

Mr. ALDRICH. I will try this illustration. I will try to make an application of the rule I have stated to the very thing he has under consideration. He says it costs 2 cents a pound—labor cost—in making yarn. The cost of yarns in this country depends largely upon the cost of wool in yarns, and if wool costs 22 cents in Montana, and 11 cents for the same character in Australia, the American manufacturer pays 11 cents a pound more for his wool from which that yarn is made, to start with, and the same differences between the ultimate foreign and the domestic cost of production runs through every item. So you may be perfectly certain that you must, in your ultimate cost of production, consider the conditions of labor in both countries, both being in competition. The scale of wages in both countries determines the difference in the cost of production.

Mr. OWEN. The difference in the cost of wages in this country is conceded to be 2.6 cents a pound for No. 1 wool, and nothing more.

Mr. ALDRICH. Oh, not for No. 1 wool.

Mr. OWEN. No. 1 yarn. That is the Wright table, No. 430.

Mr. ALDRICH. He is talking about transforming materials from one stage to another and nothing else.

Mr. OWEN. Granting every possible concession that the Senator from Rhode Island can insist upon within the bounds of reason, when the labor cost of transforming wool into No. 1 wool yarn is between 5 and 6 per cent, there is no possibility by which a rate of 145 per cent can be justified.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. OWEN. I yield with pleasure.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator is reading, I believe, from a document issued in 1898 or thereabouts.

Mr. OWEN. Eighteen hundred and ninety-eight to ninety-nine.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will turn to this document, just printed, which was quoted by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] last evening with such approbation, prepared by W. A. Graham Clark, special agent of the Department of Commerce and Labor, he will find, on page 5, that Mr. Clark says:

> In general it may be said that the cost of manufacture of worsteds in England is about half that in the United States.

The Senator says it is 5 or 6 per cent. But here is Mr. Clark's statement that it costs twice as much in this country as in England.

Mr. OWEN. The Senator is making a comparison of the cost in England and in the United States of worsted goods, where they obtain their wool at about half the price of what obtains here. I am talking about the labor cost in No. 1 wool yarn, as given in the Wright table, which has not yet been set aside as unsound. I am not talking about the cost of yarns or of wool in Montana and Australia, as the Senator from Rhode Island well knows, and I am not talking about the cost of manufactures of worsteds as the Senator from New Hampshire. They ingeniously and with intellectual cleverness confuse the issue of 145 per cent tariff on yarn being excessive.

Mr. GALLINGER. We pay more for our wool.

Mr. OWEN. I agree that the difference in the price of wool must be provided for in determining the difference in the cost of production, but when I call your attention to the labor cost in No. 1 yarn and when I call your attention to it as one of the important parts of the cost of production, in order that we may determine the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad, I can not help but call the attention of the country to the vital fact that the Committee on Finance has furnished us with no record whatever of the labor cost of these articles nor of the cost of production, and has left it impossible for anybody to determine the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad. It can not be done with the data given to the Senate for that purpose, and I hold the party in power and the Finance Committee directly responsible for this fatal and deliberate omission.

Mr. ALDRICH. I have tried, with considerable patience, to explain this matter for the reason that these claims as to the labor cost of production appear and reappear in tariff discussions; and I want to state the fact that the labor cost of production at a single stage in a long process of manufacturing has no value whatever in determining either the relative cost of production or the proper rate of duty which must be assessed to equalize the cost of production. If the Senator, with his analytical mind, will follow the advice which I gave him the other day, and will read that in the RECORD to-morrow, he must agree with me as to the accuracy of the statement I have made.

Mr. OWEN. I did read the matter in the RECORD. I examined it with critical care, and I find it utterly unfounded and utterly worthless. I mean to be respectful about it. But I am giving the honest judgment of my mind upon that statement made by the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. ALDRICH. Do I understand that the Senator bases this scheme of his upon a misconstruction of the statement which I made?

Mr. OWEN. Is the Senator alluding to the excellent amendment which I have offered?

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes; I was alluding to that, and I hope to test the Senate at an early hour as to their views and judgment upon the amendment.

Mr. OWEN. I base that amendment upon the theory of the Senator from Rhode Island and upon the Republican pledges of a tariff based on cost of production, and upon the Democratic view of a tariff for revenue, and not upon any conclusions of my own. Assuming the correctness of the declarations made by the Senator from Rhode Island that he is guided by the difference in the cost of production, my amendment could not possibly do harm. It might serve a useful purpose in bringing into effect the pledges made by the Republican party in 1904 and 1908, that the tariff should be written in the light of the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad, always assuming that the tariff ought not to go below a revenue-producing point, which is the Democratic view, because that is essential to the maintenance of our Government.

Mr. ALDRICH. Does not the Senator see, while he is discussing in one breath the differences in the cost of production, that he is discussing mainly the difference in the labor cost at a single stage of the process?

Mr. OWEN. I have discussed the labor cost from these tables, taking the elementary cost of labor in wool yarns, taking the labor cost with the yarn as the crudest form of manufactured material in the woolen schedule, and I call the attention of the Senator, first, that there is only 5 and 6 per cent of cost of labor in the yarn, and then in blankets the labor cost is only 15 and 20 per cent.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator must be willing to admit, I think, that there is nothing whatever about the labor cost in the Chicago platform, and he is discussing a rule which no party has ever laid down, which no political economist has ever laid down, and which no party that had any idea or knowledge of tariff legislation has ever laid down. He is discussing something entirely immaterial and entirely outside of any of the questions to which I have alluded.

Mr. OWEN. I have sought in vain to obtain from some member of the Finance Committee, somewhere, the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad. The Senate of the United States has not been furnished with that information. The Senate will not be furnished with it. The inquiry is regarded as unreasonable and unsound, not in accordance with party promises, not in accordance with the desire of the people of the United States.

I desire to emphasize this because I believe the people of the United States do not feel willing to give greater advantages to our manufacturing classes than will put them upon an equality and a parity with manufacturers abroad; that it is not the intention of the American people to allow monopoly to be sheltered under this tariff; that it ought not to be done, and therefore I call attention to the Republican party pledges, and I call attention to the fact that the Committee on Finance has given us no data to show the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad, and when it is repeatedly called for and when it is emphasized we have mere glittering generalities, subtle evasions, and the vague mal apropos that everything which is made consists altogether of labor, that there is nothing in it but labor, and therefore we must deal with these questions as altogether the product of labor, and that nothing enters into it except labor.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

Mr. OWEN. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will again turn to this recent publication of Mr. W. A. Graham Clark, he will find that, treating of an all-wool sateen, of botany wool, on page 88, he concludes his observations by saying:

> This shows the American cost of manufacture per yard to be 127 per cent higher than the English.

And he gives a concrete sample, and yet the Senator says it is 5 or 6 per cent.

Mr. OWEN. I call attention, in reply to the Senator from New Hampshire, to the fact that again he side steps and dis-

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

cusses "all-wool sateen" and does not consider the point I make—that the estimated cost in Belgium of woolen yarn is 3 cents a pound, which is higher than the American cost.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am quoting from a recent publication, which has been quoted with great approbation on the other side of the Chamber.

Mr. OWEN. I have not seen the recent publication. But "sateen" has nothing to do with my point on the labor cost of No. 1 yarn, which has more labor cost in Belgium than in the United States.

Mr. CARTER. To begin with, it is perfectly safe to say that the difference in labor cost in producing the wool out of which the cotton yarn is made exceeds 100 per cent in this country, as against the markets in which Germany and England draw their wool supply. How that 100 per cent of excess is reduced to 5½ or 6 per cent in the computation of the Senator is a mystery, unless it be true that, according to the suggestion made by the Senator from Rhode Island, the Senator from Oklahoma, in his computation, disregards the various elements that enter into the matter of cost and selects only one of the many incidents of labor from the beginning to the close of the finished yarn.

Mr. OWEN. I call the attention of the Senator from Montana to the fact that I have shown the exact number of cents that the material in these articles costs, as well as the exact number of cents of labor cost.

Mr. CARTER. In producing yarn, it is first necessary to raise wool. Following the raising of the wool, it is necessary to shear it from the sheep.

Mr. OWEN. That is a very remarkable circumstance, and I am much struck with it.

Mr. CARTER. They sometimes pull it off. Then this item of shearing, for instance, costs from a cent and a half per head up to 4 and in some instances 5 cents in Australia. In the United States the cost of shearing is from 10 to 14 cents per head. Then comes the matter of scouring, and after the wool is scoured it has to go through the process into roving; then into another form; finally into yarn.

The Senator proposes to take the mere cost of transforming the rovings into yarn and say that that is the total difference in the cost of producing the yarn in the United States and the cost abroad, when he starts out with more than 100 per cent difference in the cost of producing the wool to start with.

Mr. OWEN. As far as this particular item is concerned, I simply call attention to the labor cost in making No. 1 yarn from wool, whether the wool be cut off or pulled out of the sheep by bodily force.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

Mr. OWEN. I yield with pleasure to the Senator from Utah in the midst of my explanation.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator base his argument upon No. 1 yarn as numbered or as to the quality of the wool?

Mr. OWEN. I base my argument on No. 1 yarn, from table 430 of Carroll D. Wright's report, and the yarn described therein.

Mr. SMOOT. It would make a great deal of difference whether it is No. 1 quality or a No. 1 yarn; and I want to tell the Senator right now that there is no No. 1 yarn as numbered used anywhere in the manufacture of goods. A No. 1 yarn means that there is a pound of wool drawn out 640 yards, and there is no such number as that used in the manufacture of goods. No. 8 is about the first we use, and those are used only in blankets. Every number increases in fineness and it costs that much more to make the yarn. So if the figures which the Senator is reading here mean No. 1 yarn, then of course they are useless, and if they mean No. 1 grade of wool, I want to ask what number of yarn Mr. Wright is figuring on.

Mr. OWEN. Carroll D. Wright gives the precise cost of the materials and other items entering into the manufacture of No. 1 yarn, in Table 430, and he gives the cost of labor in transforming the materials; the cost of the materials and all other items except labor are 45.22 cents per pound. The cost of labor to transform the material is 2.6 cents per pound. In Table 431 he gives the cost likewise of No. 2 yarn; in Table 433, No. 3 yarn, and so on down to No. 10 yarn. The use to which No. 1 yarn is put is utterly immaterial and irrelevant to the discussion, as the Senator from Utah must know.

Mr. SMOOT. I see from the statement there what the Senator is driving at, and I want to call his attention to the fact that he is talking about No. 1 yarn—a great, coarse thread, almost coarser than is used in any kind of goods in this country.

Mr. OWEN. I am glad the Senator has discovered that there is a No. 1 yarn. He denied its existence but a few moments ago.

Mr. SMOOT. I say again it is not used in this country. I know what No. 1 yarn means. No. 1 yarn means that a pound of wool is drawn out 640 yards, and the Senator must know, if he knows anything of the wool business or the manufacturing of it, that that would be a very, very coarse wool thread indeed, almost a roving, and it is not used in the manufacture of goods. As I have said, the finest wool yarn that is used in the coarsest kinds of blankets is about an 8, and it runs from that up to 60. Take the difference between the manufacture of an 8 yarn and a No. 60 yarn. The whole argument of the Senator, based upon No. 1 yarn, is wrong in theory. It does not work in practice and it does not fit any goods manufactured in this country.

Mr. OWEN. The labor cost of producing blankets is 15 to 20 per cent.

Mr. SMOOT. Allow me to tell the Senator that no doubt on the cheapest-grade blanket that is made, the very cheapest, it would be 15 per cent, but I can tell the Senator that I have made blankets by the hundreds of thousands where the labor cost of making a blanket was 40 per cent.

Mr. OWEN. That may account for things which have happened in the Senator's woolen business.

Mr. SMOOT. It will happen to anybody who knows anything about the manufacture of goods.

Mr. OWEN. It is very interesting to know at least from some authority what the labor cost is in the making of blankets. So it is 40 per cent?

Mr. SMOOT. On some grades it is.

Mr. OWEN. Forty per cent under the highest-priced condition of labor that Utah affords, I think.

Mr. SMOOT. It is about the same as in other sections of the country, I think.

Mr. OWEN. The labor cost increases as you go west, in all lines. Everybody knows that to be true, and I suppose the Senator has overlooked the fact that it is true.

Mr. SMOOT. No, I have not overlooked it; I know what all the mills are paying in this country, and I know what we pay. The labor cost in the mills in Utah is about the same as in the East. Perhaps there may be some little difference on the lowest grade of labor, as an advantage to Utah, but the great bulk of labor is about the same there as in the East.

Mr. OWEN. I will ask the Senator from Utah whether he agrees with the Senator from Rhode Island that the labor cost is between 80 and 90 per cent, notwithstanding his experience of 40 per cent?

Mr. SMOOT. I am not going to discuss a question which was discussed when I was not here, and without knowing upon what basis it was made, but I judge from what the Senator says here that if he did make the statement that there was 80 per cent labor cost, it was the amount of labor from the raw product to the finished product, or in other words, to take a concrete case, from iron ore to the needle, and then I will agree with the Senator from Rhode Island that it is 80 per cent.

Mr. OWEN. If that were true, then I call the attention of the Senator to the fact that this tariff would be cumulative and would be several thousand per cent before you get to the finished product.

Mr. SMOOT. It is bound to be, from the very fact in the case I cited. Take the ore, which is worth only $2.50 a ton. It must be more than a thousand per cent between the ore and the manufacture of the finest needles.

Mr. OWEN. I am glad to hear the Senator improve upon the estimate of 80 or 90 per cent of the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. SMOOT. I will ask the Senator, Does he not believe it is?

Mr. OWEN. When you take the ore out of the ground and treat it, step by step, its increased value is due to human labor; but that proposition has no point in the proposition under discussion. It is a general truth that all things made are the products of labor.

Mr. SMOOT. That is right.

Mr. OWEN. That has nothing to do with the case where a manufacturer can bring in the material here.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

Mr. OWEN. Excuse me. I must be allowed to answer.

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. OWEN. When these yarns have to be brought in here as a product, finished up to a certain point, and then converted into a blanket, the labor cost in handling that yarn must be considered as a new proposition, beginning with the yarn in question; and that percentage of labor in making a blanket is what Carroll D. Wright's report says is 15 to 20 per cent. Our

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

blanket manufacturers can bring in the product for use in weaving blankets and use it as raw material for the purpose of making blankets; and then the question is, How much of labor cost is involved in making the blankets with that material purchased and ready for blanket making in their hands?

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator's argument places him even in a worse position than he was before, because for the coarsest kind of blanket you can take the wool, after being scoured and placed upon the cards, and get it at 15 per cent of the labor cost—not the yarn, the Senator says—ready to put into the loom. I do not think it would be 15 per cent from the yarn itself manufactured to simply weave it into a blanket. Certainly the Senator has made his case worse than ever.

Mr. OWEN. It is perfectly patent to anyone who considers this matter at all that the manufacturer who is protected in blankets by 165 per cent, and who gets his material, the yarn ready to go into the blanket, is only entitled to the protection covering the difference in the cost of labor.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator evidently does not understand the processes of manufacturing woolen goods. If I could only take him into a woolen mill and show him the steps, I know the Senator could see it. It is a pretty hard thing, it seems to me, to show him by words in a way that the Senator can understand.

Mr. OWEN. I understand perfectly well the question of the cost of production involving the material and the labor. I have been through woolen mills and seen every step. I have been discussing the labor cost alone. The question of the material is provided for by the tariff duty upon wool and the various forms of wool. But in addition to that there is also the further tax provided for blankets and for every variety of woolen manufacture.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the Senator does not mean to say that one hundred and odd more percentage outside of the duty is upon the wool and the manufacture of yarn?

Mr. OWEN. I do not. I am calling attention to the elements which enter into this manufacture, and I have called attention to it because I think that these schedules ought to be written in the light of the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad. That is not being done, and I submitted the proposed amendment merely to call the attention of the Senate to this matter. Having done so, I now withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma withdraws the amendment. Paragraph 375 is agreed to. The Secretary will state the next amendment passed over.

The SECRETARY. In paragraph 376, page 131, line 26, after the words "ad valorem," the committee proposes to insert the following proviso:

Provided, That on all the foregoing, weighing over 4 ounces per square yard, the duty shall be the same as imposed by this schedule on cloths.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the proviso carries these goods—it makes no difference what they are made of—if they weigh more than 4 ounces to the yard, back into the paragraph assessing duties upon woolen cloth, where they will encounter 44 cents a pound, owing to the compensation of the manufacturer and the cloth duty ad valorem. The House omitted it in view of the fact that these goods confessedly are not made of wool. I do not think that the amendment ought to be adopted.

Mr. ALDRICH. The provision was dropped out by mistake. It is in the present law and certainly it ought to be restored. It is the Dingley law and should be voted in.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee, which has been read.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Before the paragraph is agreed to, I desire to offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. In lieu of paragraph 376 it is proposed to insert:

376. Women's and children's dress goods, coat linings, Italian cloths, and goods of similar character or description, of which the warp consists wholly of cotton or other vegetable fiber, and the remainder of the fabric composed wholly or in part of wool, valued at not more than 20 cents per square yard, 11 cents per square yard and 25 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than 20 cents per square yard, 11 cents per square yard and 35 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That on all the foregoing weighing over 4 ounces per square yard the duty shall be the same as is imposed by this schedule on cloths.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, I offer that amendment because it appears to me to be a more rational classification of these various kinds of cloths, which are not woolen cloths at all. They are described in the paragraph as cloths that are composed wholly of cotton or other vegetable fiber, so far as the warp is concerned. The remainder of the fabric may be composed in whole or in part of wool. So in these cloths there is no pretense made that they are woolen cloths except that they may have the weft of wool, though it is not necessary even for them to have all the weft of wool. I am told by expert weavers that when the warp is entirely cotton it is technically impossible to have the weft entirely of wool.

Mr. President, in 1897 Governor Dingley, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, had by his side a very wise counselor, especially upon the woolen schedule, and I hold in my hand the letter of the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House, dated January 26, 1897, in his own handwriting, introducing Colonel Tichenor, confidential adviser of the committee, to two gentlemen—the president and the secretary of the American Woolen Manufacturers' Association. I also hold in my hand Colonel Tichenor's letter to Governor Dingley, found among his papers, dated Washington, D. C., June 26, 1897, in which he calls attention to the fact that various changes have been made by the Senate committee in its bill on wools of classes 1 and 2, and reciting what he regarded as proper paragraphs covering yarns, cloths, blankets, and women's dress goods.

I have had such confidence in his knowledge in the mechanism of this tariff schedule, and I have had so many evidences of his dissatisfaction with the excesses and extravagances that have crept into the assessments of these rates, that I have taken the liberty to cut out of this yellow manuscript containing his notes upon the tariff law of 1897 this one, being in the form of a letter to Governor Dingley—paragraph 376 as Colonel Tichenor thought it ought to have been written in the Dingley tariff law.

Mr. ALDRICH. Has the Senator put that letter in the RECORD?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I have it not at hand here. I have a great mass of papers that I have not brought forward so as to avoid controversies of one sort and another which I do not desire to have arise at this stage of our proceedings.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. DOLLIVER. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

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

Mr. JONES (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. I transfer that pair to my colleague [Mr. PILES], and I vote "nay."

The roll call having been concluded, the result was announced—yeas 30, nays 41, as follows:

YEAS—30.

Bacon	Clay	Hughes	Overman
Bankhead	Culberson	Johnston, Ala.	Owen
Beveridge	Cummins	La Follette	Paynter
Bristow	Davis	McLaurin	Rayner
Brown	Dolliver	Martin	Taliaferro
Burkett	Fletcher	Money	Taylor
Chamberlain	Foster	Nelson	
Clapp	Gore	Newlands	

NAYS—41.

Aldrich	Crawford	Guggenheim	Perkins
Bradley	Cullom	Heyburn	Root
Brandegee	Curtis	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Briggs	Depew	Jones	Smith, Mich.
Bulkeley	Dick	Kean	Smoot
Burnham	Dillingham	Lodge	Stephenson
Burrows	Dixon	McCumber	Sutherland
Burton	du Pont	Nixon	Warner
Carter	Flint	Oliver	
Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Page	
Crane	Gamble	Penrose	

NOT VOTING—20.

Bailey	Elkins	Piles	Smith, S. C.
Borah	Frazier	Richardson	Stone
Bourne	Frye	Shively	Tillman
Clarke, Ark.	Hale	Simmons	Warren
Daniel	McEnery	Smith, Md.	Wetmore

So Mr. DOLLIVER's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The paragraph is agreed to as amended. The next paragraph will be read.

The Secretary read paragraph 377, as follows:

377. On women's and children's dress goods, coat linings, Italian cloths, bunting, and goods of similar description or character composed wholly or in part of wool, and not specially provided for in this section, the duty shall be 11 cents per square yard; and in addition thereto on all the foregoing valued at not above 70 cents per pound, 50 per cent ad valorem; valued above 70 cents per pound, 55 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That on all the foregoing weighing over 4 ounces per square yard the duty shall be the same as imposed by this schedule on cloths.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

pride of opinion with respect to my own amendment. I have felt at perfect liberty to confer with my friend, the Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY], in order that we might compare the amendment offered by him with the amendment offered by me. I have been exceedingly anxious to reach some plan by which there need be but a single vote upon the subject of the income tax. There were but slight differences—no essential differences—between his plan and the one found in the amendment which I last offered.

I say candidly and frankly that I have conferred with the Senator from Texas, with a view to framing this measure so that the very best elements in his amendment might be combined with the best elements in mine, and therefore command the utmost strength that the proposition to levy an income tax has in this body.

I therefore move an amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas to strike out, in line 7, page 1, the word "three" and to substitute therefor the word "two."

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, if it would be convenient to the Senator from Iowa, I would suggest that this amendment be offered and printed. I am desirous, if possible, if we are to have a postponement of this proposition for a week, that we should go on as rapidly as possible with the pending schedule.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I agree, I think, fully with the Senator from Rhode Island. I do not intend to argue these matters. I had hoped that after the amendment shall be perfected, as I believe it will be in a very few minutes, we might then have it printed, so that, before it is finally considered, it may be seen as a whole and connectedly.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa.

The SECRETARY. On page 1, line 7, before the words "per centum," it is proposed to strike out "three" and to insert "two."

Mr. CUMMINS. I also offer——

Mr. BAILEY. I suggest to the Senator from Iowa that we agree to that amendment as we go along.

Mr. CUMMINS. Precisely.

Mr. ALDRICH. I think that the Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] ought to be permitted to modify and perfect their propositions without the approval of the Senate, because they have a right to do that—a moral right—but I should not like to have them expect the Senate to concur.

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator from Iowa and the "Senator from Texas" are doing, in the presence of the open Senate, what we have agreed——

Mr. ALDRICH. What you have already done——

Mr. BAILEY. Is a right and proper adjustment of any differences. If the Senator from Rhode Island wants the matter printed as we shall offer it, I think it fair to do it in this way.

Mr. ALDRICH. I have no objection to that; I have no objection to any modification that the high contracting parties may agree to; but I do not myself desire to be made a party to this controversy.

Mr. BAILEY. We shall try to accomplish that later.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair then understands that the Senator from Texas modifies his amendment.

Mr. CUMMINS. I offer the amendment, and I think the Senator from Texas accepts it.

Mr. BAILEY. I accept the amendment of the Senator from Iowa.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Then it becomes a part of the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CUMMINS. I also move to strike out from and including line 23, on page 3, to, but not including line 15, on page 6, and to substitute therefor that which I send to the Secretary's desk; which I say to the Senate is a substitute of the provision in my amendment respecting corporations for the provision in the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas. As originally offered, they differ only in this: That I provided for the reimbursement to stockholders of corporations, taxed under this law, whose total incomes from all sources are less than $5,000, of the amount which, as stockholders, they contributed to the tax paid by the corporation, the intent being to relieve all persons whose incomes were not more than $5,000 from the operation of this tax. I call that also to the attention of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. BAILEY. That amendment, Mr. President, is entirely understood between the Senator from Iowa and myself, and I accept it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] accepts the modification of the amendment in accordance with the suggestion of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS].

Mr. CUMMINS. Those are the only amendments which I propose to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas. Without debating the subject at all at this time, I leave it, saying that, with these amendments, I am wholly satisfied with the measure as presented by him.

Mr. BAILEY. Now, Mr. President, I wish——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. May the Chair interrupt the Senator to request that the Secretary report the amendment moved by the Senator from Iowa to the amendment of the Senator from Texas? It has not yet been reported.

Mr. BAILEY. I thought the Secretary did report the amendment when the Senator from Iowa offered it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Iowa stated the substance of it, but it has not been reported from the desk.

Mr. ALDRICH. That is not necessary.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair does not suppose that is necessary.

Mr. BAILEY. I ask that the amendment be printed in the RECORD without taking time to read it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. That order will be made, in the absence of objection.

The modification proposed by Mr. CUMMINS to the amendment of Mr. BAILEY was to strike out from the amendment, beginning in line 23, on page 3, down to and including line 14, on page 6, and in lieu thereof to insert:

SEC. —. That there shall be assessed, levied, and collected for the calendar year 1909, and for each calendar year thereafter, a duty of 2 per cent on the net gains, profits, and income over and above $5,000 of all corporations, companies, or associations organized for pecuniary profit under the laws of the United States or under the laws of any State or Territory or doing business for pecuniary profit in the United States, no matter where or how created or organized, but not including copartnerships. The aforesaid net gains, profits, or income of any such corporation, company, or association shall include its entire gains, profits, and income save and except the amounts paid out during the year for maintenance, operation, and a reasonable allowance for depreciation; and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to prescribe and establish such system of bookkeeping and reports as may be necessary to insure uniformity in this respect: *Provided, however*, That nothing herein contained shall apply to corporations, companies, or associations organized and conducted solely for charitable, religious, or educational purposes, including fraternal beneficiary societies, orders, or associations operating upon the lodge system and providing for the payment of life, sick, accident, and other benefits to the members of such societies, orders, or associations and dependents of such members; nor to the stocks, shares, funds, or securities held by any fiduciary or trustee for charitable, religious, or educational purposes; nor to building and loan associations or companies which make loans only to their shareholders; nor to such savings banks, savings institutions, or societies as shall, first, have no stockholders or members except depositors and no capital except deposits; secondly, shall not receive deposits to an aggregate amount, in any one year, of more than $1,000 from the same depositor; thirdly, shall not allow an accumulation or total of deposits, by any one depositor, exceeding $10,000; fourthly, shall actually divide and distribute to its depositors, ratably to deposits, all the earnings over the necessary and proper expenses of such bank, institution, or society, except such as shall be applied to surplus; fifthly, shall not possess, in any form, a surplus fund exceeding 10 per cent of its aggregate deposits; nor to such savings banks, saving institutions, or societies composed of members who do not participate in the profits thereof and which pay interest or dividends only to their depositors; nor to that part of the business of any savings bank, institution, or other similar association having a capital stock, that is conducted on the mutual plan solely for the benefit of its depositors on such plan, and which shall keep its accounts of its business conducted on such mutual plan separate and apart from its other accounts; nor to any insurance company or association which conducts all its business solely upon the mutual plan and only for the benefit of its policy holders or members, and having no capital stock and no stock or share holders, and holding all its property in trust and in reserve for its policy holders or members; nor to that part of the business of any insurance company having a capital stock and stock and share holders, which is conducted on the mutual plan, separate from its stock plan of insurance, and solely for the benefit of the policy holders and members insured on said mutual plan, and holding all the property belonging to and derived from said mutual part of its business in trust and reserve for the benefit of its policy holders and members insured on said mutual plan; nor to any part of the business of any insurance company having a capital stock and stock and stockholders except as to those gains and profits and income legally distributable to such capital stock and among such stock and stockholders. All State, county, municipal, and town taxes paid by corporations, companies, or associations shall be included in the operating and business expenses of such corporations, companies, or associations.

Provided further, Any stockholder of any corporation, company, or association the income of which is taxable and taxed under the provisions hereof, whose total income from all sources does not render him liable to the duty herein provided for, may, at any time within six months after the corporation or association of which he is a stockholder has paid the duty herein required, file a written application with the collector of the district in which he resides, in such form as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe, showing that his total income for the year under consideration, computed as hereinbefore set forth, did not exceed $5,000. Such application shall be under oath and accompanied by such other proof as the rules and regulations may require. If the application and proof are satisfactory to the collector, and are approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, and it further appears that the gains or profits of any share or shares of capital stock owned by any such stockholder in any such corporation have been included in the income upon which the corporation has paid a duty, then the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to the applicant the proportionate part which his share or shares contributed to such duty, the intent being to exempt any person whose total income, computed as herein provided, is not more than 5,000

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

from the payment, directly or indirectly, of an income duty, and the Secretary of the Treasury is expressly authorized to establish such rules and regulations, and to provide such forms, as will enable such persons to present their claims and receive their reimbursement with least difficulty and delay consistent with the due administration of the law.

Mr. ALDRICH. I think the Senator from Texas has a right to modify his own amendment to make it agree with this joint production of the Senator from Iowa and the Senator from Texas.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Rhode Island is right.

Mr. BAILEY. Now, in order that the Senator from Rhode Island may have the benefit of "the joint production," to which he refers, I ask that the pending amendment as modified by these amendments shall be printed in bill form.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, that request is agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. I now move that the further consideration of this amendment be postponed until the 18th day of June.

Mr. BAILEY. On that I demand the yeas and nays.

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

Mr. DAVIS (when the name of Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas was called). My colleague [Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas] is paired with the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. RICHARDSON]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. CRAWFORD (when Mr. GAMBLE's name was called). My colleague [Mr. GAMBLE] is paired with the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. SHIVELY]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. McLAURIN (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH]. If he were present, I should vote "nay," and he would vote "yea."

Mr. TILLMAN (when the name of Mr. SMITH of South Carolina was called). My colleague [Mr. SMITH of South Carolina] is absent on account of illness in his family. If present, my colleague would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. PILES. My colleague [Mr. JONES] is absent for a few minutes. If he were present, he would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 34, as follows:

YEAS—45.

Aldrich	Crane	Frye	Perkins
Beveridge	Crawford	Gallinger	Root
Bradley	Cullom	Guggenheim	Scott
Brandegee	Curtis	Heyburn	Smoot
Brown	Depew	Johnson, N. Dak.	Stephenson
Bulkeley	Dick	Kean	Sutherland
Burkett	Dillingham	Lodge	Warner
Burnham	Dixon	Nelson	Warren
Burrows	Dolliver	Nixon	Wetmore
Burton	du Pont	Oliver	
Carter	Elkins	Page	
Clark, Wyo.	Flint	Penrose	

NAYS—34.

Bacon	Culberson	La Follette	Rayner
Bailey	Cummins	McEnery	Simmons
Bankhead	Davis	Martin	Smith, Md.
Borah	Fletcher	Money	Stone
Bourne	Foster	Newlands	Taliaferro
Bristow	Frazier	Overman	Taylor
Chamberlain	Gore	Owen	Tillman
Clapp	Hughes	Paynter	
Clay	Johnston, Ala.	Piles	

NOT VOTING—12.

Briggs	Gamble	McCumber	Shively
Clarke, Ark.	Hale	McLaurin	Smith, Mich.
Daniel	Jones	Richardson	Smith, S. C.

So the motion of Mr. ALDRICH to postpone was agreed to.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

Mr. BROWN. I ask to have the amendment printed without reading, and that it lie on the table.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, that order will be made.

Mr. BROWN. I desire to say, however, that the amendment proposes a joint resolution for an amendment of the Constitution, which shall give Congress the undoubted power to levy a tax on incomes. I give notice further that as soon as the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] is disposed of, whenever that may be, I shall call up the amendment I now present.

Mr. FLINT. Mr. President, on the vote which was taken on the amendments of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], I inadvertently voted without noticing that my pair, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON], was absent. I therefore desire to withdraw my vote.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California to withdraw his vote? The Chair hears none.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, that, as I understand, is a vote which has been passed and announced.

Mr. FLINT. It is.

Mr. BACON. I do not think, Mr President, that it is in accord with the practice of the Senate to withdraw a vote under such circumstances. The simple statement made by the Senator will accomplish the same purpose. It is not competent to change the record as it has been made.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It can only be done by unanimous consent. Therefore, the Chair——

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The only thing that can be done is to correct the record.

Mr. BACON. I would suggest to the Senator that the announcement made by him that his vote was caused by a misapprehension, and that it did not change the result would accomplish the purpose which he has in view.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks the Senator can withdraw his vote by unanimous consent.

Mr. BACON. Undoubtedly. I simply stated, Mr. President, that the request of the Senator from California was not in accord with our custom.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair so understood the Senator.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that the remaining paragraphs of Schedule K be agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the remaining paragraphs of Schedule K are agreed to.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I now present the motion upon which I delivered some remarks this morning, which I ask may be stated.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the motion.

The Secretary read as follows:

Mr. CUMMINS moves to recommit Schedule K to the Finance Committee, with instructions to again consider the same and report a schedule as follows, to wit:

1. With the duties on wool unchanged.

2. With so-called "compensatory duties" to the woolen manufacturers that will measure the difference between the price which domestic manufacturers pay for wool and the price paid by their chief foreign competitors.

3. A further duty upon imported woolen manufactures that will represent the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad, with a fair manufacturers' profit added, less the compensatory duties already given to domestic manufacturers because of the higher price they are compelled to pay for wool.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I do not intend to repeat anything I said this morning, and I said then everything I desired to say respecting this motion. I believe it embodies the Republican view of a protective tariff upon these duties and puts upon the Finance Committee a specific instruction, under which, as good Republicans, they ought now to act, by virtue of our platform. Upon the motion, if there is to be no further discussion, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. McLAURIN. Mr. President, I merely wish to put in the RECORD, before the vote is taken, some statistics, furnished me by a statistician in whom I have confidence, showing that, according to the statistics of the Department of Agriculture, there were in this country in 1884, 50,360,243 sheep.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, will it inconvenience the Senator from Mississippi to allow a vote to be taken on this proposition?

Mr. McLAURIN. I will only take half a minute. In 1884 the number of sheep in this country was, as I have stated, 50,360,243; in 1890 the number of sheep was 44,336,072; in 1903 the number was 63,964,876; and in 1908 it was 54,631,000. I merely make this statement so that it may appear in the RECORD, for the purpose of showing that in years when the Wilson tariff law was not in force there was a great falling off in the sheep in this country.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The pending question is on the motion of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] to recommit to the Committee on Finance Schedule K, with instructions, on which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. TILLMAN. With what sort of instructions?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The instructions have been read. The Secretary will again read them, if there be no objection.

Mr. TILLMAN. There is a difference of opinion in regard to the matter, and I should like to hear them again read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will again read.

The Secretary again read the motion of Mr. CUMMINS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Mr. CURTIS (when his name was called). I desire to announce my pair with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER].

Mr. FLETCHER (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BRIGGS], and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. McLAURIN (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH]. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BURROWS. My colleague [Mr. SMITH of Michigan] is unavoidably absent. He is paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. McLAURIN]. I am at liberty to say, however, that if my colleague were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. McLAURIN. Upon the statement of the Senator from Michigan that the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH], with whom I am paired, would vote "nay" if present, I will take the liberty of voting. I vote "nay."

Mr. KEAN. My colleague [Mr. BRIGGS] is necessarily absent. He is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. CULBERSON. I am requested to announce that the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER] is paired on this question with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS]. If the Senator from Maryland were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. CURTIS. In view of the announcement of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] as to how the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER], with whom I am paired, would vote if present, I will take the liberty of voting. I vote "nay."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I desire to say that I withheld my vote because I am opposed to a portion of the motion of the Senator from Iowa and in favor of a portion of it, and so could neither vote for it or against it.

The result was announced—yeas 8, nays 59, as follows:

YEAS—8.

Beveridge	Brown	Clapp	Dolliver
Bristow	Burkett	Cummins	Nelson

NAYS—59.

Aldrich	Crawford	Gore	Paynter
Bacon	Culberson	Guggenheim	Penrose
Bankhead	Cullom	Heyburn	Piles
Bourne	Curtis	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Bradley	Davis	Kean	Scott
Brandegee	Depew	Lodge	Simmons
Bulkeley	Dick	McEnery	Smoot
Burnham	Dillingham	McLaurin	Stephenson
Burrows	Dixon	Martin	Stone
Burton	du Pont	Money	Sutherland
Carter	Elkins	Nixon	Taliaferro
Chamberlain	Flint	Oliver	Tillman
Clark, Wyo.	Foster	Overman	Warren
Clay	Frye	Owen	Wetmore
Crane	Gallinger	Page	

NOT VOTING—24.

Bailey	Frazier	La Follette	Shively
Borah	Gamble	McCumber	Smith, Md.
Briggs	Hale	Newlands	Smith, Mich.
Clarke, Ark.	Hughes	Perkins	Smith, S. C.
Daniel	Johnston, Ala.	Rayner	Taylor
Fletcher	Jones	Richardson	Warner

So the motion of Mr. CUMMINS was rejected.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The hour of 5.30 o'clock having arrived, the Senate stands in recess until 8 o'clock this evening.

EVENING SESSION.

The Senate reassembled at 8 o'clock p. m.

THE TARIFF.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask unanimous consent that we now take up the free list for consideration.

Mr. BROWN. I should like to inquire why we should pass over——

Mr. CULBERSON. We on this side are unable to hear.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Will the Senator please speak a bit louder?

Mr. BROWN. I want to inquire why it is necessary to pass over the schedule relating to pulp and print paper?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. For how long?

Mr. SMOOT. The committee thought it was proper to pass that over, at least for a day or two, in the absence of the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], who is not well enough to be here, and I would not like to have it taken up in his absence.

Mr. BROWN. Of course under those circumstances I would not insist on taking up the schedule.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Utah asks unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of the free list. Is there objection?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Wait a minute. Pardon me a minute.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. In one moment; the Chair will recognize the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. CLAPP. I suggest the want of a quorum.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Minnesota suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Frye	Penrose
Bacon	Clarke, Ark.	Gallinger	Perkins
Bailey	Crane	Gore	Piles
Beveridge	Crawford	Heyburn	Root
Borah	Culberson	Johnston, Ala.	Scott
Brandegee	Cullom	Kean	Simmons
Bristow	Cummins	La Follette	Smith, Md.
Brown	Curtis	Lodge	Smoot
Bulkeley	Davis	McCumber	Stephenson
Burkett	Dick	McEnery	Stone
Burnham	Dixon	Martin	Sutherland
Burrows	Dolliver	Money	Taliaferro
Burton	du Pont	Nelson	Tillman
Carter	Fletcher	Oliver	Warren
Chamberlain	Flint	Overman	Wetmore
Clapp	Foster	Page	

Mr. PILES. My colleague [Mr. JONES] is necessarily detained from the Chamber to-night.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Sixty-three Senators have answered to the roll call. A quorum of the Senate is present. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Utah?

Mr. BROWN. Of course, on the statement of the Senator from Utah, I would not insist on an objection, but I call the attention of the Senator from Rhode Island to the fact that this bill has been before the Senate now for nearly ten weeks.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. For what purpose does the Senator from Texas rise?

Mr. CULBERSON. I rise to inquire what is the request of the Senator from Utah?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. That the Senate now proceed to the consideration of the free-list provisions of the bill.

Mr. BROWN. This bill has been pending in the Senate now for almost ten weeks. It came here with no report and no recommendation with respect to Schedule M, the schedule relating to pulp, paper, and books; and I should like to inquire if it is not about time that the Senate had some light as to when a report is likely to be made. The Senate, I believe—and I know I, myself—would be enlightened considerably if it were known what the report is likely to be.

Mr. ALDRICH. The committee reported on all the paragraphs of Schedule M except the clause relating to printing paper. As I stated to the Senate the other day, the report of the committee is likely to be a rate which is less than the present law and in excess of the House rate.

Mr. BROWN. That is a wide margin, Mr. President. Can we have any indication about where——

Mr. ALDRICH. It is not so very wide. The House provides for a duty of $2 a ton on print paper, and the present law is 0.3 of a cent a pound, or $6 a ton. The Senator can exercise his ingenuity within those limits in making as good a guess as he can as to what the rate will be.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. What the rate recommended by the committee will be.

Mr. BROWN. I was going to say it would take great ingenuity on the part of any man to divine what the committee will report. I want to say that the hesitation and doubt of the committee on this subject give hope to men that the increase may not be so high on this schedule as on some of the others.

Mr. ALDRICH. There is sure to be a reduction. Whether the reduction will reach the rather radical ideas of my friend, the Senator from Nebraska, I am not so sure. I have been trying in all these provisions, so far as I could, to make the reductions conform to his views.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Utah?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator from Rhode Island was addressing the Chair at that particular moment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. What is the request?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Indiana was not understood by the Chair.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I was listening to the remarks of the Senator from Rhode Island, and in the midst of them the Chair suggested the order.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair did not intend to present the request until the Senator from Rhode Island had taken his seat.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. He was still on his feet. But that is a small matter. What is the request?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair regrets that he affronted the Senator from Rhode Island. He did not do so intentionally, and the Senator from Rhode Island had not complained. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Utah?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Now, what is that request?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will again repeat the request—that the Senate now consider the free-list portion of the bill. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Secretary——

Mr. LODGE. Beginning with the free list, line 17, page 193, has been agreed to by the Senate, and I ask leave to add—it is an oversight in the bill—in line 17, after the words "Philippine Islands," the words "and the islands of Guam and Tutuila."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will report the amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SCOTT. That is a committee amendment?

Mr. LODGE. Yes; a committee amendment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It is a committee amendment.

The SECRETARY. In line 17, page 193, after the words "Philippine Islands," insert the words "and the islands of Guam and Tutuila."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Rhode Island asks unanimous consent that the amendment be agreed to. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Secretary will report the first paragraph passed over.

The SECRETARY. The first paragraph passed over is 472.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I desire to say a word concerning my vote on the last roll call before the recess was taken, and I refer to the motion of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] to recommit the woolen schedule, with instructions to the Finance Committee to report the same back in accordance with the Republican platform, covering the difference between wages here and abroad plus a reasonable profit to the manufacturer. That motion was made during my absence from the Chamber, and I returned after the roll call had been concluded and upon the eve of the announcement of the result of the vote being made by the Secretary. I did not at that time fully appreciate the issue which had been raised by that motion, and I do not wish my vote against the motion to be understood as committing me in any measure to the pending bill or as committing me to any of its sections, schedules, principles, or provisions. Indeed, it was impossible for me to register my views by my vote upon that question.

I regard the pending measure as being just about as bad as human ingenuity can make it. I regard it as a great deal worse than the present Dingley law. I will vote with pleasure for any motion which might have any possible tendency either to defeat this measure or to improve it in the interest of the American people and the American consumer. The motion of the Senator from Iowa, however, was to instruct the committee to report this measure back in accordance with the Republican platform and in accordance with the principle of protection.

Mr. President, I do not believe in the principle of protection. I do not believe that the American consumer should be taxed to enrich the American producer. I believe that American people and American labor in an open contest with the rest of the world can win the race. I believe that low taxation is a blessing and that high taxation is a curse, whether that taxation be either direct or indirect. It is apparent, therefore, that I could not either by an affirmative or a negative vote register my views with fidelity and precision upon that motion. If I had been present, I should have asked to be excused from voting.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will report the first paragraph passed over.

Mr. STONE. It is paragraph 472.

The SECRETARY. The first paragraph passed over is No. 472.

Mr. STONE. I desire to offer an amendment to the paragraph.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator will present his amendment, and the Secretary will state it.

The SECRETARY. Amend paragraph 472 by inserting, after the word "carbolic," in line 18, the word "chlorosulphonic."

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, there is a large manufacturing chemical company in St. Louis, known as the "Monsanto Chemical Works." It is a very large and very responsible chemical concern. The president of that company was here, and, I think, conferred with some members of the Finance Committee about one or two matters, at least. I am sorry to say that he is a very pronounced Republican.

I will read to the Senate, and particularly to the Senators who are in charge of this bill, a brief statement which he made to me, with reference to this matter. He said:

In explanation: Chlorosulphonic acid is produced by injecting hydrochloric (muriatic) acid into fuming sulphuric acid, which results in a chemical reaction in the formation of a new chemical compound which is itself an acid.

Used largely in Germany in chemical manufacturing for the sulphonation of organic chemical compounds.

None manufactured in this country and none probable. We approached every acid manufacturer in the United States to produce it for us, but they refused to undertake it because of limited demand and heavy cost for installation for its manufacture.

We imported 250,000 to 300,000 pounds a year for two years, paying the assessed rate of 25 per cent as a "chemical compound," but were forced to discontinue a year ago.

None imported now and none likely so long as it is on the dutiable list. We will use about 300,000 pounds annually if placed on the free list.

MONSANTO CHEMICAL WORKS,
St. Louis.

According to this statement, in which I have absolute credence, none of this article is manufactured here and none is likely to be.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. STONE. I do.

Mr. SMOOT. I remember that the gentleman called at my office, and we discussed the question. I think I have an exact copy of the statement the Senator has just read.

Mr. CUMMINS. I suggest if this is a matter to be submitted to the Senate, we would like to hear what is going on.

Mr. SMOOT. I say I think I have an exact copy of the statement which was just read by the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. STONE. I have no doubt of it.

Mr. SMOOT. I have not the copy with me, and I forget whether the gentleman stated what they are using to-day in place of this particular chemical.

Mr. STONE. He does not state what they are using in place of it. I asked him that question, and he told me there was nothing they could use in place of it, and they had to discontinue the manufacture of the article in which this acid was employed.

Mr. DU PONT. I should like to ask the Senator from Missouri for what purpose this acid is used?

Mr. STONE. He says in this statement it is used for "the sulphonation of organic chemical compounds." The point I make is that as it is an acid used in a considerable degree in manufacture, as none is made here, and none can be made here, it ought to go on the free list.

Mr. ALDRICH. I have no objection to its going on the free list, and before it is reached in conference the committee will make a careful examination of it.

Mr. STONE. I am entirely satisfied with that course.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The paragraph as amended, without objection, is agreed to. The Secretary will report the next paragraph passed over.

The SECRETARY. On page 194, line 6, the committee proposes to strike out paragraph 480, in the following words:

480. Ammonia, sulphate of.

Mr. ALDRICH. Several Senators who are interested in this particular amendment are not present to-night, and I think I will have to ask that it may go over.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Rhode Island? The Chair hears none. The Secretary will report the next paragraph passed over.

The SECRETARY. On page 194, line 8, in paragraph 482, after the word "imported," the committee proposes to strike out the words "by a citizen of the United States."

Mr. ALDRICH. The second amendment, in lines 10 and 11, striking out the words "whether intended to be so used by the importer himself or for sale for such purpose," the committee are satisfied would be a mistake. They therefore withdraw the second amendment.

Mr. BURKETT. I suggest to the Senator that, in my opinion, this privilege has always been given to citizens of the United States.

Mr. ALDRICH. I have no objection to withdrawing them both.

Mr. LODGE. That is not the way it is in the old law.

Mr. BURKETT. I have three or four copies of acts where it stands as it would with the clause out.

Mr. LODGE. The existing law has no limitation to citizens of the United States.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Mr. ALDRICH. This paragraph contains provisions regarding crude and refined petroleum. I understand that amendments will be offered to that paragraph, and I ask that it be passed over.

Mr. KEAN. I suggest that another amendment be made before the paragraph is passed over, by inserting "nut oil or oil of nuts," which by amendment are made dutiable at 8 cents a gallon in paragraph 35½.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair desires to inquire of the Senator from Rhode Island whether he desires a vote upon the amendment which he offered in line 10 before the paragraph is passed over?

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes; I ask that the Senate agree to the amendment striking out "orange oil."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Now, the Senator asks that the entire paragraph be passed over.

Mr. ALDRICH. Before that is done, I move to insert in line 9 the words "nut oil or oil of nuts."

Mr. BURTON. After the words "enfleurage grease," which occur at the end of line 9, the words "nut oil or oil of nuts" should be inserted.

Mr. ALDRICH. That is the amendment I have just suggested.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After the word "grease," at the end of line 9, it is proposed to insert the words "nut oil or oil of nuts" and a comma.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the paragraph will be now passed over.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That is the oil of the alurites cordata, or the Chinese nut, is it not?

Mr. ALDRICH. The Chinese nut.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the paragraph will be passed over.

Mr. CULBERSON. I will say that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. MONEY] desires to move to put on the free list oleo stearin. He has been called away from the Senate to-night on account of sickness; but whatever may be done to preserve his rights in the matter, I wish to do.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator refers to oleo stearin?

Mr. CULBERSON. Yes.

Mr. ALDRICH. I will offer that amendment. I move to insert a new paragraph to be known as paragraph 637½, "Oleo stearin."

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee whether there have been inserted, in line 13, page 212, after the word "palm," the words "palm kernel?"

Mr. ALDRICH. Not yet; but I am willing that that shall be done.

Mr. PENROSE. I offer that amendment. I understand it has been offered in the Senate by the Senator from Ohio, and I ask for its adoption.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Rhode Island has already presented an amendment which has not yet been acted upon. In the absence of objection, that amendment will be laid aside, and the amendment proposed by the Senator from Pennsylvania will, without objection, be now considered. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Paragraph 637, page 212, line 13, after the word "palm," it is proposed to insert the words "palm kernel."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. I have another amendment to that paragraph, while we are upon it. I move to strike out, in line 12, after the word "use," the words "and valued at not more than 60 cents per gallon."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 12, page 212, after the word "use," it is proposed to strike out the words "and valued at not more than 60 cents per gallon."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that the amendment inserting oleo stearin be agreed to.

Mr. KEAN. I have another amendment to paragraph 637, which I was going to ask the Senator if he would accept. It is to insert the words "soya-bean oil."

Mr. ALDRICH. I presume I will have to take the Senator's statement that it is all right.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I should like the Senator from New Jersey to explain what that oil is.

Mr. KEAN. It is oil used in the making of soap.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I know; but what is the oil?

Mr. KEAN. It is soya-bean oil, which is used in the making of soap.

Mr. STONE. Is soap on the free list?

Mr. KEAN. No; it is not; but this is one of the materials of which soap is made.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, I desire to understand what new article is suggested for the free list.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. After the words "nut oil, or oil of nuts," insert "soya-bean oil," at the end of line 9, page 212.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I was going to suggest to the Senator from New Jersey that, while I have been familiar with that subject for a long time, I never heard of oil being produced from beans. [Laughter.]

Mr. KEAN. I think if the Senator would examine the bean family he would know that there is a great deal of oil in beans.

Mr. PILES. Should not the words "soya bean" be used in place of "soya-bean oil?"

Mr. KEAN. That is what I desire.

Mr. PILES. I move to amend so that it will read "soya bean."

Mr. SMOOT. The amendment comes in under the heading of "Oils," and all that it is necessary to say is "soya bean."

Mr. KEAN. That is all.

Mr. DOLLIVER. That simplifies it. [Laughter.]

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will again state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. After the amendment inserted at the end of line 9, it is proposed to insert the words "soya bean."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senator from Rhode Island to the amendment which he has proposed and which has not been adopted.

Mr. ALDRICH. The amendment to insert "oleo stearin?"

Mr. CULBERSON. Yes.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 212 it is proposed to add as a new paragraph the following:

637½. Oleo stearin.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The next paragraph passed over will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Paragraph 638, orange and lemon peel, not preserved, candied, or dried.

The paragraph was agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask to reconsider paragraph 641 for the purpose of offering the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the vote by which the paragraph was agreed to is reconsidered. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In paragraph 641, on page 213, line 1, after the word "bagging," insert "and all other waste."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. Also in line 2, after the word "bags," strike out "fit only to be converted into," and insert in lieu thereof "used chiefly for."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. And also after the word "paper," at the end of the paragraph, insert the word "making."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FLETCHER. If the words which are proposed to be stricken out, as the amendment has been reported by the Secretary, were to be replaced by the words mentioned by him, the paragraph would not make sense.

Mr. ALDRICH. Is the Senator speaking of paragraph 641?

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes; paragraph 641. I think the amendment does not read properly.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. If there be no objection, the Secretary will read the paragraph as amended.

The Secretary read as follows:

641. Paper stock, crude, of every description, including all grasses, fibers, rags (other than wool), waste, including jute waste, shavings, clippings, old paper, rope ends, waste rope, and waste bagging, and all other waste, including old gunny cloth and old gunny bags, fit only to be converted into paper making.

Mr. BURTON. I do not think that is quite correct. It should read "used chiefly for paper making." The words "fit only to be converted into" should be stricken out, and in place of those words should be inserted the words "used chiefly for."

Mr. ALDRICH. That is correct, "used chiefly for paper making."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. That is the way the amendment reads as it has been agreed to.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Mr. DOLLIVER. The Senator from Georgia was speaking some time ago of the discrimination in the free return of bags that had been used in the conveyance of wheat in our exports of wheat as against the free importation of cotton bagging. I call his attention to the fact that the cotton bagging seems to return to the United States free, just as other bagging does, except that it happens to come back as paper stock and waste of jute fit for paper stock, and commonly used as such. So that any additional legislation is unnecessary, as they are practically on the same basis now.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the paragraph as amended.

The paragraph as amended was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the next paragraph passed over.

The SECRETARY. Paragraph 651, plumbago.

Mr. HEYBURN. I should like to inquire if the language of paragraph 641 as to paper stock would not include wool?

Mr. ALDRICH. Oh, no.

Mr. HEYBURN. Well, it reads "paper stock, crude, of every description."

Mr. ALDRICH. Oh, no; it does not include that.

Mr. FLINT. "Paper stock * * * other than wool" is the language used.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to paragraph 651.

The paragraph was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The next paragraph passed over will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Paragraph 652, potash, crude, or "black salts." In line 7, after the word "crude," the committee propose to insert "or refined."

Mr. KEAN. I hope that amendment will not be agreed to. It puts refined saltpeter on the free list.

Mr. ALDRICH. Very well; I withdraw the amendment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment is withdrawn. In the absence of objection, the paragraph is agreed to.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I desire to ask that this paragraph be passed over. I have an amendment that I think I shall want to propose to it, but I do not desire to do so at present.

Mr. KEAN. I have no objection to the paragraph being passed over if the words "or refined" are withdrawn, and that has already been done.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Paragraph 652 will be passed over, with the committee amendment disagreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is almost 11 o'clock, and I think we might as well conclude our labors. I therefore move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 10 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, June 12, 1909, at 10.30 o'clock a. m.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, *June 12, 1909.*

The Senate met at 10.30 o'clock a. m.

Prayer by Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D., of the city of Washington.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. SCOTT presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Wheeling, W. Va., remonstrating against an increase of the duty on print paper and wood pulp, as proposed in the so-called "Payne tariff bill," which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. OLIVER presented petitions of sundry citizens of Lawrenceville and Armagh, in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. DEPEW presented memorials of compositors, stereotypers, pressmen, and mailers employed by the Binghamton Press, of Binghamton, N. Y., remonstrating against any change in the rates on pulp and paper as fixed by the House bill, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of New York, praying for the restoration of the duty on foreign oil production, which was ordered to lie on the table.

CALLING OF THE ROLL.

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

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Aldrich	Clay	Gallinger	Page
Bacon	Crane	Guggenheim	Paynter
Beveridge	Crawford	Heyburn	Penrose
Borah	Culberson	Hughes	Piles
Bradley	Cullom	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Brandegee	Cummins	Kean	Scott
Briggs	Curtis	La Follette	Smoot
Brown	Davis	Lodge	Stephenson
Bulkeley	Dillingham	McCumber	Stone
Burkett	Dolliver	McLaurin	Sutherland
Burnham	du Pont	Martin	Taliaferro
Burrows	Fletcher	Money	Tillman
Burton	Flint	Nelson	Warner
Carter	Foster	Oliver	
Chamberlain	Frazier	Overman	
Clapp	Frye	Owen	

Mr. PILES. My colleague [Mr. JONES] is unavoidably detained for a short time this morning.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I desire to state that my colleague [Mr. GAMBLE] will necessarily be absent during the day. He is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. SHIVELY].

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Sixty-one Senators have answered to the roll call. A quorum of the Senate is present. The introduction of bills and joint resolutions is next in order.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. OWEN:

A bill (S. 2602) for the relief of widows and orphans of marshals or special officers killed in the service of the United States while in the performance of their duty; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2603) to authorize the President to appoint Brig. Gen. Frank D. Baldwin to the grade of major-general in the United States Army and place him on the retired list; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

THE TARIFF.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed, and the first bill on the calendar will be proceeded with.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I have voted to reduce the duties provided for in every schedule in the bill where a vote has been taken, as I shall vote against the whole bill when it comes up on its final passage. I shall vote against it because it is unjust and full of inequalities; because it does not guarantee equal and exact justice to the whole people of this country, but it is, in my judgment, framed in the special interest of the privileged few, while the great mass of the consumers of this country will continue to groan under its heavy burdens of increased taxation. I believe it to be one of the most iniquitous tariff bills ever passed by Congress, as pass it will.

According to the reports of the last census, there were in the United States in 1900 (I speak in round numbers) more than 29,000,000 persons engaged in the five principal groups of occupation. Of these groups more than 10,000,000 people were engaged in the agricultural pursuits, 7,000,000 in manufacturing and mechanical pursuits, 5,000,000 in trade and transportation, and the others were engaged in domestic, personal, and professional services. Out of this grand total of 29,000,000 persons engaged in business in this country, only the small number of 243,000 were reported as manufacturers and officers, and so forth, and, I should say, only about 150,000 of these were manufacturers.

In deducting this privileged and protected class from the grand total we have more than 28,000,000 of our countrymen who are directly affected by this legislation, upon whose backs and appetites is to fall the burden of this indirect taxation. In behalf of this great toiling mass of our laboring people, the wealth-producing people of this country, these people who support the Government in time of peace and fight its battles in time of war, the great majority of whom make their living by the sweat of their brow, I desire to enter my protest against the passage of this bill, which carries a duty of about 46 per cent ad valorem; and when the maximum duty of 25 per cent ad valorem is added to each item on the 31st of March next, as provided in the maximum and minimum rate amendment, the average rate will be something like 71 per cent, making it the highest tariff bill that has been passed in this country, or by any legislative body in the world's history. The average duty in the Dingley bill is 44.88 per cent. This is a reduction with a vengeance; and this is the way the Republican party keeps its promise to the people. No one now has any doubt

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

quantity of wool shall be assessed as if composed wholly of wool. This schedule shall take effect ninety days after the passage of this act, and until that time Schedule K of the act approved July 24, 1897, entitled 'An act to provide revenue for the Government and to encourage the industries of the United States,' shall remain in full force and effect."

Mr. DOLLIVER. Now, Mr. President, I desire to return to paragraph 370, with a view of offering an amendment to that paragraph.

Mr. ALDRICH. It will be necessary to ask for a reconsideration of the vote by which that paragraph was adopted; and I ask that the vote be reconsidered, for the purpose of allowing the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] to offer his amendment.

Mr. BURKETT. It seems to me that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] should be acted upon one way or the other.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, I do not desire to have anything more done with the amendment than to have it printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to reconsidering the vote by which paragraph 370 was agreed to? The Chair hears none. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa to that paragraph will be stated.

The SECRETARY. At the end of the paragraph it is proposed to strike out the period and in lieu thereof to insert a colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That in no event shall the duty on any of the foregoing articles in paragraphs 368, 369, or 370 exceed 60 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, I desire to say that those paragraphs are the ones which assess the duties upon by-products of worsted manufacture, what are commonly called "wool extracts" and "wool wastes." One of the most pathetic complaints made to me—and I confess that it has touched my sympathies considerably—is the fact that the framework of our duties on wool is such that only the wools of the lighter shrinkage can be imported, thereby excluding a large part of the woolen-manufacturing interests of the United States from the right to participate in the foreign wool market, and leaving them to supplement the shortage of their home supply for manufacturing purposes by buying where they can noils and these various forms of wastes and wool extracts. They claim that the men who make these wastes are the men who are competing with them for the privilege of selling goods in this market.

They say, with a force that has greatly impressed me, that the law ought not to leave them to be dealt with on the extortionate terms of those who are interested in a business which, according to many statements that have been made here, has in some way practically extinguished the profits of the carded woolen manufactures, the knit-goods manufactures, and other of the more humble forms of woolen-goods manufactures in the United States. They say—and I stand ready to make their statements good—that the rates which we have fixed on these wastes, or some of them, rise to an incredible equivalent ad valorem percentage. They are willing to pay as much on these wastes as the equivalent ad valorem which people are called upon to pay on wool, but they do not like to be compelled to buy of their competitors the necessary materials of their craft protected by a rate higher than we have been accustomed to assess on wool itself.

Consequently, I have drawn that little amendment, attaching it to paragraph 370, and providing that these wool wastes shall be assessed just exactly as this bill assesses them, but that none of the articles mentioned in these paragraphs shall, in the aggregate, bear a duty in excess of 60 per cent. That equalizes them and places that level of charge and assessment high enough adequately to protect all interests and to deliver them, so they say, out of the hands of their adversaries.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, the Senator might just as well extend his amendment to include all the wool of all the farms and ranches of the United States as to include only these so-called "wastes." It must be remembered that these wastes are a product of scoured wool, superior to the scoured wool itself, except as to noils.

Mr. DOLLIVER. And rags.

Mr. CARTER. The rags of the world we do not desire to invite into the market or into the clothing of the people of the United States.

Mr. President, the Senator's amendment does not apply to rags exclusively. It takes in quantities of wool advanced in the cost of manufacture beyond the scoured stage, and reduces the duty of 11 cents a pound on wool of the first class in certain market conditions to less than 5 cents per pound alleged protection. That reduction would bring us to a point in the wool-growing industry in this country which would be no better than free trade in wool, because the one would destroy the flocks as quickly as the other.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, what the Senator from Montana says would be true if the facts back of his statement could be verified; but the truth is that the equivalent ad valorem upon wool is now 45 per cent—not more, and possibly less—and it would be a godsend to States like Montana and Wyoming if they could be sure that they would have 45 per cent on the value of their wool standing all the time between them and the foreign imports of wool into the United States. But I can demonstrate that this simple scheme of wool assessment takes away from the good people in Montana and Wyoming what it appears to give them, and that in reality I would be conferring a blessing upon Montana if I could secure to every sheep husbandman there an authentic, bona fide ad valorem of 45 per cent on the wool that enters the market of the United States. I do not desire to mix that question up, although if the Senator from Montana desires, I will offer another amendment and ask that they be considered together. It might embarrass me if they were both adopted; but they might as well die peacefully in the same transaction. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Add at the same place the following proviso:

Provided, That in no case shall the duty upon wools, wool wastes, noils, or any of the foregoing articles in the previous paragraphs of this schedule exceed 60 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, the representatives of the woolgrowers have always believed that an indirect attack, through wool duties, upon noils and similar products would be fatal to the wool duties, and I agree with them.

Mr. BACON. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Iowa if I am correct in understanding that the maximum which he puts upon wool, according to his own statement, exceeds the present duty on wool by 15 per cent?

Mr. DOLLIVER. It does; but it is the maximum. I do not desire to interfere with the actual wool duties that are collected.

Mr. BACON. Is it 15 per cent in excess?

Mr. DOLLIVER. That is the maximum. I am trying to equalize the duties. We have got here on wools at a given rate an equivalent ad valorem of 45 per cent, and yet in the same bill the wool wastes cast up, many of them, in the process of manufacture are assessed at a higher rate than the assessment upon wool itself.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I desire to call attention to the fact that if the price of wool should drop in a foreign country to 15 cents, under a maximum ad valorem duty of 60 per cent a pound, we would only have a duty of 9 cents on wool, instead of 11 cents; and when wool is low is the very time that the woolgrower wants his protection. I certainly hope that the amendment will not be adopted.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I ask for the yeas and nays on the first amendment. I shall not press the second.

Mr. OWEN. Before the yeas and nays are taken I should like to submit a table giving the actual market value of wool from 1885 to 1907, as compiled by Messrs. Mauger and Avery, of New York. I submit this table for the purpose of showing, in connection with the argument made against the suggestions which I submitted in regard to the relative cost of labor to the gross product in the matter of woolen yarns and blankets, that the value of wool has not changed in such a way as to make any substantial difference in the relation of the labor cost toward the gross product of the material; in other words, the cost of wool which has been washed was, in 1898, 29 cents for fine wool and 34 cents in 1907, a change of 5 cents a pound only. The tables of Carroll D. Wright were made up as of 1898 and were printed in 1897, so that his figures on the cost of materials will show a comparatively small variation in the price of wool in 1898 and 1897.

I submit also a table of labor cost, showing that the increased labor cost to 1906, as far as the tables are brought up, was a little more than the increase in the price of wool. So that the ratio submitted by Carroll D. Wright's tables will not be modified in any degree whatever by the change in the price of wool as compared with the change in the labor cost.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the absence of objection, the tables will be printed as requested.

The tables referred to follow.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Market value of wool, 1885 to 1907.

NO. 193.—FINE, MEDIUM, AND COARSE WASHED CLOTHING OHIO FLEECE WOOL IN THE EASTERN MARKETS: PRICES AT THE BEGINNING OF JANUARY, APRIL, JULY, AND OCTOBER, 1885 TO 1907.

[Data furnished by Messrs. Mauger & Avery, New York.]

Year.	January.			April.			July.			October.		
	Fine.	Medium.	Coarse.	Fine.	Medium.	Coarse.	Fine.	Medium.	Coarse.	Fine.	Medium.	Coarse.
	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.
1885	34	33	29	32	32	28	32	31	28	33	35	32
1886	35	36	32	33	34	30	33	33	29	35	38	34
1887	33	38	34	33	37	33	34	37	34	32	36	34
1888	31	35	33	31	34	33	29	33	31	31	34	31
1889	34	38	33	33	37	31	35	39	32	33	37	31
1890	33	37	29	32	36	29	33	37	29	33	37	31
1891	33	37	31	32	37	31	31	35	29	31	35	30
1892	30	35	31	29	34	31	28	34	30	29	33	29
1893	29	33	29	30	32	31	24	26	25	23	24	21
1894	23	24	21	21	23	20	20	21	18	19	21	19
1895	17½	20	19	16½	20	18	18	21	19	18	21	19
1896	19	21½	19	19	21	18	17	18	17	18	19	18
1897	19	21	19	21	22½	20	21½	23½	21	27	29	25
1898	29	30	26	29	29½	25½	28	29	24½	28½	30	24½
1899	26½	29	24	25½	28	24	29	31½	27	31	33½	29
1900	35	36½	31½	32½	35½	30½	28½	31½	27½	26½	28½	26½
1901	27	29	26	25	27	24½	25	26	22	25	26½	23
1902	25½	26½	24	25	26½	24	26	26½	25	28	28½	25½
1903	30	31	27	29½	30½	26	31½	31½	27	32	31½	28
1904	33½	32½	29½	33½	32½	29½	32½	32½	30½	32½	33½	31½
1905	34	35	36	34	36	36	36	39	36	35	35	34
1906	34	38	36	34	38	36	33	37	36	34	38	33
1907	34	39	36	34	38	36	34	36	35	35	38	34

NOTE BY MESSRS. MAUGER & AVERY.—This table exhibits in a concise form the prices of the three grades of a standard domestic fleece wool in the seaboard markets at the beginning of each quarter. In its present shape it is deemed to be intelligible to all interested in wool. In the special features of character and condition, "washed Ohio fleece wool" is less subject to variation than any other description, and thus is more a basis of value than any other class. Wool, owing to its wide variety, difference in character and condition, and liability to shrink in cleaning, is precluded from speculative operations which apply to products which may be dealt in as "futures." For these reasons the prices of wool are not liable to the same changes as cotton, wheat, etc.

Wages and hours of labor.

NO. 109.—WAGES AND HOURS OF LABOR: PER CENT OF INCREASE (+) OR DECREASE (−) IN 1906, AS COMPARED WITH PREVIOUS YEARS, IN EMPLOYEES, HOURS PER WEEK, WAGES PER HOUR, FULL-TIME WEEKLY EARNINGS PER EMPLOYEE, RETAIL PRICES OF FOOD, AND PURCHASING POWER OF HOURLY WAGES AND OF FULL-TIME WEEKLY EARNINGS PER EMPLOYEE, MEASURED BY RETAIL PRICES OF FOOD, 1890 TO 1906.

[From reports of the Bureau of Labor, Department of Commerce and Labor. Computed from the relative figures shown on page 210.]

Calendar year.	Per cent of increase (+) or decrease (−) in 1906 as compared with previous years.						
	Employees.	Hours per week.	Wages per hour.	Full-time weekly earnings per employee.	Retail prices of food, weighted according to family consumption.	Purchasing power, measured by retail prices of food, of—	
						Hourly wages.	Full-time weekly earnings per employee.
Average 1890-1899	+42.9	−4.6	+24.2	+18.5	+15.7	+ 7.3	+2.4
1890	+50.7	−5.3	+23.8	+17.3	+13.0	+ 9.6	+3.9
1891	+46.9	−5.1	+23.8	+17.6	+11.5	+11.1	+5.5
1892	+44.1	−5.1	+23.2	+17.0	+13.5	+ 8.5	+3.0
1893	+43.8	−4.9	+23.1	+17.1	+10.8	+11.1	+5.7
1894	+51.9	−4.4	+26.9	+21.3	+16.0	+ 9.3	+4.5
1895	+48.2	−4.7	+26.3	+20.4	+18.3	+ 6.8	+1.8
1896	+44.9	−4.4	+24.6	+19.1	+21.2	+ 2.8	−1.7
1897	+41.6	−4.2	+24.7	+19.5	+20.1	+ 3.8	− .6
1898	+34.3	−4.3	+24.0	+18.6	+17.2	+ 5.7	+1.2
1899	+27.5	−3.8	+21.8	+17.1	+16.3	+ 4.7	+ .7
1900	+23.6	−3.3	+17.7	+13.8	+14.4	+ 2.8	− .6
1901	+20.0	−2.8	+15.0	+11.9	+10.0	+ 4.5	+1.7
1902	+15.6	−2.0	+10.7	+ 8.5	+ 4.3	+ 6.0	+4.0
1903	+13.0	−1.2	+ 6.8	+ 5.5	+ 4.9	+ 1.8	+ .6
1904	+13.7	− .5	+ 6.2	+ 5.6	+ 3.6	+ 2.5	+2.0
1905	+ 7.0	− .5	+ 4.5	+ 3.9	+ 2.9	+ 1.4	+1.0

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On the pending amendment the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] has demanded the yeas and nays.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, before the yeas and nays are taken I desire to say another word, which I overlooked. This amendment does not propose to fix any rate; it fixes a maximum rate, beyond which the assessment shall not go. In many cases the specific rate as reported by the Senate committee will be less than this maximum rate; but in the case of the cheaper varieties of noils and many varieties of these wastes, if we allowed the specific rate to stand at 10 cents, as the Senate committee has fixed it, the equivalent ad valorem would be something fabulous and very oppressive to these good people. Therefore I merely include this maximum limitation, so that in the calculation of these specific assessments, when they rise above 60 per cent, these two lines that I put in will stop it there, thereby not only reducing it somewhat, but equalizing it throughout the schedule.

Now, I want to say another word——

Mr. BACON. Before the Senator passes from that, the point he was on, I wish to know if I understand him correctly. I understand the Senator now to say that, while the 60 per cent maximum does exceed by 15 per cent the average of the duties on wool, there are some duties collected under the specifics which rise above 60 per cent. Am I correct in that?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I will say to the Senator from Georgia that the amendment upon which the vote is about to be taken does not allude to wool, but is confined entirely to noils and wool by-products.

I would like to have the attention of my friend from Montana [Mr. CARTER]. There has never been an hour in my life that I have not been interested in the prosperity of the section of the country which has been honored for so many years by his public service. I am a frequent visitor there. I have become attached to its people. I have been especially attached to them, because it seemed to me when I first went there that they were making

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Showing difference between export and home price of certain specified articles—Continued.

Articles and description.	Export price.	Home price.	Difference.
			Per cent.
Screwdrivers, Disston's electric, 12-inch...per dozen..	$1.36	$1.86	37
Shoe dressing, Whittemore's:			
"Gilt Edge"...do....	1.20	1.75	46
"Baby Elite"...do....	.60	.67	12
Shotguns, Stevens's:			
No. 105...each..	2.80	4.25	52
No. 107...do....	3.00	4.50	50
No. 225...do....	8.67	9.75	12
Smoked-beef shavers, Enterprise, No. 23...do....	4.32	5.55	28
Squares, Disston's:			
Try, rosewood, 10-inch, No. 1...per dozen..	1.66	2.88	72
Steel, 4-inch...each..	1.10	1.46	13
Traps, Lovell's mouse and rat, metallic...per gross..	5.50	7.33	33⅓
Trowels, Disston's brick, 8-inch, No. 1...per dozen..	4.07	6.00	47
Vises:			
Armstrong's—			
Hinged, No. 1...each..	1.80	4.00	122
Combination, with leg sockets...do....	6.40	8.00	25
Bonney's, No. 112...per dozen..	2.25	2.84	26
Watches, Elgin movement:			
Twenty-year gold-filled case...each..	7.98	10.23	28
Silveroid case...do....	3.04	4.47	47
Wrenches, Hawkeye, "5 in 1"...per dozen..	3.60	4.50	25

Showing differences in discounts between export and home prices.

Articles and description.	Export discount from list.	Home discount from list.	Difference.
	Per cent.	*Per cent.*	*Per ct.*
Auger bits:			
Irwin's solid center	60, 10, and 10	50 and 10	39
Snell's	70	60	33⅓
Snell's "King"	60 and 10	50	39
Auger handles, Gunn's No. 5, adjustable and ratchet	35	15 and 10	18
Bells, Texas cow	50 and 10	50	11
Bird cages, Hendryx's brass	50	30	40
Bolt clippers, "New Easy"	60, 10, and 5	50, 10, and 10	18
Bolts:			
Machine, ⅜ by 4 inches and smaller	80 and 10	75, 10, and 5	19
Carriage, ⅜ by 6 inches and smaller	80 and 10	75 and 10	25
Tire	80, 10, and 5	80	17
Borers, bunghole, Enterprise	40 and 2	25	27
Braces, Brays:			
Genuine "Spofford's"	70	60	33⅓
Ratchet, Nos. 81-161	60 and 10	50	39
Ratchet, Nos. 83-143	60 and 10	50	39
Ratchet, Nos. 62-142	70	50	66⅔
Ratchet, Nos. 63-166	60 and 10	50	39
Sleeve, Nos. 207-214	60, 10, and 10	50	54
Sleeve, Nos. 407-414	60 and 10	50	39
Sleeve, Nos. 605-614	60 and 10	50	39
Plain, Nos. 306-314	70	50	66⅔
Can openers, "King"	25		33⅓
Cartridges, rim fire	60, 10, 10, and 6	50	64
Chains, kennel	60 and 10	60	11
Coffee mills, Enterprise	40 and 10	20 and 25	11
Door rollers and hangers, Lane's	60, 10, 10, and 5	60 and 10	17
Gauges, Disston's steel and center	45	25, 7½, and 10	12
Harness snaps, Covert's:			
"Trojan"	50 and 10	40	33⅓
"Yankee"	50	30 and 2	37
"Derby"	40 and 10	25	39
Lawn sprinklers, Enterprise	40 and 2	30	19
Levels, Starrett's bench and pocket	40 and 5	33⅓ and 5	11
Oilstones, "Lily White" and "Washita," No. 1	50	33⅓	33⅓
Plumbs, levels, etc., Disston's	70, 10, 10, 10, and 5	60 and 10	72
Sausage stuffers, Enterprise	40 and 2	25 and 7½	18
Saws, Disston's:			
Nos. 7, 107, 107½, 3, and 1	45 and 7½	30 and 7½	27
Combination	45 and 7½	30 and 7½	27
Nos. 12, 16, DS, 120, 76, 8	40 and 10	25 and 7½	28
Compass and keyhole	40 and 10	25 and 7½	28
Butcher	50	30	40
Framed wood	50	25	50
Band	70, 10, and 10	60	65
Scroll saws, Barnes's velocipede	30	20	14
Screw-drivers, Disston's electric	70, 10, 10, and 10	70	37
Smoked-beef shavers, Enterprise	40 and 10	25 and 7½	28
Squares, Disston's:			
Try, rosewood handle	70, 10, 10, 10, and 5	60 and 10	72
Steel	45	25, 7½, and 10	13
Traps, Lovell's rat and mouse	50	33⅓	33⅓
Trowels, Disston's brick	45 and 7½	25	47
Vises:			
Armstrong's—			
Plain and hinged	80 and 10	60	122
Pipe	60	50	25
Bonney's	50	30 and 10	26

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will report the pending paragraph.

The SECRETARY. Page 214, paragraph 652.

Mr. KEAN. That has been agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. If there be no objection——

Mr. KEAN. That was agreed to last night with the words "or refined" stricken out.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. That amendment was agreed to. If there be no objection, the paragraph will be agreed to as amended.

Mr. STONE. Which paragraph?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Paragraph 652.

Mr. STONE. I desire to make an inquiry. I do not see the Senator from Rhode Island present. I do not know who is in charge of the bill. Is the Senator from Utah?

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Rhode Island will be here in just a minute.

Mr. STONE. I observe, Mr. President, that in paragraph 59 caustic, or hydrate of, potash bears a duty of 1 cent a pound, and upon chlorate of potash there is 2 cents per pound, the latter being a reduction of one-half cent per pound below the Dingley rate. I wish to inquire of the Senator having charge of the bill why carbonate of potash and hydrate of, or caustic, potash, not refined, in sticks or rolls, are put upon the free list, while chlorate of potash, for instance, is put on the dutiable list. They have exactly, as I am informed, the same basic material, and both are used in the manufactures of this country. Chlorate of potash bears 2 cents under the bill, while carbonate of potash is put on the free list. Muriate of potash, which is the basic material of both, is found chiefly in Germany, and that country has a practical monopoly of the mines from which that material is derived. The raw material is largely imported here, and is used, so I am told, largely for fertilizing and other purposes. Muriate of potash is on the free list, as it should be, but if chlorate of potash is to be kept on the dutiable list, then carbonate of potash and caustic potash should also be made dutiable.

I do not see why this discrimination should be made, why a duty should not be levied upon the one as well as upon the other. A large amount of all these is being imported. I am informed that of carbonate of potash in 1907 over twenty-five and a half million pounds were imported; in 1908, over twenty-four and a half million pounds; and of caustic potash in 1907, 7,483,000 pounds; in 1908, 5,947,000 pounds. They ought to be made a source of revenue. I do not care to make any motion with reference to the matter, but I should like to ask the Senator from Rhode Island if he objects, or has a reason for objecting, to putting these articles on the dutiable list, and why they are discriminated against in favor of other like products.

Mr. ALDRICH. The deposits of potash in Germany give them a great advantage over everybody else in the world, and this potash goes into the production of fertilizers and various things of that sort. There is no competition in this country. There can be none. It has been thought desirable in all the tariff bills in recent years to keep it upon the free list, for the benefit of the consumers in this country, there being practically no competition here.

Mr. STONE. Then, I think I will in due time move to put chlorate of potash on the free list, for, if chlorate is to be put on the dutiable list, the other two ought to go on. They ought all to pay duty or all should be free.

Mr. ALDRICH. My opinion is there is no considerable manufacture of chlorate in the United States.

Mr. STONE. There is of the other.

Mr. ALDRICH. Not very much.

Mr. STONE. Not very much.

Mr. ALDRICH. It stands in a different position from muriate of potash, and the manufacturers in the United States having the advantage of free raw material——

Mr. STONE. The Senator did not understand me. I said nothing about muriate of potash. Muriate is the raw material——

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes.

Mr. STONE. Out of which the others are made; out of which chlorate of potash is made, caustic potash is made, and carbonate of potash is made.

Mr. ALDRICH. Of course chlorate of potash is not a fertilizer, and the farmers are not especially interested.

Mr. STONE. Neither is caustic potash.

Mr. ALDRICH. But it is used for making a great many things—soap making and for medicinal purposes. I think the paragraph is not exactly correct, but it is as near correct as we could make it in this connection.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The RECORD shows that paragraph 652 was passed over at the request of the Senator from Wyoming. Does the Senator from Wyoming desire to take it up this morning?

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President——
Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Is that soda?
Mr. ALDRICH. Not soda, but potash.
The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will report the next paragraph which has been passed over.
Mr. ALDRICH. Has the Senator from Wyoming any objection to paragraph 652?
Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I think I have.
Mr. ALDRICH. Suppose we agree to it, and then if the Senator wants to take it up later, we will reconsider it.
The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, paragraph 652 is agreed to.
Mr. OWEN. I have in my hand a copy of the proceedings of a conference of the independent oil producers and independent oil refiners, which took place in Washington, April 21, 1909. I should like to have it put in the form of a document (S. Doc. No. 88), if there is no objection.
The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. It is so ordered. The Secretary will report the next paragraph passed over.
The SECRETARY. The next paragraph passed over is 655.
Mr. ALDRICH. I offer as a new paragraph 655½, radium.
The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will report the amendment.
The SECRETARY. On page 215, after line 6, insert:
655. Radium.
The amendment was agreed to.
Mr. NELSON. With respect to paragraph 658——
Mr. LODGE. In paragraph 657 I move to strike out the comma after the word "gems" and to insert a semicolon; after the word "statuary," in the same line, I move to strike out the comma, and after the word "sculpture" I move to strike out the comma.
The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendments are agreed to.
Mr. NELSON. I desire to offer an amendment to paragraph 660.
Mr. ALDRICH. What is that?
Mr. NELSON. Paragraph 660. I ask that it may be reconsidered in order that I may offer an amendment.
The VICE-PRESIDENT. There is no amendment there. The Senator can offer his amendment.
Mr. NELSON. My amendment is to strike out, in line 3, page 216, the words "and sago flour," and in support of that amendment I ask that the letter which I send to the desk be read.
The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will report the amendment and, without objection, thereafter read the letter.
The SECRETARY. On page 216, after the word "crude," strike out the words "and sago flour."
The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the letter.
The Secretary read as follows:

MINNESOTA POTATO STARCH COMPANY,
Anoka, Minn., May 3, 1909.

Hon. KNUTE NELSON,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: If not too late, I would like to call your attention to the clause in the proposed tariff bill placing sago and tapioca flour on the free list. This commodity comes into direct competition with the potato-starch business, which is manufactured quite extensively in this part of Minnesota, from culls and small potatoes; and also from the good ones during times of overproduction. The starch factories are, with hardly any exception, owned and operated by farmers in their respective communities. They are not, as the term is used, money-making propositions; but erected and operated for the purpose of protecting themselves against low-priced potatoes, poor crops, or seasons of rot. While sago and tapioca are called "flour," they are used for starch purposes, and should properly be classified as starch, for as such they come in direct competition with potato starch, and are used to replace this commodity in most instances. I know that the bill provides for the retaining of the tariff on potato starch, which is quite satisfactory; but statistics show that millions of pounds of sago and tapioca are now being imported each year, and replacing to a large extent the potato starch.

In fact, we know that for several years past the demand has been lessened considerable for potato starch, and largely on this account. I believe, and I think that the people of the West believe, that the tariff should be reduced only on the necessities of life; but I hardly see how this could be classed as such, as the production is used almost entirely in cotton and carpet mills. There is no trust or combination in the potato-starch business. The factories are all owned and operated in rural communities, and none of them are money-making propositions. Although the factories cost to build from $12,000 to $20,000, there are at the present time about 25 factories in Minnesota, and about the same number in northern Wisconsin, a few in the irrigated sections of Colorado, and the balance are all in the northern part of Maine, where the potato industry is carried on extensively; and without them it would not be safe for the farmers to plant such enormous acreage or engage so extensively in the raising of potatoes, for by the aid of the factories they are able to realize at least cost for their seed and labor from any any crop they might raise. The new timber sections between Brainerd and Bemidji are destined to be great potato-raising sections, but without the factories they would be slow in developing.

If you can do anything in favor of a duty on sago and tapioca starch or flour, I am sure it would be very much appreciated.

Yours, truly,

ROBT. W. AKIN.

Mr. NELSON subsequently said:
Mr. President, I have some more letters which I should like to be incorporated with my remarks on this subject, following the letter which was read heretofore.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the letters referred to by the Senator from Minnesota will be so incorporated.
The letters referred to are as follows:

CALEY HARDWARE COMPANY,
Princeton, Minn., May 3, 1909.

Hon. KNUTE NELSON,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I write you in regard to duty on potato starch. I understand that sago flour and tapioca flour (which are potato starch) are on the free list.

Now, if there is not at least a duty of 1½ cents per pound placed on these products, it will practically close all of the potato starch industry in the West.

In foreign countries I understand they raise from 450 to 600 bushels of potatoes to the acre, and here in the West the farmers raise from 75 to 150 bushels to the acre, hence we can not compete with the foreign manufacturers at the same price, and we have been running our starch factory without making any money for some years now.

Now, Mr. NELSON, I hope you will interest yourself in behalf of the potato starch makers.

Thanking you in advance, I remain,

T. H. CALEY,
President Princeton Potato Starch Co.

THE FARMERS' COOPERATIVE STARCH COMPANY,
North Branch, Minn., May 3, 1909.

Hon. KNUTE NELSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Having paid a close attention to the daily review by the United States Senate in relation to the fight going on there by some parties aiming to get the sago and tapioca (starches) on the free list, I have been instructed by managers of starch-manufacturing concerns to write and request that you give your earnest attention toward helping the elimination of such move. We, as starch manufacturers of such starch, need all the protection possible against foreign importers on equal basis with other interests. We believe in thus appealing to you for aid and support that you will stand by your duty, thus respecting the earnest desire and need of your constituents for the mainainance of the present prosperity, caused principally by the enactment of the McKinley Act. Believing this to be a just and reasonable request by your constituents and hoping to see the enactment of a just and fair duty on all starches, we beg to remain,

Yours, for permanent prosperity,

FARMERS' COOPERATIVE STARCH COMPANY,
C. E. OBERG, *General Manager*,
Per K. O. WARME, *Secretary*.

RUSH CITY, MINN., *May 7, 1909.*

Hon. KNUTE NELSON, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Are you aware of the fact that the proposed tariff bill now before the Senate specifically places sago and tapioca flours, which are starches, in the free list, and that it is going to require the concerted efforts of all American starch industries to bring enough pressure to bear to correct this great injustice? The imports of these starches have already increased from, roughly, 2,000,000 pounds in 1882 to 50,000,000 pounds in 1908. The increase during the last five years alone being about 34,000,000 pounds, with every indication that it will not only continue but more largely increase if free of duty.

We respectfully urge upon you to support the movement for the elimination of sago and tapioca flours (starches) from the free list. This is vital to the potato-raising farmers of Chisago County, as well as all adjoining counties in this great potato belt.

Please do your best to promote our industry by not allowing these other starches to enter free of duty.

Yours, very truly,

RUSH CITY STARCH COMPANY,
By C. M. JOHNSON, *Secretary*.

Mr. ALDRICH. The proposition of the Senator from Minnesota is to take an article which has always been upon the free list and put it upon the dutiable list at a very high rate. I think the facts as stated by the Senator's correspondent are not correct. There is a combination in this business, which may not include the gentleman who writes the letter, but does include a large part of the business, I think. I am quite willing that this amendment should go over. I think I can convince the Senator that this attempt to revise the tariff upward to a very great extent is not justified by conditions.

Mr. NELSON. Whether there is a starch trust or not I do not know; but there is certainly no starch trust among the people of Minnesota. In a certain portion of our State, the northeast portion, which was originally a pine country—it is rather sandy land—they found it difficult to make a living raising small grain, and they went into the business of raising potatoes. In order to have an assured market for their potato industry they organized small companies and built small starch factories. When potatoes are high those starch factories are not in operation, because as a rule when potatoes out in that country sell for more than 25 or 30 cents a bushel, it does not pay the starch factories. But there are many seasons when potatoes are as low as 15 and 20 cents a bushel. At that time they can not afford to ship them on account of the freight, and they are utilized by the local starch factories.

The large importation of sago flour comes in direct competition with the potato-starch industry, and they feel that as

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

that they will have a common language through which they can communicate their ideas to each other and through which they can obtain some conception of the great political and economic and governmental questions that are addressed to them.

THE PHILIPPINES NOT A SOURCE OF REVENUE, BUT ALWAYS A BURDEN.

I wish to say also regarding these islands that I do not share with the Senator from Missouri the opinion that they can be made at any time the source of opulence. The forests, to which the Senator refers, are beautiful to the eye, but they are mainly forests of soft wood. Here and there you will find a magnificent tree of hard wood of great value; but I was told that the cost of taking out these occasional trees here and there in the forest was very great. The islands are mountainous, and you can hardly cultivate a mountain side. The only level and cultivable land is the land in the river valleys which is very limited, and the land on the coast formed by the wash from the mountains. The area of cultivation is exceedingly limited.

In addition to that, all nature seems to be hostile to the development of the Philippine Islands. They have a constant recurrence of cholera; they have a constant recurrence of surra and rinderpest among their cattle; so that their draft animals and animals with which they cultivate their farms, the buffalo, and so forth, are destroyed year after year.

I do not believe that those islands can be made a source of great wealth; and that being the fact, I prefer to present it in all its baldness to the American people, for I fear that if those islands are represented to the American people as the source of great future wealth, the greed of many of us will prevent us from letting them go. I believe the very fact that those islands have cost us this great expense of $500,000,000 or $600,000,000, including the war, that they are to-day costing us one-fourth of the military and naval expense of the Nation; and that they will cost us a large expenditure in the future in fortifying them with a view of holding them, not only against a foreign foe, but against domestic violence has had much to do with the present sentiment which exists throughout the country in favor of letting the islands go. The American people are becoming convinced that there was no glory in their conquest and that there is no profit in their occupation; and I believe that they will have to be convinced of both before they will let them go.

THE CASE SUMMED UP.

The objection I have to this legislation—and I will simply say a word upon that, for I have already stated fully my views—is that we are proposing to give $10,000,000 annually to the planting interests, with a view to stimulating the production there, so that those islands, which are now poverty stricken, may become prosperous. I would rather, in the discharge of the great benevolent trust which we have assumed to those islands, appropriate a tithe of that money annually to instructing those people, to aid them in getting central sugar factories which can develop sugar production there in the perfection which the Senator from Rhode Island thinks will at some time be attained.

I would rather appropriate money to train them in agricultural methods, in modern methods, to train them industrially, to train their hands and their heads, and to train them in a common language—I would rather do that than give the planters this large bounty, which in fifteen years will amount to $150,000,000 and in twenty years to $200,000,000.

I quite join with the Senator from Missouri in the desire that we should make this declaration of our purpose now, for if we once determine to let them go fifteen years hence, we will then shape our course with a view to that result. If we were to attempt to determine now the method of our withdrawal, we would all differ as to details; but we can determine upon one thing, and that is that we will withdraw in fifteen years, and then we can leave the elaboration of details to the future, and we will have plenty of time to accomplish our work of giving these people a common language and of training them in industrial and manual pursuits.

The prospect at best is not the most roseate. The tropical islands throughout the world have been beaten by the Temperate Zone in the products which they used to monopolize. Disease is against them; the climate, tending to ease, apathy, and inertia, is against them. They have not that hard contest with nature itself, so far as food and clothing and shelter are concerned, that impels to work; and so I am not very hopeful that these people will develop a high order of self-government, but they can maintain some form of autonomy there. They may have wars among themselves; they may have race wars; they may finally fall under the control of some dictator, some man of great power and ability, but if they are to be killed, I would rather they should kill each other than that we should kill them.

I believe that they must go through the process of evolution that every country composed of diverse races must go through, resulting, perhaps, in the domination of a single race, and perhaps in the dominance of a single man.

But I do feel assured that in the future those islands will be the source of great peril to the United States. They are 7,000 miles away from our basis of operations. If we should have internal difficulties there, the expense of conducting the defense of our power would be enormous. Besides that, those

And provided further, That it is hereby declared not to be the policy and purpose of the United States to maintain permanent sovereignty over the Philippine Islands, but to exercise authority in and over said islands only so long as may be necessary, not to exceed fifteen years from and after the passage of this act, to organize and establish a native government capable of maintaining public order in said islands, and until such international agreements shall have been made between the United States and foreign countries as will insure the independence of said islands and the people thereof.

withdraw in the future as the result of a useless and costly war maintained so far from our base of supply.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] to the amendment.

Mr. STONE. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

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

Mr. FLINT (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON], who is absent this evening. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BROWN], and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. FRAZIER (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. NIXON]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON], and vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. McLAURIN (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. RAYNER (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BRADLEY]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I desire to have the RECORD show that my colleague [Mr. GAMBLE] is necessarily absent. He is paired with the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. SHIVELY]. If present, my colleague would vote "nay."

Mr. DANIEL. I am paired with the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am paired with the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. FOSTER (after having voted in the affirmative). I inquire if the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] has voted?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair is informed that he has not voted.

Mr. FOSTER. Then I withdraw my vote, as I have a pair with that Senator.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES]. As he is not present, I withdraw my vote.

The result was announced—yeas 18, nays 44, as follows:

YEAS—18.

Bacon	Frazier	Money	Stone
Bailey	Gore	Newlands	Taliaferro
Clay	Hughes	Overman	Tillman
Davis	Johnston, Ala.	Paynter	
Fletcher	McEnery	Simmons	

NAYS—44.

Aldrich	Chamberlain	Flint	Page
Beveridge	Clapp	Gallinger	Perkins
Brandegee	Crane	Guggenheim	Piles
Briggs	Crawford	Heyburn	Root
Bristow	Depew	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Bulkeley	Dick	Kean	Smoot
Burkett	Dillingham	La Follette	Stephenson
Burnham	Dixon	Lodge	Sutherland
Burrows	Dolliver	Nelson	Warner
Burton	du Pont	Nixon	Warren
Carter	Elkins	Oliver	Wetmore

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NOT VOTING—29.

Bankhead	Cullom	Jones	Shively
Borah	Cummins	McCumber	Smith, Md.
Bourne	Curtis	McLaurin	Smith, Mich.
Bradley	Daniel	Martin	Smith, S. C.
Brown	Foster	Owen	Taylor
Clark, Wyo.	Frye	Penrose	
Clarke, Ark.	Gamble	Rayner	
Culberson	Hale	Richardson	

So Mr. STONE's amendment to the amendment of the committee was rejected.

Mr. BULKELEY. I now desire to move, if it is in order and proper to do so, that the paragraph now being considered—471d I think it is entitled—be referred to the Committee on the Philippines.

I do this for the reason that I do not desire, under any circumstances, that legislation shall not be enacted at this session of Congress in regard to the Philippine Islands. But from the examinations I have been able to make of the records, all measures heretofore considered by the Congress—revenue measures as well as others—for the Philippine Islands have been considered and acted upon by the committee of this body created for that purpose. It seems to me this is not the place, as I said this morning, for legislation with respect to these islands, in the tariff bill we are preparing for ourselves.

We have already pending before the Philippine Committee of this body an act to raise revenue for the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes. Many of the provisions of this act now being considered by this committee are dependent in a large measure on the legislation that is proposed in the bill pending before this body; and it seems much more in order, to my mind, that the two should be considered by the same committee, which can give the thought that is necessary, in my judgment, to a matter that is so important to those possessions which we control and for the government of which the Congress of the United States at this time is responsible.

I therefore make the motion that the paragraph we are now considering be referred to the Committee on the Philippine Islands.

Mr. ALDRICH. We are considering a tariff bill for the United States and not for the Philippine Islands, I would suggest.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Connecticut moves to commit the substitute for 471d to the Committee on the Philippines.

Mr. DANIEL. I should like to ask the Senator from Rhode Island if there is involved in this amendment any question of favored nations? Does picking out certain articles to be permitted to come to us free in this fashion from an alien, which is no part of this country, though it is said to belong to it, involve us in any controversy about favored nations?

I presume the answer will be that the Philippine Islands are not a nation and not a part of this Nation. They are something, somewhere. Their status is unanalyzable. It is also nondescript and absolutely indescribable, and why a wave of tariff or free trade in this momentous and grave fashion should be involved in a tariff bill for the United States is certainly only a technical statement without any basic facts to support it.

I therefore think that the motion by the Senator from Connecticut is a very wise and apt motion. We have a special committee to deal with the Philippine Islands and its peculiarities—like the subject. There is no geography in this question. There is no jurisprudence to this question. It has confounded the courts and the legislatures, and is now beginning to confound and override our sedate and careful tariff provisions about our own country. It is such a close and material arrangement proposed about another country and another people that we can not fitly embrace it, although technicality will support the proposition, perhaps. Here is a proposition for the introduction into this country of millions upon millions of free trade in certain subjects. It is confusing; it is unprecedented; it is totally off—uniquely by itself—and of all things that should go to the Philippine Committee of this body, it seems to me to be the chief.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BULKELEY. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

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

Mr. BANKHEAD (when his name was called). I announce my pair with the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM] for the balance of the evening.

Mr. FLINT (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON]. He is absent this evening. I transfer my pair to the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BROWN], and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. PILES (when the name of Mr. JONES was called). My colleague has been called away from the Chamber this evening. He is paired with the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. McLAURIN (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH]. If he were present, I would vote "yea."

Mr. RAYNER (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). Has the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] voted?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. TILLMAN. I have a general pair with that Senator, and therefore withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming (after having voted in the negative). I desire to inquire if the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] has voted. I do not see him in the Chamber.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I withdraw my vote.

Mr. FLETCHER. I wish to announce that my colleague is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS], and will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. DANIEL. I am paired with the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. FOSTER (after having voted in the affirmative). Observing that the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER], with whom I am paired, has not voted, I withdraw my vote.

The result was announced—yeas 21, nays 40, as follows:

YEAS—21.

Bacon	Clapp	Gore	Newlands
Bailey	Clay	Hughes	Overman
Brandegee	Davis	Johnston, Ala.	Paynter
Bristow	Dick	La Follette	
Bulkeley	Fletcher	McEnery	
Chamberlain	Frazier	Martin	

NAYS—40.

Aldrich	Crane	Heyburn	Perkins
Beveridge	Crawford	Johnson, N. Dak.	Piles
Borah	Depew	Kean	Root
Briggs	Dixon	Lodge	Scott
Burkett	Dolliver	Money	Smoot
Burnham	du Pont	Nelson	Stephenson
Burrows	Elkins	Nixon	Sutherland
Burton	Flint	Oliver	Warner
Carter	Gallinger	Page	Warren
Clark, Wyo.	Guggenheim	Penrose	Wetmore

NOT VOTING—30.

Bankhead	Curtis	McCumber	Smith, Mich.
Bourne	Daniel	McLaurin	Smith, S. C.
Bradley	Dillingham	Owen	Stone
Brown	Foster	Rayner	Taliaferro
Clarke, Ark.	Frye	Richardson	Taylor
Culberson	Gamble	Shively	Tillman
Cullom	Hale	Simmons	
Cummins	Jones	Smith, Md.	

So Mr. BULKELEY's motion was rejected.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the substitute. Without objection, the substitute is agreed to.

Mr. BULKELEY. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. No objection is heard.

Mr. BULKELEY. I should be glad to speak on that question.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Connecticut desire to speak on the question of agreeing to the substitute?

Mr. BULKELEY. I have no objection to an agreement to the substitute.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is agreed to.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I wish to offer an amendment before the substitute is voted upon.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Before the substitute is agreed upon the Senator from Wisconsin desires to offer an amendment.

Mr. BULKELEY. Do I understand the motion now is to substitute this for the paragraph of the bill?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. That has already been done. The motion now is to agree to the substitute.

Mr. BULKELEY. I wish to speak on that question.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

who is absent. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. CRAWFORD (when Mr. GAMBLE'S name was called). My colleague [Mr. GAMBLE] is necessarily absent. He is paired with the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. SHIVELY].

Mr. BURROWS (when the name of Mr. SMITH of Michigan was called). My colleague [Mr. SMITH of Michigan] is paired with the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. MCLAURIN].

Mr. STONE. I inquire whether the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that he has not voted.

Mr. STONE. I have a general pair with that Senator, and therefore withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. ELKINS (after having voted in the negative). At the time I voted I did not observe that the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] was absent from the Chamber. I am paired with that Senator, and therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. FRYE. I inquire if the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that he has not.

Mr. FRYE. I am paired with that Senator, but I transfer that pair to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. MONEY. My colleague [Mr. MCLAURIN] has just been called from the Chamber. He is unavoidably absent, and is paired with the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. BACON (after having voted in the affirmative). At the time I cast my vote I had forgotten that I had agreed to pair on this question with the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE]. I understand, however, that the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] has not voted. I therefore transfer my pair with the Senator from Indiana to the Senator from Virginia, and will permit my vote to stand.

Mr. SCOTT. I desire to announce, on behalf of the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. STEPHENSON], that he is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]. If the Senator from Wisconsin were here, he would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 38, as follows:

YEAS—27.

Bacon	Cummins	Hughes	Owen
Borah	Davis	Johnston, Ala.	Paynter
Bristow	Dolliver	La Follette	Simmons
Brown	Fletcher	McEnery	Smith, S. C.
Burkett	Foster	Money	Taliaferro
Clapp	Frazier	Newlands	Tillman
Clay	Gore	Overman	

NAYS—38.

Aldrich	Crawford	Heyburn	Piles
Bourne	Cullom	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Brandegee	Depew	Jones	Scott
Briggs	Dick	Kean	Smoot
Bulkeley	Dillingham	Lodge	Sutherland
Burnham	du Pont	McCumber	Warner
Burrows	Flint	Nelson	Warren
Burton	Frye	Nixon	Wetmore
Carter	Gallinger	Page	
Crane	Guggenheim	Perkins	

NOT VOTING—26.

Bailey	Culberson	McLaurin	Smith, Md.
Bankhead	Curtis	Martin	Smith, Mich.
Beveridge	Daniel	Oliver	Stephenson
Bradley	Dixon	Penrose	Stone
Chamberlain	Elkins	Rayner	Taylor
Clark, Wyo.	Gamble	Richardson	
Clarke, Ark.	Hale	Shively	

So Mr. LA FOLLETTE'S amendment to the amendment of the Committee on Finance was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. ALDRICH. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. FLETCHER. I desire to offer an amendment to the pending substitute and have it read. My amendment will leave the Philippine Islands to enjoy and retain the concession of 25 per cent which they already enjoy. In other words, the act of March 8, 1902, would still remain in force in reference to all importations from the Philippine Islands. I should like to have the amendment read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be read to the Senate.

The SECRETARY. Amend the substitute amendment on page 1, line 5, by striking out the colon after the word "countries" and adding the words "except as provided by existing law now in force," and striking out the remainder of the substitute, so that it will read:

471d. There shall be levied, collected, and paid upon all articles coming into the United States from the Philippine Islands the rates of duty which are required to be levied, collected, and paid upon like articles imported from foreign countries, except as provided by existing law now in force.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. President, it is my purpose to submit some remarks upon the amendment. Understanding that the Senator from Oklahoma has the preference at this hour, I suppose I am compelled to yield to him.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, do I understand that the committee desires to have a vote, or that it can be taken at this time?

Mr. ALDRICH. What is that?

Mr. FOSTER. It can not, because I want to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised of the desire of the Senator from Louisiana to address the Senate before a vote is taken.

Mr. OWEN. Before beginning my remarks, I would ask, there being no objection, that I be not expected or required to read the various tables which I shall use as illustrative of my comments on this bill or any matter which is not essential to the statement I desire to submit to the Senate in regard to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to insert certain tables in the RECORD without reading, the same to be considered a part of his remarks. Is there objection?

Mr. ALDRICH. What is the request?

Mr. CLAPP. It strikes me, while there may not be any objection to it at this time, it is better to preserve the order that when a speaker reaches anything which he desires to have printed, he call the attention of the Senate to the fact that he desires to insert it without reading.

Mr. GALLINGER. We might want something read.

Mr. CLAPP. Yes. It would establish rather a bad precedent, I think.

Mr. CULLOM. We had better adhere to the rule.

Mr. OWEN. I have no objection whatever to the rule. It will be entirely agreeable to me. The Senate, I am sure, will not care to have them read in extenso, as it would take some hours, perhaps, to read them.

Mr. CLAPP. It is a mere matter of form, I think.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, no consideration would induce me to propose or contend for a tariff reduction which would seriously harm any American industry whose existence is justified by the natural resources of our country.

Upon my oath as a Senator of the United States, I feel charged with a solemn responsibility of defending the welfare of the people of the United States, including as vigorously and as distinctly the interests of the people of Maine, of Rhode Island, or of California as the interests of the people of Oklahoma. I shall discharge that duty as an American in a broad and liberal spirit, with patience, with tolerance, and perfect fairness.

By that sense of duty I have felt impelled to submit to the Senate the reasons which make it impossible for me to support H. R. 1438. I can not agree to the passage of this bill without the registration of a solemn protest against it. I plainly see the evil results upon the people of the United States, which have followed the McKinley bill and the Dingley bill, and which must follow the passage of a worse measure.

Mr. President, I am not unmindful that what I shall say will not deter the managers of this bill in the Senate in the least from their predetermined course, but I deem it my duty to place upon the records of the Senate and of the United States the reasons which justify my protest and from which future students may perhaps find something of value in determining this question, when they shall consider it with intellectual and moral integrity and not in a spirit of trade, of barter, or of easy compliance with the demand of special interests, whose lobbyists swarm the corridors of this Capitol.

Mr. President, mere denunciation of a bill, or of the managers of the bill, I regard as serving no good purpose unless proof is offered which shall be convincing to thoughtful and honest men that the condemnation is thoroughly justified.

In pointing out the injurious effects of what I shall demonstrate to be a monopoly-protecting tariff upon our entire people, including every class of consumers, every class of producers, every class of manufacturers or distributers or merchants except the masters of monopoly, I shall do so dispassionately, with a composed temper and with an earnest desire to offer reasons, at least, to those now trusted by our people with power

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

why they should not persist in a policy full of injury and harm to the Republic.

I shall be compelled in this discussion to point out the logical consequences of a monopoly-protecting tariff; its effect, its dangerous effect, in piling up stupendous wealth on the one side in the hands of its favorites, and in causing great wretchedness and poverty on the other side among the weaker and more defenseless classes of our people.

When I point out the unavoidable effect of extreme poverty as the necessary complement of unlimited wealth in the hands of the few, accumulated under the shelter of law, I wish it distinctly understood that the dark picture of human misery which the truth compels me to portray breathes from me no spirit of pessimism, because I am full of hope. I recognize the immediate dawn of better things and an early remedy. The increasing intelligence of our people already begins to understand the causes of these conditions and to formulate the natural and reasonable remedy for their correction. The spirit of benevolence and of patriotism which characterizes the great body of our people and, I rejoice to say, moves a multitude of the beneficiaries of our unwise system gives promise for an early correction of the injurious consequences which naturally follow a prohibitive tariff, with its necessary brood of successful monopolies, by the reduction of that tariff; if not now, through the party in power, then by the unwearied Democracy that has been faithfully pointing out its evils for twenty-five years. I shall endeavor to point out some of the injurious consequences of the tariff-engendered monopolies and their crushing effect upon human life; but in doing so I shall not be understood as a pessimist, because I am precisely the contrary.

OPTIMIST.

Mr. President, I am an optimist; because I feel that the Anglo-Saxon race and the Teutonic blood represented in this country by millions of men of the northern races of Europe and Great Britain and the adopted sons of other great nations in our land have an unquenchable love of liberty, of justice, and of compassion, and will correct every evil of our great Government; because our forefathers distinguished themselves by a love of liberty that dared death in every form to establish it and maintain it in the bosom of this Republic; because our immediate forefathers not only loved liberty, but they practiced that form of government which made liberty a working force in the administration of this Government from the days when the town meeting in New England, in Massachusetts, Mr. President, in Connecticut, and in Rhode Island instructed their representatives according to the will of a free people. In those good old days when the Representative was not a machine-made politician, but was a Representative in the highest and best sense—of representing directly the opinions and the commercial interests of the common people who sent him.

I am an optimist because of my perfect confidence in the great body of the American people, whose stability, patriotism, and common sense will control this country and direct it along sound paths of good government; because I see in many directions the gradual restoration of the right and power of the people to select their public servants directly, and directly require them to carry out their will. I rejoice to see the establishment of the initiative and referendum in Maine and in Oregon and in other States, as well as in Oklahoma, and the establishment of the direct primary in so many of our States.

I rejoice to see the people instructing their legislatures in the selection of Senators, and while I did not receive any report from the Senator from Michigan, as chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, of the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States I had the honor to submit during the last Congress for the election of Senators by direct vote of the people, I have felt justified in being an optimist because I was able to point out 24 States in the Union that had requested from their legislative assemblage this restoration to the people of their ancient right of rule.

Now, Mr. President, I am an optimist, notwithstanding the hostile attitude of the leaders now in control of the Senate, because already there are 29 States, including Michigan, the State of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, in which the election of Senators is controlled by the direct voice of the people.[a] It will only be a few short years when 46 of the States will be controlled in this manner; and when that day comes, no Senator in this Chamber will be so callous as to mock the pledges made to the people in national platforms.

I am an optimist, Mr. President, because of the magnificent growth of our Republic under the blessings of liberty.

From 5,000,000 people in 1800 we have over eighty-five millions in 1907. From five billions of wealth in 1800 we have a hundred and twenty-five billion in 1909. From a weak nation we have become potentially the greatest nation in the world; but above all, Mr. President, has been our increase in the means of intelligence.

Forests are now converted into paper with lightning speed. Volumes innumerable, filled with learning upon every subject, are crowding into the pathway of knowledge; but chief of all the modern newspapers, filled with learning, wit, and humor, illustrated with splendid descriptions and photographs of everything "in the heavens above, the earth beneath, and the waters under the earth," are thrust into the hands of the wayfaring man for a price incredibly small, so that he who runs may read and instantly learn what is transpiring in regard to everything of human interest at home and abroad, so that every citizen may know at breakfast every fact transpiring on earth that he cares to know, from the diplomatic questions of foreign courts to the wonderful home run of Casey on the Chicago ball grounds, from the market quotations of London and New York to the astonishing description of the last wild beast slain on the eastern coast of Africa by one of our very distinguished fellow-citizens.

While it is true that thirty-five thousand millions of dollars of the proceeds of human labor in the United States have passed into the hands of various corporations, and a very large part of all of the net proceeds of American labor have been improperly acquired by monopoly; and while 7,000,000 women have been driven from out the peaceful shelter of the American home into commercial rivalry with men; and while 5,000,000 children in like manner are being driven under the commercial whip to sacrifice their youth, in large part, to the demand of Mammon; and while there are many millions of men who regard life with great anxiety, constantly in fear of the drastic power of extreme poverty and lack of employment, still I see that the American workmen, in the factories of our land, have exhibited a net output per capita of over twelve hundred dollars, from which the legitimate demand on him for the support of an American family can be met and still leave a large surplus earning.

The American people have shown that they are far more than abundantly capable of sustaining themselves and making the most substantial contribution to the wealth of the Republic and of the world and still leave themselves reasonable leisure.

And, finally, Mr. President, I am an optimist because I believe that the American people—who love liberty, who believe in self-government, who believe in mercy and in charity as well as in industry and providence—will see to it that this Government is so conducted by their representatives that in the future there shall be *a more equitable distribution of the proceeds of human labor;* that we shall change the present policy, whose inevitable tendency is the useless, the vulgar, and insane enrichment of the few at the expense of the misery and sorrow and of the physical and spiritual degeneration of millions of men, women, and children who are now submerged by the devices of commercialism gone mad.

The bill should not pass,

BECAUSE IT IS CONTRARY TO THE WILL OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE.

Mr. President, the American people were promised by both parties a reduction of the tariff, and had a right to expect substantial reduction. The representatives of one-half of the people, assembled at Denver, emphasized this matter most vigorously in the Democratic platform in the following language:

We welcome the belated promise *of tariff reform* now offered by the Republican party. * * *

This platform declared:

The people can not safely intrust the execution of this important work to a party which is so *deeply obligated to the highly protected interests as is the Republican party.*

This platform states:

We call attention to the significant fact that the promised relief *was postponed until after the coming election*—an election to succeed in which the Republican party must have *the same support from the beneficiaries of the high protective tariff as it has always heretofore received from them;* and to the further fact that during years of uninterrupted power no action whatever has been taken by the Republican Congress to correct the admittedly existing tariff iniquities.

This platform further declared:

We favor immediate revision of the *tariff by the reduction of import duties.* * * *

[a] Alabama, Arkansas, California, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Missouri, Mississippi, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Washington, and Wisconsin. Of these California, Nevada, Idaho, and Michigan came in this year—1909.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

The party to which I have the honor to belong has, since 1876, demanded a proper reform of the inequalities, injustices, and false pretenses of a tariff controlled by selfish interests at the expense of the American people.

It never has, Mr. President, at any time contemplated so reducing the tariff as to injuriously affect any legitimate industry whatever. On the contrary, while it has pointed vigorously to the fraud and false pretenses of the monopoly protecting tariff, it always has been mindful of the rights of capital legitimately employed in manufacture, and equally mindful of labor employed in industries established under the shelter of our tariff system.

In 1884 the Democratic national platform said:

Many industries have come to rely upon legislation for successful continuance, so that any change of law must be at every step regardful of the labor and capital thus involved. The process of reform must be subjected in the execution to this plain dictate of justice; *all taxation shall be limited to the requirements of economical government.* The necessary reduction of taxation can and must be effected *without depriving American labor of the ability to compete successfully with foreign labor* and *without imposing lower rates of duty than will be ample to cover any increased cost of production which may exist in consequence of the higher rate of wages prevailing in this country.*

The practice of writing these schedules at prohibitive rates and preventing competition and engendering monopoly has been fiercely condemned by the Democracy as "robbery of the great majority for the benefit of the few" (1892). It has demanded a constitutional tariff drawn for the purpose of revenue, but has not condemned the unavoidable incidental protection which any tariff for revenue, or for revenue only, unavoidably affords, and which will always be found sufficient for the incidental protection of legitimate industry.

The reason why protection AS PRACTICED has been denounced as "robbery" is because such schedules have been drawn not for constitutional revenue purposes, but to shelter monopoly and permit monopoly to wrongfully tax the people under the color of a pretended revenue law.

The party to which I have the honor to belong, therefore (1908), welcomed the promise of tariff reform offered by the Republican party in 1908 on the basis of "the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad," for the obvious reason that a tariff so drawn would necessarily be a tariff for revenue with only such incidental protection as justice and common sense requires.

It was this kind of tariff law drawn in 1846, with which both parties were well satisfied in 1856. If this law were now so drawn, the contention between the two great parties on this issue would necessarily cease. [For party platforms compared see Exhibit 11.]

The party leaders of both great parties declared the purpose of reducing the tariff downward. No manner of explanation or evasion can alter the substantial truth that it was the expressed will of the American people making itself felt through both party platforms and through both party leaders that there should be a substantial reduction of tariff duties.

The Republican platform of 1908 declares "*unequivocally*"—a remarkable word in a platform, and suggests the purpose of equivocation—"for revision of the tariff by *special* session of the Congress *immediately* following the inauguration of the next President," and says:

In all tariff legislation the true principle of protection is best maintained by the imposition *of such duties as will equal the difference between cost of production at home and abroad*, together with a reasonable profit to American industries.

The platform also says that it is the Republican policy—

To preserve *without excessive duties* the security against foreign competition to which American manufacturers, farmers, and producers are entitled, but also to maintain the high standard of living of the wage-workers of this country, who are the most direct beneficiaries of the protective system.

Excessive duties are here condemned by the leaders of the Republican party, and in 1904 the Republican platform declared:

The measure of protection should always at least equal the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad.

Even in the majority report of the House committee, page 2, section 1, they declared:

While duties should be protective, they should be adjusted as nearly as possible *to represent the difference in cost of production at home and abroad.*

IT VIOLATES THE REPUBLICAN PLEDGES.

The rates of the bill submitted by the Finance Committee average higher than the Dingley bill and are not a reduction at all.

The chairman of the Committee on Finance ostentatiously sets forth 379 items on which reductions are made.

These reductions, as will appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 5 and by Exhibit 12, I here submit, are items of no national importance. Two hundred and seventy-four of these items involve articles whose imports are less than $25,000, or severally less than one-thirtieth part of 1 penny gross imports per capita. The table which I submit gives the items in excess where the imports of such articles amounted to over $25,000, and the table discloses the fact that the total imports excepting lumber was extremely small, and that the pretended reductions are of no importance, while the increases are of substantial importance.

Mr. President, this bill should not passs, because it violates the pledges of the Republican party and of the Republican leader during the last campaign. The party platform, I have shown above, is unequivocal. Its reasonable and natural interpretation is plain. The Senator from Indiana on May 25 set forth at great length the declarations of the President of the United States, quoting him as pledging the American people—

Genuine and honest revision * * * substantially a *revision downward*, though there will probably be a few exceptions—

As delivered by the President September 24, 1908.

No wonder the Republican Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] demands to know what this special session was called for, if it was merely to rewrite the Dingley bill.

No wonder the Republican Senators from Iowa, Indiana, Nebraska, Minnesota, and Wisconsin and other States *vehemently protest* against this betrayal of the party pledge. The Senator from Massachusetts will explain in vain to the American people that it was not the purpose of the party to have a substantial revision downward, as the President said, September 24, 1908, at Milwaukee.

The President in his inaugural address reiterated his construction of the purposes of the party, as was strongly pointed out by the Senator from Indiana, and stated in the most positive manner:

It is imperatively necessary, therefore, that a tariff bill be drawn in *good faith* in accordance with *promises made before the election* by the party in power.

And on December 17 last the President is quoted as having said before the Ohio Society:

Better no revision at all, better that the new bill should fail, unless we have an honest and thorough revision on the basis laid down and the principles outlined in the party platform.

The Republican platform declared in 1904 for a tariff law merely "equal to the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad," and in 1908 likewise declared for—

Such duties as will equal the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad.

And yet the leaders of that party, neither in the House nor in the Senate, have concerned themselves to compile "the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad," although they have submitted many volumes of thousands of pages of confused miscellany, a small portion under oath, a large portion not under oath, with no safeguard whatever, and coming from selfish interests seeking the privilege of monopoly over the American people.

When I, as a Senator of the United States, representing the people of the United States, from Maine to California, and entitled by the honor and dignity of my position to a proper answer, demand to know "why the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad" had not been compiled as a basis for the drafting of this statute, the Senator from New Hampshire rises in his place and solemnly advises me that my inquiry is "absurd." [Turning to the Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. GALLINGER.] He will find his remarks on page 2134 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The suggestion is made by other Republican leaders that the information can not be obtained, and when I myself offer over 446 items which had been compiled ten years ago by Carroll D. Wright, Commissioner of Labor, they show themselves acquainted with the matter, confess that this information can be obtained, and plead that the report is not up to date.

The Senator from Rhode Island, chairman of the Committee on Finance, rises in his place and, with a fine sense of humor excited by my request and inquiry why the difference in cost of production had not been compiled, advises me with amused satire that he will have a clerk compile for me a list of publications relating to the tariff, but will be unable to furnish me with the intelligence to digest them.

I shall not question the intelligence of the chairman of the Committee on Finance, nor shall I reply to him in kind. I appeal from him to the American people, who will not hold him

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

guiltless for his callous and reprehensible conduct in this matter.

Mr. President, I keenly regret to feel impelled to comment in this manner upon the conduct of public business in the Senate. Not only has the chairman of the Committee on Finance not furnished the Senate "the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad;" not only has he not made a proper report to the Senate in regard to this matter; not only has he replied with satirical indifference to a respectful demand for proper information which he was charged with the duty of obtaining, but he has withheld information upon this point obtained by our Department of State, through the German Government, for the express purpose of our enlightenment. He has done, Mr. President, what is infinitely more reprehensible; he has refused to the Senator of Virginia and to the other Democratic members of the Senate Finance Committee the privilege of having the same information as he himself has enjoyed by virtue of being an officer of this body; and when, Mr. President, his attention is called to this unjust and unconstitutional conduct, he justifies it by quoting from an evil precedent of Democratic origin and seemed to think he had fully answered for this breach of duty.

Mr. President, a bad Democratic precedent is no more respectable to me than a bad precedent from any other source.

The conduct of the chairman of the Committee on Finance in holding secret meetings with regard to this public matter and in giving repeated confidential audiences to the agents of monopoly, whose advice is influencing the various paragraphs of this bill in their own interests against the interests of the American people, is a bad precedent either to set or to follow, and puts the management of the Senate of the United States under the suspicion of a want of frankness and of a want of sincerity in drawing these schedules. It is of the highest national importance that the Senate of the United States and every Member of it should not only be above suspicion, but, as far as possible, beyond danger of being deceived or misled.

This evil precedent has already borne bad fruit, and the chairman of the Committee on Finance has been induced to put into this bill and to retain in this bill many so-called "jokers"—that is, words and phrases, innocent in appearance, with far-reaching consequences, favorable to the beneficiary and unfavorable to the people. These devices have already been pointed out on the floor, and I shall not pause to enumerate them. No court of justice, and no high official of government charged with a sacred trust should permit himself to conduct "star-chamber proceedings," because it is almost sure to bring upon himself the odium of suspicion and public hostility as a Member of the United States Senate.

I enter my emphatic protest against this conduct of the public business as a precedent. It should not be permitted to stand as a precedent.

The poor excuse that the Democratic Members were lately furnished with the assistance of two statisticians does not in the least degree excuse this grossly improper method of conducting the public business. These experts were not furnished until it was too late to use their services advantageously for the proper digest and amendment of this bill.

For over a year the Republican Members have given it out that they were preparing this bill, and yet with all this time they have never yet furnished either the House or Senate with "the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad" of the items in the paragraphs of the Dingley bill, which they were honor bound to do by the platform of 1904 and by the platform of 1908, which required the redrawing of these paragraphs on this precise basis.

They can furnish no explanation of this astonishing and shocking neglect of duty, except perhaps the explanation offered by the Senator from South Carolina, who humorously apologized for them—

That they could not be expected to furnish a rope with which to hang themselves.

Is it possible, Mr. President, that men of nobility and character, that Senators trusted by the people with such power, have knowingly refused to compile "the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad" on the items of the Dingley bill for our present guidance because they intended to break faith with the American people and did not dare to make the truth manifest by compiling this damning evidence of their betrayal of their party pledges?

Whatever the purpose, Mr. President, the responsible authorities of the Senate in charge of this bill have furnished everything else except the evidence in point, and have obscured the issues both in the Senate and House by many volumes of undigested and undigestible matter, as well calculated to confuse the mind of an intelligent and laborious legislator as the huge volumes of testimony bundled before the petit jury in the criminal-rich cases, for the purpose of befogging the issue and assuring a miscarriage of justice.

In answer to my resolute demand for this information, the managers of the Senate, presenting and sustaining this bill, undertook to ridicule and discourage the inquiry. The chairman of the Committee on Finance [Mr. ALDRICH] indulges in satire, evasion, and suggests a lack of intelligence in the inquiry. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] declares the inquiry absurd. The Senator from Montana [Mr. CARTER] suggests that Senators can not expect to be fed with an intellectual spoon, and so forth. And this is the utterly contemptible and pusillanimous manner in which party pledges are redeemed. This is the answer made to a respectful inquiry, why this information is not furnished as to "the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad," and why this bill is not written in the light of this evidence, as the party pledged itself to do to the American people.

Mr. President, the Republican leaders in charge of this bill occupy a position absolutely and utterly indefensible. They have boldly and openly violated the pledges of the party and have sacrificed the interests of the American people to benefit those selfish interests which are using these high schedules for the purpose of sheltering monopoly.

Mr. President, I can not help but believe that the Republican leaders, acting through the subtle influence of machine politics, have been led into a support of these high schedules without fully realizing that they are violating their party pledges, which confines them to the difference of the cost of production at home and abroad, but having made the error, defend it from false pride of opinion.

They have been, not perhaps quite hypnotized, but overwhelmed with the "power of suggestion" enveloping them and creating the atmosphere and controlling environment established by a swarm of attorneys, special pleaders, and fascinating representatives of the high-tariff beneficiaries.

They seem to have entirely lost sight of the principle of protection taught by their forefathers and defended by their own platform. This bill ought not to pass

BECAUSE IT VIOLATES THE TRUE PRINCIPLE OF LEGITIMATE PROTECTION, WHICH DOES NOT ENGENDER OR DEFEND MONOPOLY.

This bill ought not to pass, because it violates the principle of protection from beginning to end.

Mr. President, if there is one thing that ought to be more thoroughly understood than another in this country it is—

The principle of legitimate protection.

There is not the slightest doubt about what it means from the days of Alexander Hamilton to this good day. The meaning of protection is absolutely clear to all students of economy, and that is a duty under a constitutional revenue tariff, so levied as to equal "the difference in cost of production at home and abroad," and thus enable the American manufacturer *to meet on equal terms the competition of the foreign manufacturer*, who enjoys cheaper labor or more favorable conditions, but not to establish monopoly by prohibitive duties.

Alexander Hamilton, in his famous report on the encouragement of manufacturers, gives the reasons for this policy. It was accepted by Washington, by Jefferson, by Madison, by Andrew Jackson, and various Democratic leaders down to the days of Samuel J. Tilden and Grover Cleveland, and has not been denied, as far as I am informed, by any great Democratic leader.

The Democratic platform of 1884 vigorously declared that in reducing the tariff the reduction—

Must be effected without depriving American labor of the ability to compete successfully with foreign labor, and without imposing lower rates of duty than will be ample to cover any increased cost of production which may exist in consequence of the higher rate of wages prevailing in this country.

And the Republican platform of 1904 says:

The measure of protection should always, at least, equal the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad.

And this doctrine is repeated again in the tariff of 1908 in the following words:

The true principle of protection is best maintained by the imposition of such duties as will *equal the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad.*

The Republican platform of 1908, however, adds the words:

Together with a reasonable profit to American industries.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

This latter is not the doctrine of protection. It is the political wedge of monopoly. It is the latest political device of those who have been fraudulently building up monopoly under color of the doctrine of protection.

The Democrats have sincerely and justly declared "Republican protection" a fraud and the shelter of monopoly. The Republicans have unjustly and deceitfully declared the Democratic tariff for revenue to be free trade.

I shall undertake, Mr. President, to show that the tariff under the doctrine for revenue would be three times as high as a tariff drawn purely for purposes of protection under the principles laid down in the Republican platform of equaling the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad, if it were honestly drawn.

The Democratic doctrine of a tariff for revenue is not free trade or anything which approximates it. It is a tariff high enough to abundantly afford every protection to any American industry which it has an honest right to ask, as I shall immediately show.

The Democratic doctrine has been the correct one; that is, a tariff as low as economical government will permit, and not so low as to injure any legitimate industry established under our tariff system, contending that a tariff for revenue properly drawn will meet by incidental protection every legitimate demand.

I shall not pause to discuss the difference between the two parties. I shall content myself with showing that this bill does not conform to the principle of legitimate protection, absolute or incidental, laid down by either party, but under the pretense of protecting American labor and American capital legitimately employed it is written in such a manner as to utterly ignore the principles of protection as taught by the Republicans themselves. This will be perfectly obvious to any man who will take the schedules submitted under the head of "Estimated revenues of this bill," of April 12, 1909, showing the rates proposed by this present bill and the comparison of the rates with the Dingley bill.

THE DIFFERENCE IN THE COST OF PRODUCTION AT HOME AND ABROAD.

The cost of production depends on materials and labor.

Materials are as cheap in the markets of the world to the American as to the European, except as we tax import of raw material by our own statute. Our policy, with few exceptions, is to admit raw material free, so that the question of the relative cost of materials is of very small relative importance.

Our manufacturers get free raw materials for their export business by refund of duties paid.

Many materials are cheaper in the United States than they are abroad, except where controlled by our unrestrained monopolies.

LABOR COST.

Labor cost in wages *in the protected industries, measured by efficiency* and *the purchasing power of wages* paid to labor, is approximately the same in the United States as in Europe, except where the American wage-earner is highly organized.

1. I shall undertake to show that this is true by showing that the money paid American labor *in protected industries* is approximately on an average but little more than that paid in Europe.

2. That the American workman is *twice as efficient*, and because of efficiency is entitled to twice the wage of the European workman, and that the difference in labor cost compared to the value of the product is in favor of the American manufacturer.

3. I shall undertake to show that $150 of wages in the United States buys only what a hundred dollars buys in Europe in manufactured goods, and for this reason the American manufacturer does not pay his labor as much in proportion to work done as the European manufacturer.

4. I shall undertake to show, finally, that the total percentage of wages to the gross product of all American manufacturers is only 17.8 per cent of the gross value of the product, and, therefore, that the difference in the cost of production in the United States and abroad must be on an average less than this percentage. If labor abroad cost half as much as in the United States, as the high protectionists pretend, then the difference in cost of production necessary to be provided for by a purely protective tariff would be less than the average of 10 per cent, while a revenue tariff would be between 30 and 40 per cent.

I shall undertake to show the bad effect of a prohibitive tariff on wages, on commerce, on distribution of wealth, and in corrupting of public and private life.

3. Effect of prohibitive tariff.

ON WAGES.

(*a*) Has lowered wages relative to product.

(*b*) Has lowered wages in protected industries compared to unprotected industries.

(*c*) Has lowered purchasing power of wages.

(*d*) Has established monopoly, and, consequently,

1. Has prevented or obstructed the organization of labor.
2. Restricted output and diminished demand for labor.
3. Has substituted foreign pauper labor for American labor.
4. Has required ruinous hours.
5. Subjected labor to bad housing, bad water, insanitary conditions.
6. Has increased mortality of labor.
7. Has destroyed political liberty of its labor in large measure.
8. Has impaired labor's commercial independence.
9. Has appropriated all the net proceeds of labor and accumulated it in the hands of the few.

ON COMMERCE.

(*a*) Has weakened our imports and exports.

(*b*) Has diminished the output of smaller factories, depending for material on monopolies.

(*c*) Has raised prices in United States 50 per cent above the prices abroad, thus *diminishing consumption.*

1. This means a ruinous tax on the man or woman with fixed income. A man with income of $1,500 *has one-third of income* confiscated by monopolies' high prices.

This affects all men with fixed income. The clerk, the servant, the government employee, the pensioner, the man receiving fixed return from investment, yields one-third of it all to monopoly.

ON DISTRIBUTION OF WEALTH.

1. It has piled up enormous wealth in few hands, which now grows with accumulating force, absorbing all *natural opportunities* of life. The oil fields, coal, ore, timber, transportation, and transmission services, municipal franchises, real estate, water powers, with the inevitable result, if not checked, of commercial mastery and commercial slavery and destruction of political independence.

2. It has *corrupted our public life*, our elections, our cities, our courts, legislatures, and executive officers, and our private citizens.

FIRST. RELATIVE LABOR COST.

Mr. President, I wish to point out the relative labor cost, because in considering this matter as a student, I have faithfully undertaken to do so. What I shall say will be as a student of this matter and not as a mere controversialist—and I defy the Committee on Finance to challenge the accuracy of the figures which I submit to the Senate—the labor cost of material is the first great factor that ought to be considered by the Senate. The percentage which labor bears to various products, as shown by our statistical tables, is carefully set forth in Exhibit 1, taken from volumes 7–10 on manufactures of our federal census.

It is true that the Census Bureau neglected to work out the percentages of labor cost, but that is a mathematical problem easy of solution, to which I have given industrious attention. I call the attention of the Senate to these percentages, which are of vital importance if this bill is to be writen in a spirit of integrity. From this table it appears that labor's share of the gross product in the food industries was 5.7 per cent; in textiles, 19.5 per cent; in iron and steel, 22.10 per cent; lumber, 27.4 per cent; leather industries, 16.5 per cent; in paper and printing, 21.6 per cent; in liquors and beverages, 8.9 per cent; in chemicals and allied products, 8 per cent; clay, glass, and stone products, 37.1 per cent; in metals and metal products, 12.7 per cent; tobacco products, 18.9 per cent; for vehicles for land transportation, 34.4 per cent; in shipbuilding, 35.2 per cent; in miscellaneous industries, 19.9 per cent.

The average of wages paid to labor, compared with the gross product in the 14 great industries, therefore, is only 19.7 per cent of the gross product. And yet the leaders bring in this bill with the average three times as high as the total labor cost, and ask us, representing the people of the United States, to accept it without a murmur and without a protest. They have neglected to point out the difference of the cost of production at home and abroad. I have undertaken to do so, and to put upon the records of the Senate a lasting memorial of what this cost is, that they shall not leave this matter without explanation to the people of the United States. It shall be recorded and it is recorded by the tables which I shall immediately submit.

Mr. President, before I submit these tables, however, I wish to call attention to the report of Carroll D. Wright. I have suggested heretofore to the managers of this bill that they might consult the tables of Carroll D. Wright with advantage. He

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

offers 446 different articles, with the total labor cost measured to the cent in each and every one of them, taking this information from the United States, from Germany, from Belgium, from England, and he verifies in these particular instances the accuracy of our general tables taken from the Census Bureau.

Obviously, the difference in the percentage which the wages of labor abroad would bear to manufactured products in like great industries will be somewhat similar to the percentage in this country. Wages are somewhat cheaper abroad in the protected industries than they are in this country, and if the average wage was only half abroad what it is at home, the difference in the cost of wages at home and abroad would not exceed 10 per cent ad valorem on the gross products of labor in all of our 14 great groups of manufacturing industries; but when it is remembered that American labor is twice as productive in this country as it is abroad, even this 10 per cent disappears. Notwithstanding this important and vital fact, the representatives of high protection continually declaim that a 50 per cent tariff is almost solely and exclusively in the interest of the American laborer and for the protection of the American manufacturer from bankruptcy.

THE LOWER WAGES IN EUROPE OFFSET BY GREATER EFFICIENCY OF AMERICAN LABOR.

James G. Blaine once said:

That the actual labor cost of the American product is less because the effectiveness of American labor was superior to that of the workingman of any other nation on earth.

Prof. William G. Clark, indorsed as an authority by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], in the Engineering Magazine for May, 1904, submits a table, which he bases on official data, showing the comparative productivity of American labor for the year 1900, as follows, to wit:

American, average annual output	$2,450
Canadian, average annual output	1,455
Australian, average annual output	900
French, average annual output	640
England, average annual output	556
German, average annual output	460

I do not assert that these figures are strictly correct, but believe it will be generally conceded that the American workman has at least twice the efficiency of the European workman, because of the use of superior machinery, modern appliances, and more effective invention.

PER CENT OF WAGES TO VALUE OF PRODUCT NOT CONSIDERED IN TARIFF RATES OF PENDING BILL.

The percentage which labor receives upon the gross product in the textiles industry, for example, as compiled by our own census on manufactures, is only 19.5 per cent; and yet when the woolen schedule, for example, is examined, the present bill puts yarn, 143 per cent (par. 373); knit fabrics, 141 per cent (par. 374); plushes and other pile fabrics, 141 per cent; wool advanced in any manner beyond scouring, 140 per cent; woolen cloths or worsted, 134 per cent (par. 374); blankets, 107 per cent; flannels for underwear, 143 per cent; dress goods, coat linings, and so forth, 105 per cent (par. 376); felts, not woven, 95 per cent; wearing apparel, clothes, dolman, jackets, ulsters, and so forth, for ladies and children, 80 per cent; hats of wool, 92 per cent; shawls, 92 per cent; woolen carpets, 114 per cent (par. 389).

Grossly violating the principle of protection, even from the Republican standpoint, and even in cotton cloth, which is particularly needed by our poorest people, cotton carpets are taxed 50 per cent (par. 389); cotton cloth 42 per cent, and as high as 61 per cent for different kinds of cotton cloth; cotton handkerchiefs, 55 per cent; cotton sleeve linings, 58 per cent.

Mr. President, the cost of labor in transforming wool and cotton into cloth is small. It does not exceed an average of 25 per cent, and in England it is slightly more than in the United States, because the labor there is not so efficient as in the United States; and the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad as far as the labor cost in cotton and woolen cloth is concerned is almost a negligible quantity.

It will not do, Mr. President, to attempt to deceive anyone by pretending that the difference in cost of production of items on this bill at home and abroad is not available, or that it would take years to compile it, as the managers of this bill have asserted on the floor of the Senate during this debate. It is available, and it has been collected on many sample products.

I had the honor to submit to the Senate, during the present session, the report of Carroll D. Wright, Commissioner of Labor, of 1898, who carefully examined into this question of costs, giving the precise amounts of costs in 446 instances. And in regard to woolen goods he shows that No. 1 woolen yarn can be made at a labor cost of 5.44 per cent of the finished product (S. Doc. 20, 55th Cong., 3d sess., p. 84); that woolen yarn No. 2 could be made with a labor cost of 4.74 per cent of the finished product; that woolen yarn No. 3 could be made for 7.11 per cent of the finished product; that woolen yarn No. 4 could be made for 6.49 per cent of the finished product; that woolen yarn No. 5 could be made at a cost of 7.71 per cent of the finished product; that woolen yarn No. 6 could be made at a labor cost of 9.29 per cent of the finished product; and including the entire cost of labor in transformation materials, which are shown in No. 426, that woolen cloth in the United States, 55 inches wide, 24 ounces to the yard, can be made at a labor cost of 16.44 per cent of the finished product.

But the Committee on Finance approve a rate of 143 per cent on woolen yarn.

Mr. President, if I should point out all of such inequalities between the cost of production at home and abroad and the rates fixed by this bill, with its 4,000 items, it would require a volume and many days of time. I therefore content myself with a complete demonstration of the general character of this bill in its indifference to the principles of protection as laid down in the Republican platform, and will then proceed with other considerations.

I take a few items from Carroll D. Wright's report, giving the cost of labor in transforming wool into blankets in the United States, compiled by him under the instructions of the Senate ten years ago, and of woolen cloth.

He explains that this work was obtained directly from the manufacturers by the Department of Labor, using "experts from the department, detailed for that purpose."

He shows the total cost of labor in blankets, cloth, and woolen yarns to be from 5 per cent to 30 per cent.

[From report of Carroll D. Wright, Commissioner of Labor, 1898, by experts on cost, in answer to Senate resolution.]

Woolen goods.

No. 390.—*Blankets:* United States; 1897; unit, 1 pound.
White; best grade; all wool; warp, 16 cut; filling, 10 cut; 46 threads of warp and 38 picks of filling per inch; size, 72x80 inches; weight, 6 pounds.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	$0.145	15.56
Cost of materials and all other items except labor	.787	84.44
Total cost	.932	100.00

No. 391.—*Blankets:* United States; 1897; unit, 1 pound.
White; navy; all wool; warp, 7½ cut; filling, 6½ cut; 24 threads of warp and 24 picks of filling per inch; size, 58x78 inches; weight, 3¼ pounds.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	$0.0978	15.28
Cost of materials and all other items except labor	.5422	84.72
Total cost	.6400	100.00

No. 392.—*Blankets:* United States; 1897; unit, 1 pound.
White; medium grade; all wool; same general description as product No. 390, but made of cheaper quality wool.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	$0.13	18.57
Cost of materials and all other items except labor	.57	81.43
Total cost	.70	100.00

No. 393.—*Blankets:* United States; 1897; unit, 1 pound.
All wool; warp, 11 cut; filling, 9 cut; 23⅜ threads of warp and 27 picks of filling per inch; size, 58x76 inches; weight, 2 pounds.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	$0.1417	31.40
Cost of materials and all other items except labor	.3096	68.60
Total cost	.4513	100.00

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Woolen goods—Continued.

No. 394.—*Blankets:* United States; 1897; unit, 1 pound.
White; best grade; cotton warp and wool filling; warp, No. 16; filling, 10 cut; 52 threads of warp and 42 picks of filling per inch; size, 60x72 inches; weight, 5 pounds.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	$0.125	15.76
Cost of materials and all other items except labor	.668	84.24
Total cost	.793	100.00

No. 395.—*Blankets:* United States; 1897; unit, 1 pound.
White; mixed cotton and wool; warp, 10 cut; filling, 10 cut; 36 threads of warp and 36 picks of filling per inch; size, 60x72 inches; weight, 5 pounds.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	$0.135	16.71
Cost of materials and all other items except labor	.673	83.29
Total cost	.808	100.00

No. 392.—*Blankets:* United States; 1897; unit, 1 pound.
White; medium grade; all wool; same general description as product No. 390, but made of cheaper quality wool.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	$0.13	18.57
Cost of materials and all other items except labor	.57	81.43
Total cost	.70	100.00

No. 393.—*Blankets:* United States; 1897; unit, 1 pound.
All wool; warps, 11 cut; filling, 9 cut; 23⅜ threads of warp and 27 picks of filling per inch; size 58x76 inches; weight, 2 pounds.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	$0.1417	31.40
Cost of materials and all other items except labor	.3096	68.60
Total cost	.4513	100.00

No. 394.—*Blankets:* United States; 1897; unit, 1 pound.
White; best grade; cotton warp and wool filling; warp No. 16; filling, 10 cut; 52 threads of warp and 42 picks of filling per inch; size, 60x72 inches; weight, 5 pounds.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	$0.125	15.76
Cost of materials and all other items except labor	.668	84.24
Total cost	.793	100.00

No. 400.—*Blankets:* United States; 1897; unit, 1 pound.
Horse; medium grade; all wool; warp and filling, both 5-cut; 22 threads of warp and 22 picks of filling per inch; size, 84x90 inches; weight, 7 pounds.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	$0.0850	19.07
Cost of materials and all other items except labor	.3607	80.93
Total cost	.4457	100.00

No. 401.—*Blankets:* United States; 1897; unit, 1 pound.
Horse; plaid; all wool; warp and filling, both 4½-cut; 21½ threads of warp and 17 picks of filling per inch; size, 78x80 inches; weight, 5 pounds.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	$0.1000	21.42
Cost of materials and all other items except labor	.3669	78.58
Total cost	.4669	100.00

Woolen goods—Continued.

No. 402.—*Blankets:* United States; 1897; unit, 1 pound.
Horse; low grade; mixed wool and cotton; warp and filling, both 4-cut; 20 threads of warp and 20 picks of filling per inch; size, 84x90 inches; weight, 7 pounds.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	$0.0550	32.09
Cost of materials and all other items except labor	.1164	67.91
Total cost	.1714	100.00

No. 403.—*Blankets:* United States; 1897; unit, 1 pound.
Horse; blue; cotton warp and wool filling; warp, No. 10; filling, 4-cut; 32½ threads of warp and 48 picks of filling per inch; size, 84x90 inches; weight, 7 pounds.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	$0.0714	24.43
Cost of materials and all other items except labor	.2209	75.57
Total cost	.2923	100.00

No. 404.—*Blankets:* Belgium; 1897; unit, 1 pound.
White; all wool; medium quality.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	$0.0525	14.99
Cost of materials and all other items except labor	.2977	85.01
Total cost	.3502	100.00

No. 405.—*Cloth:* United States; March, 1898; unit, 1 yard.
Beaver; 54 inches wide; weight, 29 ounces per yard; warp yarn, No. 16 colored cotton; weft yarn, ⅝ of 2¼ run and ⅜ of 1 run shoddy; 85 ends of warp and 62 picks of weft per inch.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	$0.240	28.20
Cost of materials and all other items except labor	6.11	71.80
Total cost	.851	100.00

No. 406.—*Cloth:* United States; March, 1898; unit, 1 yard.
Cassimere; 54 inches wide; weight, 20½ ounces per yard; warp yarn, 2¼ run; weft yarn, 2⅜ run; 50 ends of warp and 36 picks of weft per inch.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	$0.20	23.81
Cost of materials and all other items except labor	.64	76.19
Total cost	.84	100.00

No. 407.—*Cloth:* United States; March, 1898; unit, 1 yard.
Cassimere; 54 inches wide; weight, 22 ounces per yard; warp yarn, 2 run; weft yarn, 2¼ run; 50 ends of warp and 36 picks of filling per inch.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	$0.2100	23.80
Cost of materials and all other items except labor	.6725	76.20
Total cost	.8825	100.00

No. 408.—*Cloth:* United States; 1897; unit, 1 yard.
Cassimere; 54 inches wide; weight, 26 ounces per yard; warp yarn, 4-run; weft yarn, 5-run; 75 ends of warp and 64 picks of weft per inch.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	$0.3654	28.31
Cost of materials and all other items except labor	.9252	71.69
Total cost	1.2906	100.00

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Woolen goods—Continued.

No. 409.—*Cloth:* United States; 1897; unit, 1 yard.
Cassimere; 54 inches wide; weight, 20 ounces per yard; warp yarn, 4-run; weft yarn, 5-run; 60 ends of warp and 52 picks of weft per inch.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	$0.2801	28.09
Cost of materials and all other items except labor	.7172	71.91
Total cost	.9973	100.00

No. 410.—*Cloth:* United States; 1897; unit, 1 yard.
Cassimere; 55 inches wide; weight, 22 ounces per yard; 4½-run yarn, single, double, and twisted, is used in both warp and weft; 38 ends of warp and 38 picks of weft per inch.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	$0.2163	17.30
Cost of materials and all other items except labor	1.0337	82.70
Total cost	1.2500	100.00

No. 411.—*Cloth:* United States; November, 1897; unit, 1 yard.
Cheviot; 56 inches wide; weight, 32 ounces per yard; warp yarn, 2-ply No. 24 worsted face and 2½-run wool; back weft yarn, 2⅝-run face and 2-run back; 86 ends of warp and 60 picks of weft per inch.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	$0.42	28.00
Cost of materials and all other items except labor	1.08	72.00
Total cost	1.50	100.00

No. 412.—*Cloth:* United States; November, 1897, unit, 1 yard.
Cheviot; 55 inches wide; weight, 28 ounces per yard; 1¼-run yarn used in both warp and weft; 38 ends of warp and 32 picks of weft per inch.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	$0.22	22.45
Cost of materials and all other items except labor	.76	77.55
Total cost	.98	100.00

No. 413.—*Cloth:* United States; 1897; unit, 1 yard.
Cheviot; half shoddy; 56 inches wide; weight, 22 ounces per yard; 1⅜-run yarn is used in both warp and weft; 28 ends of warp and 26 ends of weft per inch.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	$0.15	28.30
Cost of materials and all other items except labor	.38	71.70
Total cost	.53	100.00

No. 414.—*Cloth:* United States; November, 1897; unit, 1 yard.
Cheviot; piece dyed; 55 inches wide; weight, 20 ounces per yard; 2 threads of 3¾ runs each, doubled and twisted, used in both warp and weft; 40 ends of warp and 30 picks of weft per inch.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	$0.1688	22.51
Cost of materials and all other items except labor	.5812	77.49
Total cost	.7500	100.00

No. 415.—*Cloth:* United States; 1897; unit, 1 yard.
Kersey; high grade; finely finished; 55 inches wide; weight, 20 ounces per yard; 4½-run yarn is used in both warp and weft; 48 ends of warp and 48 picks of weft per inch.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	$0.54	30.86
Cost of materials and all other items except labor	1.21	69.14
Total cost	1.75	100.00

Woolen goods—Continued.

No. 416.—*Cloth:* United States; November, 1897; unit, 1 yard.
Kersey; 55 inches wide; weight, 27 ounces per yard; warp yarn, 4 run; weft yarn, 4½-run face and 2-run back; 76 ends of warp and 60 picks of weft per inch.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	$0.38	31.93
Cost of materials and all other items except labor	.81	68.07
Total cost	1.19	100.00

No. 417.—*Cloth:* United States; November, 1897; unit, 1 yard.
Kersey; piece dyed; 55 inches wide; weight, 32 ounces per yard; warp yarn, ⅜ of 7 run and ⅛ of 2¾ run; weft yarn, ⅜ of 5 run and ⅛ of 2¼ run; 88 ends of warp and 66 picks of weft per inch.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	$0.4202	22.47
Cost of materials and all other items except labor	1.4498	77.53
Total cost	1.8700	100.00

No. 418.—*Cloth:* United States; 1897; unit, 1 yard.
Kersey; one-third shoddy; 56 inches wide; weight, 28 ounces per yard; warp yarn, 20 ends of 3¾ run and 20 ends of 1¾ run per inch; weft yarn, 2 run; 40 ends of warp and 40 picks of weft per inch.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	$0.288	25.09
Cost of materials and all other items except labor	.860	74.91
Total cost	1.148	100.00

No. 419.—*Cloth:* United States; November, 1897; unit, 1 yard.
Kersey; half shoddy; piece dyed; 55 inches wide; weight, 32 ounces per yard; warp yarn, ⅜ of 3 run and ⅛ of 1 run; weft yarn, 2¼ run; 54 ends of warp and 40 picks of weft per inch.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	$0.2388	28.09
Cost of materials and all other items except labor	.6112	71.91
Total cost	.8500	100.00

No. 420.—*Cloth:* United States; November, 1897; unit, 1 yard.
Frieze; 55 inches wide; weight, 32 ounces per yard; warp yarn, 3⅛ run; weft yarn, 1¾ run; 44 ends of warp and 44 picks of weft per inch.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	$0.26	25.49
Cost of materials and all other items except labor	.76	74.51
Total cost	1.02	100.00

No. 421.—*Cloth:* United States; 1897; unit, 1 yard.
Melton; 54 inches wide; weight, 28 ounces per yard; warp yarn, 3 run; weft yarn, 3¼ run; 58 ends of warp and 54 picks of weft per inch.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	$0.2549	25.67
Cost of materials and all other items except labor	.7381	74.33
Total cost	.9930	100.00

No. 422.—*Cloth:* United States; November, 1897; unit, 1 yard.
Thibet; 55 inches wide; weight, 23 ounces per yard; 3¼ run yarn used in both warp and weft; 95 ends of warp and 46 picks of weft per inch.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	$0.32	28.57
Cost of materials and all other items except labor	.80	71.43
Total cost	1.12	100.00

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Woolen goods—Continued.

No. 423.—*Cloth:* United States; November, 1897; unit, 1 yard.
Thibet; piece dyed; 55 inches wide; weight, 22 ounces per yard; warp yarn, 5 run; weft yarn, 1½ run; 46 ends of warp and 32 picks of weft per inch.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	$0.1825	28.08
Cost of materials and all other items except labor	.4675	71.92
Total cost	.6500	100.00

No. 424.—*Cloth:* United States; November, 1897; unit, 1 yard.
Tricot; piece dyed; 32 inches wide; weight, 3¼ ounces per yard; 6/4 run yarn used in both warp and weft; 35 ends of warp and 26 picks of weft per inch.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	$0.035	25.00
Cost of materials and all other items except labor	.105	75.00
Total cost	.140	100.00

No. 425.—*Cloth:* United States; November, 1897; unit, 1 yard.
Whip cord; 55 inches wide; weight, 22 ounces per yard; warp yarn, 5/4 run and 9 run, twisted; weft yarn, 4 run; 98 ends of warp and 40 picks of weft per inch.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	$0.38	24.36
Cost of materials and all other items except labor	1.18	75.64
Total cost	1.56	100.00

No. 426.—*Cloth:* United States; November, 1897; unit, 1 yard.
Woolen cloth; 55 inches wide; weight, 23 to 24 ounces per yard; warp yarn, 2-ply 3½ run wool; weft yarn, 2-ply 20/2 worsted; 30 picks per inch.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	$0.24	16.44
Cost of materials and all other items except labor	1.22	83.56
Total cost	1.46	100.00

No. 427.—*Cloth:* Great Britain; 1897; unit, 1 yard.
Cheviot; 54 inches wide; worsted warp and woolen weft; warp 2 fold No. 10 worsted; weft No. 9½ and No. 30 twist; 20 picks per inch.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	$0.2233	29.45
Cost of materials and all other items except labor	.5349	70.55
Total cost	.7582	100.00

No. 428.—*Cloth:* Great Britain; 1897; unit, 1 yard.
Melton; 54 inches wide; woolen warp and weft; warp No. 12; weft No. 12; 32 picks per inch.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	$0.2026	29.89
Cost of materials and all other items except labor	.4752	70.11
Total cost	.6778	100.00

No. 429.—*Cloth:* Great Britain; 1897; unit, 1 yard.
Undress worsted; 56 inches wide; woolen warp and weft; warp No. 18; weft No. 18; 50 picks per inch.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	$0.2407	25.15
Cost of materials and all other items except labor	.7162	74.85
Total cost	.9569	100.00

Woolen goods—Continued.

No. 430.—*Woolen yarn:* United States; 1897–98; unit, 1 pound.
No. 1 yarn.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	$0.0260	5.44
Cost of materials and all other items except labor	.4522	94.56
Total cost	.4782	100.00

No. 431.—*Woolen yarn:* United States; December, 1897; unit, 1 pound.
No. 2 yarn.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	$0.0287	4.74
Cost of materials and all other items except labor	.5773	95.26
Total cost	.6060	100.00

No. 432.—*Woolen yarn:* United States; November, 1897; unit, 1 pound.
No. 2 yarn.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	$0.0800	21.82
Cost of materials and all other items except labor	.2866	78.18
Total cost	.3666	100.00

No. 433.—*Woolen yarn:* United States; 1897–98; unit, 1 pound.
No. 3 yarn.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	$0.0382	7.11
Cost of materials and all other items except labor	.4987	92.89
Total cost	.5369	100.00

No. 434.—*Woolen yarn:* United States; December, 1897; unit, 1 pound.
No. 3 yarn.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	$0.0337	5.50
Cost of materials and all other items except labor	.5788	94.50
Total cost	.6125	100.00

No. 435.—*Woolen yarn:* United States; November, 1897; unit, 1 pound.
No. 3½ yarn.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	$0.1000	23.12
Cost of materials and all other items except labor	.3325	76.88
Total cost	.4325	100.00

No. 436.—*Woolen yarn:* United States; December, 1897; unit, 1 pound.
No. 4 yarn.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	$0.0412	6.49
Cost of materials and all other items except labor	.5938	93.51
Total cost	.6350	100.00

No. 437.—*Woolen yarn:* United States; 1897–98; unit, 1 pound.
No. 5 yarn.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	$0.0640	10.48
Cost of materials and all other items except labor	.5469	89.52
Total cost	.6109	100.00

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Woolen goods—Continued.

No. 438.—*Woolen yarn:* United States; December, 1897; unit, 1 pound. No. 5 yarn.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	$0.0512	7.71
Cost of materials and all other items except labor	.6133	92.29
Total cost	.6645	100.00

No. 439.—*Woolen yarn:* United States; November, 1897; unit, 1 pound. No. 5½ yarn.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	$0.1200	22.37
Cost of materials and all other items except labor	.4165	77.63
Total cost	.5365	100.00

No. 440.—*Woolen yarn:* United States; 1897–98; unit, 1 pound. No. 6 yarn.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	$0.0742	11.88
Cost of materials and all other items except labor	.5505	88.12
Total cost	.6247	100.00

No. 441.—*Woolen yarn:* United States; December, 1897; unit, 1 pound. No. 6 yarn.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	$0.0637	9.29
Cost of materials and all other items except labor	.6218	90.71
Total cost	.6855	100.00

No. 442.—*Woolen yarn:* United States; 1897–98; unit, 1 pound.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	$0.0941	13.51
Cost of materials and all other items except labor	.6025	86.49
Total cost	.6966	100.00

No. 443.—*Woolen yarn:* United States; November, 1897; unit, 1 pound. No. 9 yarn.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	$0.1500	19.85
Cost of materials and all other items except labor	.6055	80.15
Total cost	.7555	100.00

No. 8 yarn.

No. 444.—*Woolen yarn:* United States; 1897–98; unit, 1 pound. No. 10 yarn.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	$0.1085	14.65
Cost of materials and all other items except labor	.6322	85.35
Total cost	.7407	100.00

No. 445.—*Woolen yarn:* Belgium; 1897; unit, 1 pound.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	$0.0700	26.66
Cost of materials and all other items except labor	.1926	73.34
Total cost	.2626	100.00

Woolen goods—Continued.

No. 446.—*Woolen yarn:* Belgium; 1897; unit, 1 pound.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	$0.0306	11.65
Cost of materials and all other items except labor	.2320	88.35
Total cost	.2626	100.00

CENSUS TABLES, SHOWING PERCENTAGE OF LABOR TO VALUE OF PRODUCT IN COST OF PRODUCTION.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I submit the following tables, taken from Table 156 of the Abstract of the Census of 1900, relative to 15 groups of industries. While these tables can not be called microscopically exact, they certainly comprise the best evidence available to show the relative return to labor and to capital affected by the tariff, and in so far as they lack precision are more favorable to capital than to labor, because these figures were obtained from the reports of manufacturing establishments controlled by capital, and the evidences, therefore, are out of the mouths of the manufacturers themselves, but are based on watered stocks, and cover returns to capital contained in salaries and miscellaneous items which can not be determined.

These tables which I shall submit will show the capital alleged to be invested in 1890, 1900, and 1905, with the expenses, including salaries of officers, amounts paid in wages, amounts paid under the head of "Miscellaneous," and the amount paid for "materials," with the value of the product and the profit, showing the percentage of profit to capital and the percentage paid to labor out of the proceeds of labor, and the percentage of wages to the increase of value by manufacture.

I have been compelled to make these compilations, and am indebted for the calculations to Mr. Josiah H. Shinn, of Washington, a statistical expert of high standing, and to Mr. J. J. McCoy, Actuary of the United States Treasury. The Census Bureau neglected to point out in its tables the comparative reward of capital and labor, and I have done so, in order to show the truth with regard to it.

Neither the Committee on Finance nor the Committee on Ways and Means in the House has seen fit to furnish this information to the country, and yet only in this direction and by like methods and tables can be determined "the difference in cost of labor or of production at home and abroad" on which this tariff bill is falsely pretended to be drawn.

The percentage of labor is worked out in every one of the great tables affecting the 14 groups of industries in the United States from details gathered with infinite care from the manufacturer himself, and are therefore as favorable to him as they might naturally be expected to be. A very interesting ratio of the relative wages is found in these tables; that is to say, that under this high prohibitive tariff, engendering monopolies, the result has followed which might be expected to follow—that labor continually receives a diminishing share of that which it produces. For instance, taking the textile industry, in 1890 labor received 22 per cent of the gross product; in 1902 it received 20.8 per cent of the gross product; and in 1905 it received 19.5 per cent. So it will be found all through these tables that the monopolies which have been built up upon these tariffs have gradually diminished the part which labor receives.

Look at these wonderful tables, showing the profits of the various manufacturers of the country by groups of industries. Remember the enormous stock-watering operations shown by Moody's Manual and by Poor's Manual and the corporation statistics of the last fifteen years, and then consider what it means when this watered capital on food products pays 16.4 per cent interest, with a fairly estimated profit, considering water, of 32 per cent; on textiles, of 12 per cent, with a fairly estimated profit of 24 per cent; on iron and steel, of 10.6 per cent, which would be probably 30 per cent; on lumber, of 18.7 per cent, and probably of nearly 50 per cent; on the industries of leather, 13.5 per cent, when it should be at least three times that; and so all through the list.

These monopolies are shown to have the certain enormous rates of profits which these tables point out. These tables necessarily include a multitude of companies whose profits are reasonable and just in every respect, who are not monopolists, who are doing business on a fair competitive market, so that the profits of monopoly are the special profits which swell this total to a high figure, and which stand above, and far above, the averages

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

which are given. When there is also taken into consideration the fact that on a physical valuation they would not have probably one-third of the capital invested which they pretend to have by their capital stock; when it is remembered that under the head of salaries and miscellaneous expenses and other artful methods of bookkeeping the earnings of these monopolies are being secretly used and concealed and being invested in various forms of property, it is no exaggeration to say that the earnings on physical valuation are probably three times what they appear to be on the face of the census reports.

Mr. President, I call the attention of Senators in considering these tables and invite them to remember that since 1890 the United States has gone through the most remarkable stock-watering operation that the civilized world has ever seen. And *the earning power of labor and of public franchises has been capitalized in a multitude of monopolies*, which have been established by combining competing enterprises into single companies, so that, while the capital of 1890 was in a large measure watered stock, it is probably no exaggeration to say that the capital of 1905 will average probably 66 per cent of "water;" so that when you consider the percentage of profit on the capital in these tables it should be at least doubled and should be probably trebled to give a fair estimate.

Another item which should be kept in mind is that the men who control corporate organizations can allow themselves such enormous rewards under the head of salaries that this item is also an important additional item in favor of capital. With this explanation, it will be seen that labor's share of the return of the work done in this aggregate group of all the great industries relating to manufactured products is very small and, after supplying the necessaries of life, leaves labor no surplus; the profit of capital, confessedly, is 16.4 per cent.

Now, Mr. President, I submit a tabulated abstract showing the profits of capital conceded; also a table of estimated profits and a table of probable profits in the 14 great groups of our national industries.

THE MEANING OF WORDS USED IN THE TABLES.

Salaries.—Covers the salaries of officials, salesmen, bookkeepers, clerks, stenographers; in some cases, superintendents and foremen.

Wages.—The word "wages" means the wages of workingmen.

Miscellaneous.—Means (see Special Report of Census, Manufactures, vol. 1, 1905, p. xcix):

1. Amount paid for rent of factory or works.
2. Amount paid for taxes, not including internal revenue.
3. Amount paid for *rent of offices and buildings* other than factory or works, and for *interest, insurance*, internal-revenue tax, *ordinary repairs of buildings and machinery, advertising, traveling expenses*, and *all other sundry expenses not reported under the head of "Materials."*

Materials.—The word "materials," page ci, means:

1. Cost of components of the product.
2. Cost of fuel, oil, and waste.
3. Packing boxes, and materials to make them.
4. Wrapping paper.
5. Freights paid by the manufacturers.
6. Rent of power and heat.

The salaried officials include the administration force, whether of *sales, manufacturing, purchasing, advertising, or mail orders* (p. lxxiv).

See Exhibit 1.

EXHIBIT 1.

Summary of manufactures by fourteen groups of industries.

[Special Census Report, Manufactures, pt. 1, 1905, p. 28 et seq.; Twelfth Census, 1900, Manufactures, pt. 1, p. 20 et seq., and pp. cxliv and cxlv; with special calculations by Josiah H. Shinn and J. J. McCoy, actuary of United States Treasury.]

	1905.	1900.	1890.
1. Food-products industries:			
Capital	$1,173,151,276	$940,889,838	$507,678,328
Expenses—			
Officers	$51,456,814	$39,313,654	$33,313,664
Wages	$164,601,813	$129,910,070	$90,373,450
Miscellaneous	$131,773,642	$77,986,185	$52,936,982
Materials	$2,304,416,564	$1,839,256,143	$1,318,963,830
Total	$2,652,248,833	$2,086,466,062	$1,495,587,926
Profit	$192,986,067	$191,235,948	$140,609,265
Gross product	$2,845,234,900	$2,277,702,010	$1,636,197,191
Per cent profit on capital stock	16.4	20	27.6
Labor's share of gross product, per cent	5.7	5.7	5.5
Value of gross output	$2,845,234,900	$2,277,702,010	$1,636,197,191
Cost of materials	$2,304,416,564	$1,839,256,143	$1,318,963,830
Increase in value	$540,818,336	$438,445,867	$317,233,361
Cost of labor	$164,601,813	$129,910,070	$90,373,450
Per cent of cost of labor to increase in value	30.4	33.7	35.1
2. Textile industries:			
Capital	$1,744,169,234	$1,366,604,058	$1,008,050,268
Expenses—			
Officers	$69,281,415	$49,982,357	$35,496,483
Wages	$419,841,630	$341,734,399	$278,167,769
Miscellaneous	$199,066,264	$128,481,214	$78,404,675
Materials	$1,246,562,061	$895,984,796	$705,004,909
Total	$1,934,751,370	$1,416,182,766	$1,097,073,839
Profit	$212,690,048	$221,301,718	$164,598,665
Gross product	$2,147,441,418	$1,637,484,484	$1,261,672,504
Per cent profit on capital stock	12	16.1	16.3
Labor's share of gross product, per cent	19.5	20.8	22
Value of gross output	$2,147,441,418	$1,637,484,484	$1,261,672,504
Cost of materials	$1,246,562,061	$895,984,796	$705,004,909
Increase in value	$900,879,358	$741,499,688	$556,667,595
Cost of labor	$419,841,630	$341,734,399	$278,167,769
Per cent of cost of labor to increase in value	46.6	46.1	50
3. Iron and steel industries:			
Capital	$2,331,498,157	$1,528,979,076	$997,872,488
Expenses—			
Officers	$100,444,683	$58,090,781	$36,583,536
Wages	$482,357,503	$331,875,499	$285,351,714
Miscellaneous	$166,836,587	$91,492,127	$57,694,853
Materials	$1,179,981,458	$987,198,370	$617,554,226
Total	$1,929,680,234	$1,518,656,777	$997,184,329
Profit	$247,059,492	$274,834,131	$146,872,208
Gross product	$2,176,739,726	$1,793,490,908	$1,144,056,537
Per cent profit on capital stock	10.6	17.9	14.7
Labor's share of gross product, per cent	22.10	21.2	24.9
Value of gross output	$2,176,739,726	$1,793,490,908	$1,144,056,537
Cost of materials	$1,179,981,458	$987,198,370	$317,554,226
Increase in value	$996,758,268	$806,292,538	$826,502,311
Cost of labor	$482,357,503		
Per cent of cost of labor to increase in value	48.5	45	46
4. Lumber industries:			
Capital	$1,013,827,138	$946,116,515	$844,418,472
Expenses—			
Officers	$48,571,861	$28,982,927	$30,833,184
Wages	$336,058,173	$212,201,768	$201,558,706
Miscellaneous	$130,850,824	$42,142,321	$45,510,782
Materials	$518,908,150	$561,501,302	$462,658,350
Total	$1,034,389,008	$844,828,318	$740,561,022
Profit	$189,341,328	$185,078,261	$137,363,808
Gross product	$1,223,730,336	$1,030,906,579	$877,954,920
Per cent profit on capital stock	18.7	19.6	16.2
Labor's share of gross product, per cent	27.4	20.6	22.9
Value of gross output	$1,223,730,336	$1,030,906,579	$877,954,920
Cost of materials	$518,908,150	$561,501,302	$462,658,350
Increase in value	$704,822,186	$469,405,277	$415,296,570
Cost of labor	$336,058,173	$212,201,768	$201,558,705
Per cent of cost of labor to increase in value	47.7	45.2	48.5
5. Leather industries:			
Capital	$440,777,194	$343,600,513	$246,795,713
Expenses—			
Officers	$18,372,722	$14,186,690	$15,348,267
Wages	$116,694,140	$99,759,885	$98,432,593
Miscellaneous	$40,737,343	$22,942,594	$18,587,831
Materials	$471,112,921	$395,551,232	$294,446,011
Total	$646,917,126	$532,440,401	$426,814,702
Profit	$58,830,344	$51,290,645	$30,741,328
Gross product	$705,747,470	$583,731,046	$457,556,030
Per cent profit on capital stock	13.3	14.9	24.6
Labor's share of gross product, per cent	16.5	16.9	20.1
Value of gross output	$705,747,470	$583,731,046	$457,556,030
Cost of materials	$471,112,921	$395,551,232	$294,446,011
Increase in value	$234,634,549	$188,179,814	$193,110,019
Cost of labor	$116,694,140	$99,750,885	$98,432,593
Per cent of cost of labor to increase in value	49.7	53	51

Summary of manufactures by fourteen groups of industries—Continued.

	1905.	1900.	1890.
1. Food-products industries—Continued.			
Value of gross output	$2,845,234,900	$2,277,702,010	$1,636,197,191
Cost of materials	$2,304,416,564	$1,839,256,143	$1,318,963,830
Increase in value	$540,818,336	$438,445,867	$317,233,361
Cost of labor	$164,601,813	$129,910,070	$90,373,450
Per cent of cost of labor to increase in value	30.4	33.7	35.1
2. Textile industries:			
Capital	$1,744,169,234	$1,366,604,058	$1,008,050,268
Expenses—			
Officers	$69,281,415	$49,982,357	$35,496,483
Wages	$419,841,630	$341,734,399	$278,167,769
Miscellaneous	$199,066,264	$128,481,214	$78,404,675
Materials	$1,246,562,061	$895,984,796	$705,004,909
Total	$1,934,751,370	$1,416,182,766	$1,097,073,839
Profit	$212,690,048	$221,301,718	$164,598,665
Gross product	$2,147,441,418	$1,637,484,484	$1,261,672,504
Per cent profit on capital stock	12	16.1	16.3
Labor's share of gross product, per cent	19.5	20.8	22
Value of gross output	$2,147,441,418	$1,637,484,484	$1,261,672,504
Cost of materials	$1,246,562,061	$895,984,796	$705,004,909
Increase in value	$900,879,358	$741,499,688	$556,667,595
Cost of labor	$419,841,630	$341,734,399	$278,167,769
Per cent of cost of labor to increase in value	46.6	46.1	50
3. Iron and steel industries:			
Capital	$2,331,498,157	$1,528,979,076	$997,872,488
Expenses—			
Officers	$100,444,683	$58,090,781	$36,583,536
Wages	$482,357,503	$331,875,499	$285,351,714
Miscellaneous	$166,836,587	$91,492,127	$57,694,853
Materials	$1,179,981,458	$987,198,370	$617,554,226
Total	$1,929,680,234	$1,518,656,777	$997,184,329
Profit	$247,059,492	$274,834,131	$146,872,208
Gross product	$2,176,739,726	$1,793,490,908	$1,144,056,537
Per cent profit on capital stock	10.6	17.9	14.7
Labor's share of gross product, per cent	22.10	21.2	24.9
Value of gross output	$2,176,739,726	$1,793,490,908	$1,144,056,537
Cost of materials	$1,179,981,458	$987,198,370	$317,554,226
Increase in value	$996,758,268	$806,292,538	$826,502,311
Cost of labor	$482,357,503		
Per cent of cost of labor to increase in value	48.5	45	46
4. Lumber industries:			
Capital	$1,013,827,138	$946,116,515	$844,418,472
Expenses—			
Officers	$48,571,861	$28,982,927	$30,833,184
Wages	$336,058,173	$212,201,768	$201,558,706
Miscellaneous	$130,850,824	$42,142,321	$45,510,782
Materials	$518,908,150	$561,501,302	$462,658,350
Total	$1,034,389,008	$844,828,318	$740,561,022
Profit	$189,341,328	$185,078,261	$137,363,808
Gross product	$1,223,730,336	$1,030,906,579	$877,954,920
Per cent profit on capital stock	18.7	19.6	16.2
Labor's share of gross product, per cent	27.4	20.6	22.9
Value of gross output	$1,223,730,336	$1,030,906,579	$877,954,920
Cost of materials	$518,908,150	$561,501,302	$462,658,350
Increase in value	$704,822,186	$469,405,277	$415,296,570
Cost of labor	$336,058,173	$212,201,768	$201,558,705
Per cent of cost of labor to increase in value	47.7	45.2	48.5
5. Leather industries:			
Capital	$440,777,194	$343,600,513	$246,795,713
Expenses—			
Officers	$18,372,722	$14,186,690	$15,348,267
Wages	$116,694,140	$99,759,885	$98,432,593
Miscellaneous	$40,737,343	$22,942,594	$18,587,831
Materials	$471,112,921	$395,551,232	$294,446,011
Total	$646,917,126	$532,440,401	$426,814,702
Profit	$58,830,344	$51,290,645	$30,741,328
Gross product	$705,747,470	$583,731,046	$457,556,030
Per cent profit on capital stock	13.3	14.9	24.6
Labor's share of gross product, per cent	16.5	16.9	20.1
Value of gross output	$705,747,470	$583,731,046	$457,556,030
Cost of materials	$471,112,921	$395,551,232	$294,446,011
Increase in value	$234,634,549	$188,179,814	$193,110,019
Cost of labor	$116,694,140	$99,750,885	$98,432,593
Per cent of cost of labor to increase in value	49.7	53	51

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Summary of manufactures by fourteen groups of industries—Continued.

	1905.	1900.	1890.
6. Paper and printing:			
Capital	$798,758,312	$557,610,887	$344,003,723
Expenses—			
Officers	$81,809,311	$48,974,138	$34,625,986
Wages	$185,547,791	$140,092,453	$117,611,864
Miscellaneous	$138,245,437	$76,069,663	$59,524,277
Materials	$308,209,655	$214,158,423	$149,597,579
Total	$713,811,194	$479,294,677	$361,359,706
Profit	$143,301,062	$127,023,091	$84,227,724
Gross product	$857,112,256	$606,317,768	$445,587,430
Per cent profit on capital stock	17.9	22.7	24.4
Labor's share of gross product, per cent	21.6	23.1	26.5
Value of gross output	$857,112,256	$606,317,768	$445,587,430
Cost of materials	$308,209,655	$214,158,423	$149,597,579
Increase in value	$548,902,601	$392,159,345	$295,989,851
Cost of labor	$185,547,791	$140,092,453	$117,611,864
Per cent of cost of labor to increase in value	33.8	35.7	39.7
7. Liquors and beverages:			
Capital	$659,547,620	$534,101,049	$310,002,635
Expenses—			
Officers	$21,421,353	$16,893,405	$11,118,673
Wages	$45,146,285	$36,946,557	$29,140,916
Miscellaneous	$223,446,420	$188,754,387	$117,046,500
Materials	$139,854,147	$122,218,073	$109,830,410
Total	$429,868,205	$364,812,422	$267,136,589
Profit	$71,398,400	$60,691,745	$74,018,772
Gross product	$501,266,605	$425,504,167	$341,155,361
Per cent profit on capital stock	10.8	11.3	23.8
Labor's share of gross product, per cent	8.9	8.6	8.5
Value of gross output	$501,266,605	$425,504,167	$341,155,361
Cost of materials	$139,854,147	$122,218,073	$109,830,410
Increase in value	$361,412,458	$303,286,094	$231,324,951
Cost of labor	$45,146,285	$36,946,557	$29,140,916
Per cent of cost of labor to increase in value	12.5	12.2	12.6
8. Chemicals and allied products:			
Capital	$1,504,728,510	$498,390,219	$322,543,674
Expenses—			
Officers	$49,864,233	$26,335,164	$14,171,587
Wages	$93,965,248	$43,870,602	$33,872,540
Miscellaneous	$128,879,323	$49,825,945	$29,508,992
Materials	$609,351,160	$356,192,334	$239,915,794
Total	$882,059,964	$476,224,045	$317,468,913
Profit	$149,905,299	$76,667,832	$62,587,584
Gross product	$1,031,965,263	$552,891,877	$380,056,497
Per cent profit on capital stock	9.9	15.3	19.4
Labor's share of gross product, per cent	8	7.9	8.9
Value of gross output	$1,031,965,263	$552,891,877	$380,056,497
Cost of materials	$609,351,160	$356,192,334	$239,915,794
Increase in value	$422,614,103	$196,699,543	$140,140,703
Cost of labor	$93,965,248	$43,870,602	$33,872,540
Per cent of cost of labor to increase in value	22.2	22.3	24.2
9. Clay, glass, and stone products:			
Capital	$553,846,682	$350,902,367	$217,386,297
Expenses—			
Officers	$21,555,724	$13,718,966	$11,370,622
Wages	$148,471,903	$109,022,582	$90,541,771
Miscellaneous	$37,822,036	$19,185,657	$14,094,740
Materials	$123,124,392	$94,615,281	$68,990,146
Total	$330,974,055	$236,542,486	$184,997,279
Profit	$60,256,367	$57,021,749	$44,808,724
Gross product	$391,230,422	$293,564,235	$229,806,003
Per cent profit on capital stock	10.8	16.2	20.6
Labor's share of gross product, per cent	37.1	37.4	39.3
Value of gross output	$391,230,422	$293,564,235	$229,806,003
Cost of materials	$123,124,392	$94,615,281	$68,990,146
Increase in value	$268,106,030	$198,948,954	$160,815,857
Cost of labor	$148,471,903	$109,022,582	$90,541,771
Per cent of cost of labor to increase in value	55.4	54.8	56.3
10. Metals and metal products other than iron and steel:			
Capital	$598,340,758	$410,646,057	$204,285,820

Summary of manufactures by fourteen groups of industries—Continued.

	1905.	1900.	1890.
10. Metals and metal products other than iron and steel—Continued.			
Expenses:			
Officers	$24,854,590	$16,059,194	$14,924,917
Wages	$117,599,837	$96,749,051	$64,055,644
Miscellaneous	$41,595,062	$21,295,406	$14,731,078
Materials	$644,367,583	$496,979,368	$179,169,940
Total	$828,417,072	$631,083,019	$272,881,579
Profit	$93,845,384	$117,712,445	$44,026,571
Gross product	$922,262,456	$748,795,464	$316,908,150
Per cent profit on capital stock	15.6	28.6	21.5
Labor's share of gross product, per cent	12.7	12.9	20.4
Value of gross output	$922,262,456	$748,795,464	$316,908,150
Cost of materials	$644,367,583	$496,979,368	$179,169,940
Increase in value	$277,894,873	$251,816,096	$137,738,210
Cost of labor	$117,599,837	$96,749,051	$64,055,644
Per cent of cost of labor to increase in value	42.3	38.4	46.5
11. Tobacco:			
Capital	$323,983,501	$124,089,871	$96,094,753
Expenses—			
Officers	$8,800,434	$8,951,534	$10,241,271
Wages	$62,640,303	$49,852,484	$44,550,735
Miscellaneous	$80,145,016	$79,495,422	$37,561,681
Materials	$126,088,608	$107,182,656	$92,304,317
Total	$277,674,361	$245,482,096	$184,658,004
Profit	$53,443,320	$37,594,450	$27,088,619
Gross product	$331,117,681	$283,076,546	$211,746,623
Per cent profit on capital stock	16.4	30.2	28.1
Labor's share of gross product, per cent	18.9	17.6	21
Value of gross output	$331,117,681	$283,076,546	$211,746,623
Cost of materials	$126,088,608	$107,182,656	$92,304,317
Increase in value	$205,029,073	$175,893,890	$119,442,306
Cost of labor	$62,640,303	$49,852,484	$44,550,735
Per cent of cost of labor to increase in value	30.5	28.3	37.3
12. Vehicles for land transportation:			
Capital	$447,697,020	$396,778,672	$248,224,770
Expenses—			
Officers	$24,334,118	$15,101,444	$11,172,134
Wages	$221,800,517	$164,614,781	$118,212,379
Miscellaneous	$29,107,649	$19,842,332	$9,460,374
Materials	$334,244,377	$268,278,205	$174,624,639
Total	$609,486,661	$467,926,762	$313,469,526
Profit	$34,437,781	$40,722,367	$31,006,717
Gross product	$643,924,442	$508,649,129	$344,476,243
Per cent profit on capital stock	7.6	10.2	12.4
Labor's share of gross product, per cent	34.4	32.4	34.3
Value of gross output	$643,924,442	$508,649,129	$344,476,243
Cost of materials	$334,244,377	$268,278,205	$174,624,639
Increase in value	$309,680,065	$240,370,924	$169,851,604
Cost of labor	$221,800,517	$164,614,781	$118,212,379
Per cent of cost of labor to increase in value	71.6	68.5	69.6
13. Shipbuilding:			
Capital	$121,623,700	$77,332,701	$53,393,074
Expenses—			
Officers	$3,339,741	$2,008,537	$1,194,870
Wages	$29,241,087	$24,839,163	$14,833,977
Miscellaneous	$5,255,506	$3,085,661	$1,392,551
Materials	$37,463,179	$33,486,772	$16,925,109
Total	$75,299,513	$64,020,133	$34,346,507
Profit	$7,469,726	$10,558,025	$5,995,608
Gross product	$82,769,239	$74,578,158	$40,342,115
Per cent profit on capital stock	6.1	13.6	11.2
Labor's share of gross product, per cent	35.2	33.3	35.7
Value of gross output	$82,769,239	$74,578,158	$40,342,115
Cost of materials	$37,463,179	$33,486,772	$16,925,109
Increase in value	$45,306,060	$41,091,386	$23,417,006
Cost of labor	$29,241,087	$24,839,163	$14,833,977
Per cent of cost of labor to increase in value	64.5	60.4	63.3

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Summary of manufactures by fourteen groups of industries—Continued.

	1905.	1900.	1890.
14. Miscellaneous:			
Capital	$974,316,571	$1,348,920,721	$768,870,920
Expenses—			
Officers	$50,655,229	$49,199,283	$33,363,252
Wages	$187,514,312	$202,746,162	$136,643,444
Miscellaneous	$101,198,364	$81,933,611	$49,025,323
Materials	$460,205,501	$490,073,705	$300,231,851
Total	$799,573,406	$823,952,761	$519,263,870
Profit	$142,031,467	$180,139,533	$126,310,583
Gross product	$941,604,873	$1,004,092,294	$645,574,453

Summary of manufactures by fourteen groups of industries—Continued.

	1905.	1900.	1890.
14. Miscellaneous—Continued.			
Per cent profit on capital stock	14.5	13.3	16.4
Labor's share of gross product, per cent	19.9	21.6	21.1
Value of gross output	$941,604,873	$1,604,092,294	$645,574,453
Cost of materials	$460,205,501	$490,073,705	$300,231,851
Increase in value	$481,399,372	$514,018,589	$345,342,602
Cost of labor	$187,514,312	$202,746,162	$136,643,444
Per cent of cost of labor to increase in value	38.9	39.4	39.5

Average percentage of wages to labor compared to gross product in the 14 great classes of industries.

Industries.	Profit on capital, 1905.	Ratio of wages to gross product.			Estimated profit on capital.	Probable profit on capital.	Per cent of labor wages to gross product.	Per cent of wages to increase of value in manufactures by labor.		
		1905.	1900.	1890.				1905.	1900.	1890.
1. Food products	16.4	5.7	5.7	5.5	32.8	49.2	5.7	30.4	33.7	35.1
2. Textiles	12	19.5	20.8	22	24	36	19.5	46.6	46.1	50
3. Iron and steel	10.6	22.1	21.2	24.9	21.2	31.8	22.1	48.5	45	46
4. Lumber	18.7	27.4	20.6	22.9	37.4	56.1	27.4	47.7	45.2	48.5
5. Leather	13.3	16.5	16.9	20.1	26.6	39.9	16.5	49.7	53	51
6. Paper and printing	17.9	21.6	23.1	26.5	35.8	53.7	21.6	33.8	35.7	39.7
7. Liquors and beverages	10.8	8.9	8.6	8.5	20.6	32.4	8.9	12.5	12.2	12.6
8. Chemicals and allied products	9.9	8	7.9	8.9	19.8	29.7	8	22.2	22.3	24.2
9. Clay, glass, and stone	10.8	37.1	37.4	39.3	20.6	32.4	37.1	55.4	54.8	56.3
10. Metal and metal products other than iron and steel	15.6	12.7	12.9	20.4	31.2	46.8	12.7	42.3	38.4	46.5
11. Tobacco	16.4	18.9	17.6	21	32.8	49.2	18.9	30.5	28.3	37.3
12. Vehicles for land transportation	7.6	34.4	32.4	34.3	15.2	22.8	34.4	71.6	68.5	69.6
13. Shipbuilding	6.1	35.2	33.3	36.7	12.2	18.3	35.2	64.5	60.4	63.3
14. Miscellaneous	14.5	19.9	24.6	21.1	29	43.5	19.9	38.9	39.4	39.5

For full details see Exhibit 1. Average rate of wages to gross product in all industries, 17.8 per cent, calculating from table of totals of wages and value of products.

RELATIVE LABOR COST.

Mr. OWEN. The first important deduction shown from these tables is the relative cost of labor as compared with the gross product. It is less than 6 per cent in food products, and yet the tariff on food products is an average of 32 per cent, in order to measure the cost of difference at home and abroad.

The total labor cost in textiles is 19.5 per cent, and yet the tariff in this bill on flax manufactures is over 44 per cent, on cotton manufactures over 47 per cent, on wool manufactures over 58 per cent, and on silk manufactures over 60 per cent to measure the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad; a patent and ridiculous fraud on its face, which has not been explained, which will not be explained, and which can not be explained by the managers of this bill, and so it goes all through this table.

The total percentage of the value of the product paid in wages in textiles is 19.5 per cent.

If we concede that the labor cost in Europe is absolutely nothing; if we concede that the foreigner would not have to pay any freight to bring his goods to America, would pay nothing for ocean insurance, for breakage, wharfage, dockage, leakage, rattage, or stealage, still 19.5 per cent would be high enough to protect the American manufacturer *on an average*.

Granting, however, that the European laborer earns half as much, then one-half of 19.5 per cent would be sufficient.

Granting that the American laborer has twice the efficiency of the European laborer, then no tariff whatever is necessary to protect the American manufacturer; and granting that the wages paid in Europe buy more of manufactured products and as much of food products as in America, the European manufacturer would be entitled to a bonus from his home government to put him on a parity with the American manufacturer.

In some cases a duty is necessary for protective purposes, but the cases are few and the rate not high. A tariff for revenue intelligently drawn will be more than three times as high as a tariff for pure protection drawn in a spirit of perfect honesty.

If the Finance Committee can show any justification for the schedules on the basis of the "difference of the cost of production at home and abroad," I am willing to concede this measure of incidental protection under a tariff for revenue, but to conceal the facts, to refuse to hear, to ridicule the inquiry, and ignore the facts when proven is surely indefensible.

This abstract briefly exhibits the ratio of wages to gross products and affords a basis of comparison with the ratio of wages to gross products in countries competing with ours. This supplies a basis for a generalization showing the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad.

It will be seen, for example, that the average ratio of wages paid to the gross product in the textile industry averages 19.5 per cent, less than 20 per cent. The difference in the wage cost in the United States and abroad, conceding that the foreign workman receives a wage only half of that paid the American workman and conceding that he is equally efficient and conceding that his wages (half in money) has a purchasing power of half the wages of the American workman, the difference in the cost of production based on such wages would be an average of less than 10 per cent.

But it is not true that the wages paid foreign workmen buys only half as much, but the fact is that every dollar paid the foreign workman buys at least 50 per cent more than the dollar paid the American workman, so that $10 paid a European workman is equivalent to $15 in purchasing power in the United States.

So that the difference in the amount paid in wages because of this factor as compared to the value of the gross product is less than an average of 10 per cent, as above estimated.

Another factor of vital importance is the superior efficiency of the American workman. Ten dollars paid to him turns out twice as much goods as that paid the European workman; consequently the difference in wages compared to gross product is not only not against the American workman, but it is in his favor, although he does not get the benefit of it from the man who employs him.

It is not surprising, in view of these calculations based upon our national statistics and well-established facts, that the managers in charge of this bill dare not answer the question whether this bill is being written in accordance with the pledge of the party that the rates should be determined by the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad.

The monopolist can not and does not consume his profit. So that the result is that the capital of monopoly is rolling up like

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

a huge snowball, picking up every opportunity offered by God to mankind in our natural resources—the forests, the mines, the water powers, the highways, and the land, both of city and of the countryside; and labor, the creator of wealth, languishes and grows weaker as the creature of wealth grows stronger and exercises a natural but unrestrained appetite by "acquiring" the title to every visible and invisible natural resource.

Mr. President, I am a firm friend of capital and always ready to befriend its just rights. I believe in giving it safety and stability, protecting it in its right to earn a fair reward upon its employment. It is of great importance that the incentive should be removed neither from the capitalist nor from the business man who uses capital nor from the laborer who is employed by capital, but I do not believe that all of the net proceeds of human labor and every opportunity of human life should be appropriated by capital and all the reasonable opportunities of life cut off from millions of wage-earners who have no more wisdom or knowledge of how to protect themselves against the crafty schemes of monopoly than if they were so many blind girl babies. The Senate and the Senators on this floor, it seems to me, are under a solemn personal responsibility to find the way to protect the weaker elements of society, and they ought not to write the laws of this country to serve monopoly at the expense of the defenseless citizen wage-earner.

The incentive ought not to be taken away from capital; neither should the incentive be taken away from the small business man who may be crushed by gigantic organizations of capital, and above all the incentive of a reasonable reward, of a reasonable return for labor, of the power to support a family by labor, industry, and providence. The power to have some leisure for playtime should not be taken away from the American workingman or the American working woman or the American working child by the grinding process of unthinking corporate monopoly.

Under the head of "Miscellany" are concealed many items favorable to capital by increasing the capital itself under color of repairs, and so forth.

The estimate of the profit on capital is also too small, because more than half of the capital claimed is water.

All of the return on capital, except a small percentage, necessary to provide for a reasonable return on capital, is a net profit, while the return on labor contains no net profit worth mentioning, although it is true that by long, hard hours of labor, great deprivation, rigid economy, and careful saving, the labor classes, through the savings banks exhibit a considerable accumulation out of the proceeds of their labor.

Statistics of the savings banks of the United States for 1906.

[Comptroller Currency Report, 1907.]

	Total depositors.	Amount of deposits.	Average.
New England	2,987,261	$1,168,148,705	$391.04
Eastern States	3,562,804	1,656,905,727	405.06
Southern States	31,598	6,143,167	194.41
Middle States	1,087,746	385,503,885	354.41
Pacific States	357,783	265,435,714	741.89
Total United States	8,027,192	3,482,137,198	433.79

The savings under forty years of high-protective tariff average $433.79 to those who have been able to save, and these figures include hundreds of millions of the savings of the well-to-do and many of the capital class, but only one person in ten, after all, has a savings account, and the savings between the laboring people and actual want will not average $43 per capita for our entire productive population, counting all savings as the savings of labor, while many millions are utterly defenseless against the exactions of capital.

When it is remembered what the enormous product of the labor of the average American workman is—$2,500 per annum—it will be observed that these savings of many years comprise but a small part of the proceeds of labor.

In the table exhibited—the industries engaged in "food products"—labor's share of the gross product is very small, because of the very large amount of raw material used, out of which labor had previously been paid in the process of production.

The same thing is relatively true of the industries dealing with liquors and beverages.

It is also true that labor's share in lumber and iron and steel, and clay, glass, and stone products, and in vehicles and shipbuilding reaches a high percentage relative to the product, for the simple reason that nearly all of the value in lumber, outside of the stumpage, is pure labor. Labor goes into the woods, cuts the tree down, hauls it to the mill, puts it on the runway, saws the log, planes it, stacks the lumber, and puts the lumber on the car. Capital, having acquired the land, furnishes the sawmill, and permits labor to have a part of its own profits in wages, but no more than labor can command in a free, competitive market for labor.

The same thing is true with regard to clay products. The workman digs the clay out of the ground, puts it through every process with the work of his hands, and converts it into a finished product. Capital, having acquired the title to the clay, permits the workmen to dig upon the earth, owned by the capitalist, and furnishes the workmen with tools, and pays the workmen precisely as much, and no more, as his labor commands in a free, competitive, labor market.

The laborer has a very narrow margin, and unless he be exceptional in self-denial, in providence, and is free from accident or sickness or other incidental loss, he may, perhaps, save enough to lift himself from the severe conditions which so environ him to a more fortunate place where he can join the capital class and get the benefits of a system which is well devised to make the rich richer and the poor poorer.

THE HIGH TARIFF HAS LOWERED THE WAGES OF AMERICAN WORKMEN.

Mr. President, the advocates of a high tariff have always professed, and I suppose usually felt, the greatest solicitude for the welfare of the laboring man, and have believed, or appeared to believe, that a high tariff would protect the American laboring man against the injurious competition of the "pauper labor" of Europe. I shall show by our own statistics that *the wages of the American workman have been lowered under the operation of this tariff.*

Wages are not valued alone by dollars and cents; dollars change in purchasing power, depending on the number of dollars put in circulation in any given country and the intimacy of its commercial relations with other countries, and the whole world is confused in the question of prices by the grossly unequal distribution of currency in the different nations of the world; a great problem, which is now undergoing and will undergo a more rapid readjustment under the fast increasing improvement of rapid modern intercourse.

Attention is expressly called to the fact that labor's share of the proceeds of labor has not increased in the highly protected industries—it has decreased.

In the textile industries labor received 22 per cent of the gross product in 1890, 20.8 in 1900, and 19.5 in 1905.

In iron and steel labor received 24.9 per cent in 1890 and 22.1 per cent in 1905.

In leather goods labor received 21.1 per cent of the proceeds of labor in 1890, 16.9 per cent in 1900, and 16.5 per cent in 1905.

In paper and printing labor received 26.5 per cent of the proceeds of labor in 1890, 23.1 per cent in 1900, 21.6 per cent in 1905.

In chemical and allied products labor received 8.9 per cent in 1890, 8 per cent in 1905.

In clay, glass, and stone products labor received 39.3 per cent in 1890, 37.1 per cent in 1900.

In metal and metal products, other than iron and steel, labor received 20.4 per cent in 1890 and 12.7 per cent in 1905.

In tobacco labor received 21 per cent in 1890 and 18.9 per cent in 1905.

In shipbuilding labor received 36.7 per cent in 1890 and 35.2 per cent in 1905.

In miscellaneous industries labor received 21.1 per cent in 1890 and 19.9 per cent in 1905.

It is perfectly obvious that under the high tariff the reward of labor has diminished relatively to the gross product of labor.

When we compare the increase of the value of products, the increase of the cost of materials, and the number of wage-earners, and the total wages between 1890 and 1900, we find that the growth of capital value corresponding with that of the value of products is decidedly more than the increase of total wages; that the average wage for all classes of wage-earners, in dollars and cents, is less in 1900 than in 1890. The increase of earnings is 25 per cent; that of wages only a little over 22 per cent.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

	Capital value.	Value of products.	Cost of materials.	Number of wage-earners.	Total wages.	Average value, product of the wage-earner.	Per cent.
1900	$9,813,834,390	$13,000,149,159	$7,343,627,875	5,306,143	$2,320,938,168	$2,450	17.8
1890	6,525,050,759	9,372,378,843	5,162,013,878	4,251,535	1,891,953,795	2,204	20.2
Increase	3,288,783,631	3,627,770,316	2,181,613,997	1,054,608	428,984,373		

Nineteen hundred average wage, $437; annual weekly wage, $8.60, to support 3 people, a labor loss of 10 per cent in wages relative to value of product.

The percentage of wages to value of products was 17.8 per cent in 1900, 20.2 per cent in 1890, a loss for labor of 10 per cent.

Here is an increase of $3,627,740,316 in the value of the products of labor under the "value of products," and $428,984,373 goes to 1,054,608 additional laborers, while $3,198,755,943 is the net value of the products of such labor. One million fifty-four thousand six hundred and eight new workmen get $428,984,373 with which to sustain approximately 3,000,000 people; to feed, clothe, and shelter them; *leaving no surplus for enforced idleness, sickness, accident, or death;* and a vast profit goes to capital that does not have the same exacting demands for food and clothing. The annual weekly wage is only $8.60 to support three people. How does this compare with Europe where the dollar buys 50 per cent more, and $8.60 here is only equal to $5.73 there? Look at their wages, their earning power, and ask what is the difference in the cost of production here and there. Do these census records teach us nothing?

The above figures demonstrate beyond the possibility of dispute that wages are being lowered under the operation of a monopoly-protecting tariff. It shows more, that a tariff averaging nearly 50 per cent is thoroughly unjustifiable on the Republican theory of protecting labor, since the gross amount of labor's wages only comprises an average of 19.7 per cent of gross product value (Exhibit 1), much less on the theory of providing only the "difference in the cost of labor," since the difference in the cost of labor will not approximate 20 per cent, nor equal the half of it.

The plain truth is the bill will not protect labor, but will gratify the clamorous demand of organized greed and avarice urged by the lobby of numerous monopolies. This tariff, in the pretended interest of the American workman, does not properly include over 1,000,000 *out of 29,000,000 workmen*, while it taxes all.

It has been convincingly shown by Edward Atkinson, in his learned report of December, 1902 (Exhibit 2), that not over 1,000,000 persons out of 29,000,000 persons would be affected in an adverse way if the tariff were absolutely abolished. This calculation, made in great detail, goes far to show the utterly false pretense of a great public demand for a high protective or prohibitive tariff. Attention is earnestly called to it in Senate Document No. 46, Sixty-first Congress, first session, from which I submit the essential part as Exhibit 2.

THE HIGH TARIFF HAS LOWERED THE WAGES OF AMERICAN WORKMEN IN PROTECTED INDUSTRIES MORE THAN THE WAGES OF WORKMEN IN UNPROTECTED INDUSTRIES.

I submit as Exhibit 3 a carefully compiled table of the labor wages of our American railways (Statistics of Railroads in United States, 1907, Interstate Commerce Commission, p. 59), showing the wages of railroad employees in the unprotected industries of the railroad service, and also a table of the wages of employees in building trades, which are not protected, but which are duly organized, prepared by William J. Spencer, secretary of the building-trade department of the American Federation of Labor, for 1908 (Exhibit 4), showing the average wages of masons and bricklayers, structural iron setters, ornamental iron setters, plasterers, lathers, hoisting engineers, tile setters, plumbers, steam fitters, steam fitters' helpers, gas fitters, carpenters, stonecutters, marble cutters and setters, painters, sheet metal workers, electricians, roofers, cement finishers, laborers, and hod carriers. Their wages per hour will be seen to be, on an average, at least twice as high as the wages of labor in protected industries (Exhibit 5), as shown by Census Bulletin 77 of the Bureau of Labor of 1907.

Mr. President, here will be seen that the cheapest workmen (Exhibit 3) in the railroad service, the brakemen, received an average throughout the United States for 1907, $1.46 a day; section foremen, $1.90; other shopmen, $2.06; carpenters, $2.40; machinists, $2.87; firemen and other trainmen, $2.54; conductors, $3.69; engineer men, $4.30; station agents, $2.05; general office clerks, $2.30; other officers, $5.99; general officers, $11.93. These wages in unprotected industries are decent, are reasonable, are just according to service, in the transportation work of the United States. These people have their wages influenced to an important degree by labor organization.

Now, Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact—and a vital fact in this matter—that in the protected industries of the United States the wage-earner does not receive one-half as much as in the unprotected industries, and these tables abundantly exhibit it.

Exhibit No. 4 shows that masons and bricklayers get from 45 to 87 cents an hour; structural iron setters, 30 to 62 cents an hour; ornamental iron setters, 30 to 70 cents an hour; plasterers, 50 to 87½ cents an hour; lathers, 45 to 62½ cents an hour; hoisting engineers, 50 to 75 cents an hour; tile setters, 35 to 75 cents an hour; plumbers, 50 to 75 cents an hour; steam fitters, 35 to 75 cents an hour; steam fitters' helpers, 15 to 37½ cents an hour; gas fitters, 35 to 81 cents an hour; carpenters, 35 to 62½ cents an hour; stonecutters, 45 to 70 cents an hour; marble cutters and marble setters, 30 to 62½ cents an hour; painters, 25 to 56 cents an hour; sheet metal workers, 30 to 62½ cents an hour; electricians, 25 to 65 cents an hour; roofers, 25 to 75 cents an hour; cement finishers, 35 to 75 cents an hour; laborers and hod carriers, 15 to 50 cents an hour.

Mr. President, these people are outside of the protected industries; they have some degree of organization and can demand the value from capital for their labor.

The laws of human nature operate upon the laboring man precisely as they do upon the capitalist, and he tries to get the greatest return for his wares. Labor organizations have sometimes gone to extremes and put the price of labor above a reasonable market value and lowered the demand to the point of putting themselves out of business. The urgency of labor's need for supplying food and clothing is an extenuating circumstance even when the demand itself is unreasonable and foolish, but when the demand of monopoly puts an exorbitant price upon the necessaries of life its motive is not hunger for food or need for clothing or shelter for children, but merely ambition for power or mere greed for gain.

Now, Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the astonishing difference between the wages of men in unprotected industries with the wages in the "protected industries," so called, and you will observe that the wages in the protected industries, except where modified by a powerful organization of the laborers, as in the glass industry, are far below the wages in unprotected industries. Organized capital has beaten down the wages of labor to a point at which the proper support of a family required by a decent American standard is often impossible. This meanness on the part of such offending manufacturers is painfully apparent.

THE PROTECTED INDUSTRIES HAVE DRIVEN OUT THE AMERICAN AND SUBSTITUTED THE FOREIGNER.

It has resulted in driving out the native American who was able to escape and has substituted in his place the oppressed people of other races, who, having been under the grinding monopoly of the landed nobility and powers which have seized every opportunity in European countries, do not feel so keenly the crushing conditions imposed upon them in these offending factories.

I call attention to the low wages which are paid in the protected industries, so low as not to be sufficient to sustain an American family upon the wages of the head of the family, who may be devoting all his time to that purpose. The average wage in the cotton and wool industry will not exceed a dollar a day, and that is shown by our census tables, which I submit.

Now, Mr. President, the protected industries have driven out the American and substituted the foreigner. We have been listening for years to talk about the protection of American labor against the pauper labor of Europe; and yet our census shows how shallow and how hollow that pretension is. I call your attention to what is shown by our census.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

The Boston Traveler in the article of June 2, 1909, ridicules the argument of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and says:

He made an impassioned plea for the mill operatives of New England, who "must not be deprived of their right to work and wages," and for the manufacturers, who must be protected against "cheap labor abroad." The mill operatives, for whom the Nahant Senator's eloquence was unloosed, are practically all Greeks, Syrians, Poles, Armenians, and Italians, who have driven out every other kind of labor, because, under present wages in the cotton mills, to bring up a family under American conditions is absolutely impossible. * * *

Mr. LODGE'S defense of the cotton manufacturers, whose mills are filled with aliens on starvation wages, is paralleled in history only by the arguments made in parliament at the time England was attempting to abolish the slave trade, that if the bringing of black people from Africa to America and elsewhere was prohibited shipowners would not find any use for their vessels, and that these slave ships furnished the only market for decayed fish and other putrid food, on which there would be a dead loss if the slave trade was outlawed.

The Pittsburg Survey gives a tabulated map showing that the Carnegie mills at Homestead, from which organized labor was driven by private armed military power in the Homestead riots, is filled with Slovaks, 6,477 of them; with Poles, 611 in number; with Bohemians and Germans, in another group; with Croatians, 1,249 in number; with Hungarians, 1,323 in number; with Roumanians, 410 in number; with Poles, 1,644 in number; with Lithuanians, 476 in number. Austria-Hungary furnished 10,421; Russia, 2,577; etc.

Representatives on behalf of these monopolies make "impassioned appeals" to protect the American workman against the foreign pauper labor which the monopolies have imported and are using wholesale with the effect of driving the native American to despair.

Mr. President, examine the census of 1900, Volume I, pages cxxxi and 698, on population and see what it exhibits.

Table of foreign born, etc.

Census 1900, Volume I.	Foreign born (cxxxi).	White population foreign parentage (p. 698).	Total foreign born and of foreign-born parentage.	Total population.	Percentage of population foreign born and of foreign-born parentage.
Massachusetts	846,324	897,386	1,743,710	2,805,346	62.1
Rhode Island	134,519	140,292	274,811	428,556	64.1
Connecticut	238,210	282,245	520,455	908,420	57.3
New York	1,900,425	2,415,845	4,316,270	7,268,894	59.3
New Jersey	431,831	556,294	988,125	1,883,669	52.4
Pennsylvania	985,250	1,430,028	2,415,278	6,302,115	38.3

It will be seen by the table which I submit that Massachusetts has 1,743,710 persons foreign born or of foreign-born parentage out of 2,805,346 total population, having therefore 62.1 per cent of people who are foreign born or of foreign-born parentage; Rhode Island, in like manner, has 64.1 per cent of its population foreign born or of foreign-born parentage; Connecticut has 57.3 per cent of foreign born or of foreign-born parentage; New York has 59.3 per cent of its people foreign born or of foreign-born parentage; New Jersey has 52.4 per cent of its population foreign born or of foreign-born parentage; thus disclosing in the completest manner the extent to which this use of foreign labor has driven out the American.

Mr. KEAN. What is the date of that?

Mr. OWEN. The last census of 1900, to which I invite the Senator's prayerful attention.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. OWEN. With pleasure.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I will be glad to have the Senator give, if he has them, the figures of the percentage of foreign-born as distinguished from their children.

Mr. OWEN. I have it, Mr. President, in the table which I submit, giving the exact details.

I call attention to this matter because too much has been said in behalf of protecting the American laborer and keeping out the pauper labor of Europe. The pauper labor of Europe to-day fills the very factories of these protected monopolies, and those same pauper laborers of Europe are coming into this country at the rate of 100,000 a month. It is time that this hypocrisy should cease.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

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

Mr. OWEN. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. Has the Senator the statistics for the State of Wisconsin?

Mr. OWEN. The statistics will be found in the same tables to which I have referred.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator has them not at hand?

Mr. OWEN. Not at hand. I have them available, but not so as to easily read them.

I will say that, of course, on the eastern coast, with our country inviting foreigners into this land we should expect a large percentage; and I do not speak that in any sense of reproach to those States. I, for one, am not at all in favor of closing our ports by any tax upon these poor souls who seek a refuge in our land from a monopoly which is worse by far than that which we endure. I invite them, and bid them God speed and welcome. This Republic is under the deepest obligations to those who have come from abroad and to their children. I honor them, and I am glad, as one American, to give them a cordial welcome. I wish they were better paid; and when they go West and enter the fields of the West, perhaps they will find conditions more congenial to human life and more profitable and beneficial to them.

Mr. President, I am glad to see America, the land of liberty, made an asylum for the oppressed of other lands, and recognize the fact that the United States is under enormous obligations to people who have come from foreign lands, and I only call attention to these figures to show that the plea of the monopolies that they are deeply concerned about high wages for the American workman is so offensively hypocritical and absurd that no words known to the English language are capable of describing it.

I have submitted Table 5, showing the wages of workmen in American industries; and I call your attention to the fact that, except where they are organized, they are on almost starvation wages. The papers were full a few days ago of the slavery of white women brought into these protected factories from Italy, sold by their kinspeople, and all their wages practically taken for their keep and to pay to the foreign home—a substantial exhibition of white slavery under the color of freedom and under the protection of the American flag, which ought not to endure slavery either of the white man or the black man.

WAGES IN PROTECTED INDUSTRIES LOWER THAN IN UNPROTECTED INDUSTRIES.

I respectfully submit a table (Exhibit 5) showing the wages of workmen in the protected industries of every class: In the industry of making carpets; of clothing; cotton goods; foundry and machine shops; furniture; glass; fur hats; hosiery and knit goods; iron and steel, bar, and iron and steel, Bessemer; iron and steel, blast furnace; lumber, paper, and wood pulp; pottery; printing and binding; shipbuilding; silk goods; woolen and worsted goods. I have indicated in every case in these tables the condition of labor organization.

It will be seen by the tables of Exhibit No. 5, in the grouped industries, for example, that in 1907 burlers got 14 cents an hour; dyers, 16 cents an hour; loom fixers (who must be men of a high class), 28 cents an hour; spoolers, 13 cents an hour; twisters, 12 cents an hour; weavers, Wilton (high-class experts), 30 cents an hour; weavers, ingrain, 15 cents an hour; winders, 13 cents an hour; and, except where the workmen must be trained experts, their wages are very low.

Buttonhole makers (female), 12 to 14 cents an hour; examiners (female), 11 to 14 cents an hour; finishers, 10 to 13 cents an hour; pressers (male), 19 to 26 cents an hour; sewing-machine operators, 22 to 31 cents an hour; carding-machine tenders, 10 to 13 cents an hour; dyers, 11 to 15 cents an hour; loom fixers, 16 to 24 cents an hour; spinners, 9 to 13 cents an hour; spinners (female), 7 to 12 cents an hour; weavers (male), 11 to 19 cents an hour; weavers (female), 9 to 16 cents an hour; bleachers, 13 cents an hour; calenderers, 14 cents an hour; color mixers, 14 cents an hour.

In the hat business, colorers get 19 cents an hour; fitters, 12 cents an hour; flower blowers, 17 cents an hour; trimmers, 15 cents an hour; weighers, 13 cents an hour.

Silk goods.—Beamers get 19 cents an hour; doublers, 11 cents an hour; dyers, 19 cents an hour; loom fixers, 27 cents an hour; pickers, 12 cents an hour; quillers, 9 cents an hour; spinners, 10 cents an hour; weavers, female, 10 cents an hour; weavers, female, 17 cents an hour.

Woolen goods.—Burlers get 11 cents an hour; carders, 12 cents an hour; card strippers, 13 cents an hour; combers, 12 cents an hour; combers, female, 9 cents an hour; dyers, 15 cents an hour; loom fixers (experts), 26 cents an hour; male spinners,

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

11 cents an hour; male weavers (expert), 21 cents an hour; female weavers (expert), 18 cents an hour.

It must be remembered that these figures, low as they are, are not uniformly paid; that the laborer who misses an hour from sickness or weakness, or who is thrown out of employment by the closing of the shop for repairs or for any other reason must then rely upon his accumulation in savings out of the wages paid. The matter which I wish to call attention to is that under the pretense of protecting the American workman in protected industries, the most of whom are foreigners, they are paid only about half of the wages that workmen received in unprotected industries, and with these pretenses of "passionate interest" in the American workman is an unspeakable fraud which ought not to be endured by men who regard this matter soberly and seriously from a standpoint of patriotism and the better interests of the American Republic.

A great advantage which men have who are organized and not in the "protected industries," so called, is that they no longer submit to the long, grinding, sweat-shop hours, but have an eight-hour day.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

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

Mr. OWEN. With pleasure.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator kindly inform me in what part of the country the wages are paid that he has just read?

Mr. OWEN. Table No. 5, which I submit with this matter, shows the wages paid in different parts of the country.

THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN WORKMEN.

Mr. President, I have been gratified to observe the growing organization of workingmen, which is steadily advancing in the United States. Only by such organization and by the solidarity of their interests can labor make effective its righteous hope for a decent market for its wares; only in this way can men, under present conditions of organized capital, obtain a fair return for their labor.

It is true that sometimes the unwise members in certain labor organizations compel their leaders to stand for wages "higher than the traffic will bear," and in this case they throw themselves out of employment and are thus compelled to be more moderate in their demands. It is true that sometimes thoughtless men force their leaders into gross error and compel them to make demands that are unreasonable, but all men make errors, and all men are unreasonable at times, and these things are self-correcting.

Examine these tables which I submit, and you will observe that just in degree as they are organized just in that degree do they receive proper compensation and obtain decent hours.

They deserve the greatest credit for what they have done in obtaining the eight-hour rule among the organized trades and in promoting legislation to protect labor and to promote its interest. If Congress had heretofore seen more clearly its duty, their organization would have been in large measure unnecessary.

Shall the organization of labor be condemned because of the thoughtless or even criminal act of some occasional individuals out of this vast army? It would be as reasonable to condemn the church because of the sins of its occasional members. The organization of labor stands in the main for good order, for respect to law, for patriotism, for the upbuilding of our country, for the preservation of human life and a decent reward to those who perform the hardest labors of life and bear the sweat and dust, exposure and danger, of life's hard places.

These great organizations are a bulwark to society and stand for the future stability and preservation of our institutions, while their chief antagonists, the captains of monopoly, who, I trust, will soon be led by public opinion to better methods, have been often misled by avarice and greed, have been thus blinded to their duty toward the working people, and are blindly pursuing a policy whose results constitute a menace to the stability of our present peaceful progress.

I think the less of the management of the United States Steel, and of the American Tobacco Company, and of the sugar trust, and the Cramp shipbuilding yards, and others, that they have so opposed organized labor that no member of organized labor can be employed by these monopolies.

Prof. John R. Commons, of the University of Wisconsin (vol. 2, Publications of the American Sociological Society, p. 141), says:

> The unions have practically disappeared from the trusts, and are disappearing from the large corporation as they grow large enough to specialize minutely their labor. The organized workmen are found in the small establishments like the building trades or the fringe of independents on the skirts of the trusts; on the railways where skill and responsibility are not yet displaced by division of labor; in the mines where strike breakers can not be shipped in; on the docks and other places where they hold a strategic position.

Aaron Jones, esq., master of the National Grange, November 11, 1903, at Rochester, N. Y., said:

> Combinations and trust methods in the sale of supplies and in the purchase of the products of the farm have in previous addresses been set out. A striking and forceful illustration of these methods and their effect on both the producer and the consumer is furnished by the market reports of meats. October 10, 1902, market reports show that in one of the leading live-stock markets of the country the price of hogs has been lowered during the year 30 per cent and the price of pork raised 10 per cent. These manipulations add 40 per cent profit to the meat trust, taking 30 per cent from the farmer and 10 per cent from the consumer. Beef steers in the hands of farmers were reduced 20 per cent and dressed beef raised 10 per cent, thus adding 30 per cent profit to the trust and taking 20 per cent from the farmer and 10 per cent from the consumer. More than $150,000,000 has been lost to the live-stock industry in the past year by the manipulations of the meat trust. This may in a measure explain how the meat trust may contribute $50,000 to place the official management of a single city under obligations to it. If the entire product of the farm—wheat, corn, hay, cotton, live stock, dairy, and fruit—is taken into account, farmers have lost more than $700,000,000 in the past year through manipulations of combines and trusts, and because farmers have not developed and maintained a wise, safe, and well-guarded business system of selling the products of the farm. Farmers have also suffered another great loss in the purchase of supplies needed in this business.

Monopolies prefer unorganized labor; they prefer that labor should be helpless and incapable of making effective any demand for its comfort or convenience, or for its rights.

The law should firmly and unhesitatingly demand and require of labor, organized or unorganized, strict obedience to the law; but it should also demand and require of monopoly considerate and decent treatment of labor and of its rights both as producer and consumer.

The tables indicating the wages of working people in high-tariff industries are taken from Bulletin No. 77 of the United States Bureau of Labor for 1907.

I call upon the chairman of the Committee on Finance to explain the astonishing parallel between the low rate of wages paid to people in protected industries and the high wages paid those in industries not protected.

What satisfactory explanation can the Senator from Rhode Island offer for the difference in the pay of masons and bricklayers, who receive 60 cents an hour in Boston, and the burler in the carpet factory receiving 14 cents; the dyer, 16 cents; the loom fixer, 28 cents; the spooler, 13 cents; the twister, 12 cents; the weaver of Brussels and Wilton, 30 cents; the weavers of ingrain, 16 cents; and the winders, 13 cents an hour?

How does the Senator from Rhode Island explain why the plasterer receives 60 cents an hour in Boston and the workers in cotton goods can not possibly receive half as much, and do not average one-third as much?

In good old Boston the plasterer gets 60 cents an hour; the tile setter gets 60 cents an hour; the plumber, 55 cents an hour; the steam fitter, 53 cents; the stonecutter, 50 cents; the carpenter, 40 cents; the marble cutter, 56 cents; and side by side with these unprotected industries the carding-machine tender in the cotton goods protected industry receives 13 cents; the dyers, 15 cents; the loom fixers, 24 cents; the spinners, 13 and 14 cents; the mule spinners, 24 cents; the weavers, 20 cents; the female weavers, 17 cents; the bleachers, 14 cents; the color mixers, 14 cents; the male dyers, 15 cents; the male engravers, 45 cents; the male printers, 44 cents; and this remarkable comparison is most striking all the way through these tables, except in cases where labor itself, by its own organization, has prevented itself from being plundered by the employer.

PROTECTION AS IT IS PRACTICED IS AN OPEN, OBVIOUS FRAUD.

It is time that the New England Senators were dropping the mask of superior knowledge and of mysterious learning with regard to the protective tariff.

The worst enemy of protection, as it is practiced, is detection.

The infinite pains taken by the committee in charge of this bill to furnish Members of this body with all sorts of data except the vital facts with regard to "the difference in cost of production at home and abroad," does not argue well for their judgment or for their sincerity in dealing with this question.

I am more than willing to believe that they have merely followed a beaten track and trodden the pathway of greatest convenience, of easy good nature, but I can not but feel that a generous complaisance to those who have contributed to their successful campaigns is also responsible for the lack of this essential information. I wish to make record here that the information which I have obtained with regard to this matter is due to no effort of theirs. I have been compelled as a Member

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

of this body to dig out laboriously the information which I lay before the Senate.

How does the Senator from Rhode Island explain the fact that in the unprotected industries of New England, of transportation for example, the station agents get an average daily pay of $2.03, while a carding machine tender in the protected cotton-goods industry receives 13 cents an hour, and the dyers 15 cents an hour, and the spinners 13 cents an hour, and the weavers 19 cents an hour.

How does he explain that enginemen in the unprotected industry on the railway service receive $3.78 a day and conductors $3.26 a day, and in the protected industry of printing textiles the bleachers receive 13 cents an hour, the calenderers 14 cents an hour, the color mixers 14 cents an hour, and dyers 15 cents an hour?

How does the Senator from Rhode Island explain why it is that in the unprotected industry of railways in New England firemen receive $2.20 a day, trainmen $2.32 a day, carpenters $2.25 a day, section foremen $2.24 a day, laborers $1.85 a day, when in the protected industry of hosiery and knit goods the knitters receive only 20 cents an hour for men and 13 cents an hour for women, loopers 14 cents an hour, the menders 13 cents an hour, the men pressers 17 cents, and the women pressers 10 cents an hour?

And how do these higher wages in unprotected industries contrast with the blast-furnace men and cinder snappers receiving 15 cents an hour, the hot-blast men 19 cents an hour, the keepers' helpers 17 cents an hour, and the top fillers 17 cents an hour?

The plain truth is that in the unprotected industries of transportation, as shown by the compilation of wages by the Interstate Commerce Commission and the labor in the unprotected industries of the building trades, compiled by the American Federation of Labor, by William J. Spencer, secretary, is far better paid than in the protected industries of the cotton mills, the hosiery mills, the woolen mills, and iron mills, and other factories.

The tables submitted of the wages of the building trades, which are unprotected, show that they receive a wage over 200 per cent higher than the wages in the protected industries, and the reason for this is not difficult to see. Labor in the building trades and in the railroad business is comparatively easy of organization, because the men in the railroad and building trades are out of doors and can be reached and talked to and organized. They are not locked up inside of the jail-like inclosures of private factories, where it is almost impossible to reach the employees or to organize them.

Labor has rarely succeeded in thoroughly organizing itself in any of the great manufacturing industries, which are usually controlled by monopolies and mechanical corporate power.

Organized labor was practically driven out of the shops of Andrew Carnegie and of the United States Steel Corporation, American Tobacco Company, Cramps' shipyards, and various others of the existing monopolies.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

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

Mr. OWEN. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator has put in tables—I have not seen them—showing the wages in protected and unprotected industries. In the New York Sun of the 13th instant there is a dispatch from London giving the wages paid in unprotected industries in Great Britain. Is the Senator willing that I should have this inserted in the RECORD?

Mr. OWEN. I am perfectly willing that it should be inserted in my remarks.

Mr. GALLINGER. Thank you.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be inserted.

Mr. OWEN. I will state to the Senator from New Hampshire that in my examination of this matter I have tried not to make a partial statement giving the facts favorable to my view and those unfavorable to the other side, but have tried to give, in a just measure, both sides, because the only purpose which I have in view is to arrive at the truth and to make it manifest. I do not know what the quotation from the Sun is nor its sources nor its accuracy.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is a dispatch bearing a London date, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. OWEN. I have heard of dispatches from London which were not reliable.

The matter submitted by Mr. GALLINGER is as follows:

WOMEN ON STARVATION PAY—REVELATIONS OF THE "SWEATING" SYSTEM IN LONDON—FACTS BROUGHT OUT BY A POOR SEAMSTRESS'S ATTEMPT AT SUICIDE—HOME WORKERS, 62 CENTS TO $1.10 A WEEK—AVERAGE WEEKLY PAY OF ENGLISH WOMEN $1.75.

[From New York Sun, June 13, 1909.]

LONDON, *June 2.*

A poor little seamstress attempted suicide in London recently. She jumped into the Thames and was ignominiously fished out, not drowned, and not in the least repentant. When questioned as to reasons for her act she had only one to give. She simply could not keep body and soul together by working her hardest at her trade, and in utter fatigue she had decided to end her struggles.

There was nothing very new in her story, but when she explained that she always had plenty of work to do, the only difficulty being to live on the prices paid for her labors, London was roused from its apathy long enough to protest against the "sweating" of women thus revealed.

The House of Lords once defined "sweating" as a condition under which work is carried on in insanitary surroundings and for low wages. There are those who would add that it is a condition of labor which does not give the laborer, in return for a fair day's work, enough to maintain himself and his family in decency and comfort.

In England it is women who are the greatest sufferers from sweating. Their average wage, taking it all the year round and allowing for sickness and slackness, is not much more than $1.75 a week. The Lancashire textile trade average is $3.75, and in some districts as much as $6; but this comparatively high rate is pulled down by the East End home worker, who earns anything from 62 cents to $1.10 a week.

In the unskilled women's trades there is no standard by which wages are computed. For instance, one famous firm of cocoa manufacturers pays women for filling bags with cocoa 28 cents a thousand bags, and exactly the same work is done for 16 cents for another firm. In East London there is a firm whose girls earn $3.50 a week by packing tea. In the same locality there is another firm, the head of which is a well-known sportsman and yachtsman, where the earnings of the girls average only $1.87 a week.

The manager of a tin-plate factory recently fixed time rates at $1.50 a week for his women workers, and he openly gave the reason that they had taken advantage of piecework rates to make too much. Some had earned $4!

The average wage paid to waitresses in tea shops or restaurants throughout the country does not exceed $2.50 a week. On this the girls must keep up a neat and well-dressed appearance. Then wages are likely to be interfered with and even, if "necessary," reduced.

Many firms don't pretend to pay their girls a living wage. The head of a large company was asked recently how he expected the girls in his employment to live on $1.50 a week.

"I don't expect it," he answered. "Immediately we hear that a girl has lost her father or that she has no outside means of support, she is discharged."

This same firm employs what it calls "half-day waitresses." They work from 11.30 a. m. till 6.30 p. m. for $1 a week. All tips are forfeited.

The lot of the home worker is the worst of all. Miss Mary MacArthur, secretary of the Women's Trade Union League, gave a picture of the home worker in the East End in an interview.

"So terrible is their life that I wonder that they take the trouble to exist at all," she said. "Here is a single room in a Stepney slum. The furniture consists of a table, a chair, and a bed. The unfinished trousers at which the woman stitches serves as a blanket at night.

"She slaves from daybreak until her eyes fail, and she never earns more than 5 shillings a week. She sustains herself mainly, almost entirely, upon weak tea. Some days she drinks 14 cups, making the same tea leaves do service again and again. That is one of the women slaves of England, and there are thousands in similar plight.

"I know many women who make men's shirts at 1 shilling or 9 pence a dozen. I have even found the actual worker making at 8 pence a dozen shirts which had originally been given out at 1 shilling a dozen.

"There is a girl in Woolwich; she has one child, aged 2 years, entirely dependent upon her. She is a shirt finisher and does buttoning and buttonholing by hand. She is paid 5 shillings a dozen for collars. Remember, this is high-class work. Cotton costs her from 3 pence to 4 pence a week. Her average earnings are 4 shillings 6 pence a week, or from one-half pence to three-fourths pence an hour.

"Every day she has to spend an hour and a half in fetching her work, as it is only given out in small quantities. Sometimes she has worked with hardly any break for twenty hours, from 6 a. m. until 2 a. m. the following morning. The rent of the room is 1 shilling and 6 pence a week.

"All this she told the parliamentary committee. The members of Parliament were aghast. Some were incredulous. 'But how do you live, you and the child?' asked one member of Parliament. 'We don't live,' the woman replied, with a passion in her tone I had never heard before. 'Often we have no food at all.'"

Miss MacArthur contends that goods are not sold any cheaper when made by sweated labor. She tells of a fur-lined motor coat, marked at $105, which was made for $1.88 by sweated labor; and of a $5.25 nightdress for which the home worker who made it got 5 cents—63 cents for a dozen of these nightdresses. The employer of the girls who made these nightdresses said he could not pay more, as there was no profit in his trade.

There are many persons who are struggling to organize and help the women workers of England. There is a scheme for a trades board, which shall fix a legal minimum wage, and there are other propositions which will help to do away with the present sweating system, if they are ever put into practice.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire might have struck out the London heading and inserted New York, Pittsburg, or Jersey City, and the cruel oppression of

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

labor by organized capital, *uncontrolled by law*, would not be overdrawn, as I shall abundantly show before I conclude.

The Senator and the party of which he is a conspicuous leader have a duty to perform in which they seem strangely oblivious.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. OWEN. With pleasure.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator has made a comparison about a man, a bricklayer——

Mr. GALLINGER. Or a plumber.

Mr. SMOOT. In an unprotected industry, receiving 60 cents an hour, while a little girl who does spooling in a woolen mill gets 14 cents. Is that a fair comparison?

Mr. OWEN. I should say it is not a fair comparison. That comparison has not been made.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator just made a comparison that was even worse than that, because he spoke of burlers in a woolen mill, and they were receiving only 11 cents.

Mr. OWEN. I gave, in extenso, the wages paid to burlers and to all other employees in woolen mills and in silk mills and in cotton mills, stating what it was, whether they were male or whether they were female. I have given them all, and the comparison is just which I have made, substantially, and no comparison the Senator might suggest of a little girl and a big, burly brick mason, who weighs 247 pounds, will affect the general comparison in the slightest degree.

Mr. SMOOT. That is exactly the comparison which the Senator makes. And in relation to the wages paid here for weavers, I may say I do not know a weaver in any part of this country who earns so small an amount as that stated by the Senator. I have many times seen weavers earn as high as $3 a day, and the higher the wage they earn the better it is for the manufacturer, because they are all on piecework.

Mr. OWEN. Does the Senator challenge the accuracy of the census in this matter?

Mr. SMOOT. I challenge the figures the Senator gave here as to the wages paid to woolen weavers in this country.

Mr. OWEN. Then I commend the Senator to the United States census, from which the table was taken, and he may dispute the authoritative tables of the Federal Government; but he can not correct the accuracy of my quotation from the census reports.

Mr. SMOOT. I am not saying that the figure quoted by the Senator was not quoted from some table, but I do positively say that weavers in this country are not paid the price the Senator quoted.

Mr. OWEN. I appeal from the evidence of the Senator from Utah, as a special pleader, to the evidence of the federal census and of the London Board of Trade, and prefer to take the census of the United States and the official figures to his off-hand comments.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President——

Mr. OWEN. I cordially yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I have been very much interested in the Senator's statistics and figures, but it has often occurred to me that the industries to which he refers as unprotected industries are really the only perfectly protected industries we have in the United States, for the reason that if a man is to build a brick house here at all he has no competition from any quarter on earth. A man making a horseshoe has to be protected by a law, but a man shoeing a horse has an absolute, perfectly natural protection, because the horse has to be shod where he is and not in some other country, and no competition, direct or indirect, beats upon those occupations which are naturally and perfectly protected.

Mr. OWEN. I think there is force in the observation of the Senator from Iowa, and I shall not quarrel with it, but content myself with saying that like industries abroad are also much better paid than factory labor. But I do call attention to the fact that these men who are in the railway service and in the unprotected building trades and not in the business of manufacturing woolen or cotton or flax textiles are receiving a very much higher reward than those who are in those industries, and I have shown by these tables that they could be paid a much larger price without depriving the factories of a just reward. If there were some competition, it would be far better for labor; and if there were some measure of competition in this country, I believe it would be better for the manufacturers themselves.

LABOR HAS NOT BEEN ABLE TO SHARE EQUITABLY WITH THE EMPLOYERS IN THE VALUES THAT LABOR HAS INCREASINGLY CREATED.

In Volume VIII, page 982, of the Twelfth Census, 1900, is the following table. It shows that labor received in 1850, 23.21 per cent of the total value of products, while in 1900 it received only 17.8 per cent of the product, although the per capita increase in production was greater by 130 per cent in 1900 than in 1850.

Year.	Average number of wage-earners.	Total annual wages.	Total annual value of products.	Average per capita production.
1850	957,059	$236,755,464	$1,019,106,616	$1,064
1900	5,321,389	2,330,578,010	13,039,279,566	2,451

Year.	Average annual wage.	Per cent of product paid in wages.	Per capita increase in production in the 50 years.	Per capita increase in wages in 50 years.
			Per cent.	*Per cent.*
1850	$247	23.21	130	77
1900	437	17.80		

From Exhibit 1 labor shows a diminishing wage as compared to value of its product.

In textiles labor received 22 per cent of the product in 1890, 20.8 per cent in 1900, 19.5 per cent in 1905.

In the iron and steel industries labor received 24.9 per cent of the product in 1900, 22.1 per cent in 1905.

In the leather industries labor received 20.1 per cent of the product in 1890, 16.9 per cent in 1900, 16.5 per cent in 1905.

In paper and printing industries labor received 26.5 per cent in 1890, 23.1 per cent in 1900, 21.6 per cent in 1905.

In metal and metal products labor received 20.4 per cent of the gross product in 1890, 12.9 per cent in 1900, 12.7 per cent in 1905.

In tobacco industries labor received 21 per cent in 1890, 18.9 per cent in 1905.

Labor has constantly grown in efficiency, but has not been able to share equitably in the value it has created.

Taking a special industry, such as iron and steel, including rolling mills and blast furnaces, as shown by the special report of the United States Census Office, Part IV, selected industries, 1905, on pages 5 and 16, will be found the tables for the years 1890 and 1905. I submit an analysis which shows that the per capita increase of the product of labor by weight was 50 per cent; by value, 33.5 per cent; while the increase in wages is only 11 per cent.

Year.	Average number of wage-earners employed.	Total annual wages paid.	Total value of products.	Total weight of products in tons.
1890	171,181	$89,273,956	$478,687,519	16,264,478
1905	242,740	141,439,906	905,854,152	34,844,933

Year.	Per capita increase in production in 15 years in values.	Per capita increase in production by weight.	Per capita increase in wages in 15 years.	Average weekly wage.
	Per cent.	*Per cent.*	*Per cent.*	
1890	33.5	50.5	11.5	$10.02
1905				11.20

These figures might be multiplied indefinitely in all of the monopoly-controlled industries.

I submit a table of the wages in the woolen and cotton goods factories of New England. It shows that they do not receive to-day an average wage of exceeding a dollar a day, a fact of special interest in connection with this controversy where the schedules are supposed to be written for the protection of labor.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Wages 1860 and 1900 compared in woolen and cotton goods factories of New England.

Year.	Number of employees.	Wages.	Wages per capita.	Value of product.	Value of output per capita.	Pounds of cotton used.	Actual increase in output by weight.
Cotton:							Per ct.
1860	81,403	$16,720,920	$205	$79,359,000	$794	283,701,306	----------
1900	164,944	56,258,202	341	191,690,913	1,162	940,908,114	331
Woolen:							
1860	25,583	6,144,847	240	47,722,814	1,474	----------	----------
1900	82,472	31,230,772	378	161,566,277	1,934	----------	----------

This schedule shows that, counting the best paid labor, the annual average wage of the employees in the cotton and woolen mills do not exceed $1 a day, and that, therefore, the pretense of better paid labor in the United States in the cotton and woolen mills, at least, is not true, because such wages do not greatly exceed the wages in Europe; and measured by purchasing power, probably do not exceed them at all; and measured by the output of American labor, which is twice as efficient as European labor, the American labor is not as well paid as European labor. The American manufacturer gets all the net profit. It has been shown in this debate what the enormous profits of the cotton and woolen mills have been, and our statistics clearly demonstrate the inequitable manner in which these profits have been proportioned between the American monopolists and his foreign-born workmen.

AMERICAN AND EUROPEAN WAGES IN PROTECTED INDUSTRIES COMPARED.

I submit this comparison of wages in the United States, Germany, France, and the United Kingdom, with the proper authorities, showing that the wages paid in the United States in the textile industry do not very greatly exceed those paid in Germany, France, and England, while it is conceded that the output of the American laborer is twice as much as in Europe.

The spinners, for example, in Germany in 1905, at Mulhausen, received from $6.57 to $7.30 per week. In France they received $5.91 and in the United States $4.12. The weavers, on the contrary, received in Germany $4.02 to $4.75; in France, $4.48 to $5.19; in the United Kingdom, $5.11 to $7.06; and in the United States, $8.29. So that the weavers in our country received double as much as they did in Germany, and the spinners in our country received a smaller money wage than in either Germany or France.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the table show that the weavers receive less than the spinners in Germany?

Mr. OWEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SMOOT. Whoever prepared the table does not know a thing about manufacturing, and it can not possibly be true.

Mr. OWEN. The Senator from Utah, having corrected the United States census with regard to employees in cotton factories, may now correct the tables used by the Board of Trade of the United Kingdom in their report to Parliament, from which this is taken.

Mr. SMOOT. I know just as well as I know I am alive that there is no country that can employ weavers at a less price than they can spinners. Spinners are boys and girls. Weavers are men and women. It can not be possible. It is a mistake.

Mr. OWEN. I again appeal from the personal assurances of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] to the records of the Board of Trade of London and of the United States census, from which these figures are accurately taken; and I call attention to the fact that the Senator from Rhode Island, the chairman of the Committee on Finance, when he was giving these tables, confined himself to those parts of the tables favorable to his contention and failed to insert those parts of the tables which were unfavorable to his contention, and such a leadership I neither approve nor follow.

These tables show the differences which I have pointed out, and they speak for themselves and are easily capable of their verification.

Wages in textile industry in Germany, France, United Kingdom, and United States.

In the protected industries.	Germany, 1905, Mulhausen.		France, 1905, Lille.		United Kingdom. Weekly pay, 1906 (W. K. Preston).	United States. Average, 1904.	Hours.
	Weekly pay.	Hours work.	Weekly pay.	Hours work.			
COTTON INDUSTRY.							
Spinners:							
Male	$6.57–$7.30	66	$5.91	60	----------	$4.12	64.55
Female	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	5.16	61.01
Weavers:							
Male	4.02–4.75	66	4.48–5.19	60	$5.11–$7.06	8.29	60.42
Female	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	7.58	60.13
Piecers	4.42–4.87	66	3.51–5.19	60	----------	----------	----------
Laborers	3.81	66	4.10	60	----------	----------	----------
Dyers	3.65–4.62	58½–63	4.66–5.25	60–66	----------	6.89	62.48
Mule spinners	----------	----------	11.78–12.45	60	8.52–10.95	11.24	59.32
WOOLEN INDUSTRY.							
	Mulhausen.		Roubaix.		Bradford.		
Spinners	7.20–7.79	61	6.22–6.81	60	1.95–2.68	6.52	58.34
Weavers (Aschen):							
Male	5.11–5.84	60	5.45–5.84	60	3.16–4.14	9.87	58.47
Female	4.38	60	----------	----------	----------	8.79	57.57
Combers (Leipzig):							
Male	4.38	65	4.20–4.26	60	4.87–5.60	7.11	58.33
Female	----------	----------	----------	----------	2.68–3.41	5.49	57.40
Dyers (Leipzig)	5.60	65	3.79–3.91	60	5.84	7.86	59.11
SILK INDUSTRY.							
Weavers:							
Silk—	Crefeld, 1905.		Lyon, 1905.				
Male	5.11–5.84	58–58½	3.20–3.51	60	----------	9.74	56.52
Female	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	8.19	57.82
Velvet	5.84–6.57	58–58½	4.10–4.97	60	----------	----------	----------
Ribbon—							
Male	7.30	58–58½	[a] 3.51–4.66	60	----------	10.93	52.98
Female	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	9.84	50.71
Dyers	6.57	60	5.84–6.81	60	----------	10.98	55.05

[a] St. Etienne.

NOTE.—In 1905 the wages received at St. Etienne, France, by ribbon weavers varied from $3.51 to $4.66 per week. In 1906 it was over 100 per cent more than this. In August, 1907, it was from 30 per cent to 50 per cent higher than in 1905. These weavers received as pay, in piecework, from one-half to two-thirds the value of their product.

Authority for United States figures: Bulletin of the Bureau of Labor, No. 59, July, 1905.

Authority for foreign figures: Cost of Living in German Towns (1908); Cost of Living in French Towns (1909); Cost of Living of Working Classes, United Kingdom, 1908; Report of Board of Trade to Parliament.

I exhibit a comparison of wages in the United States, Germany, France, and the United Kingdom in the nonprotected industries, which present a very much more favorable wage to the unprotected American workingman and much more favorable hours.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Comparison of wages in United States, Germany, France, and United Kingdom.

Class of labor. (In the unprotected industries.)	Berlin (1905).		London (Oct., 1905).		Paris (Oct., 1905).		United States—North Atlantic (1904).	
	Weekly wages.	Number of hours.	Weekly wages.	Number of hours.	Weekly wages.	Number of hours.	Weekly wages.	Number of hours.
Bricklayers and masons	$9.51	53½	$10.65	50	$9.35	60	$25.52	46.92
Carpenters	9.51	53½			10.50	60	18.03	47.89
Joiners and cabinetmakers	7.77	52			9.35	60		
Plumbers	7.81	53½	11.16	50	9.35	54	20.60	48.00
Painters	7.16	53½	8.77	50	9.35	60	16.95	48.40
Laborers (building trades)	6.25	53½	7.10	50	5.84	60	9.50	54.70
Hod carriers (building trades)	8.86	53½	7.10	50	5.84	60	13.88	46.72
Molders	8.27-9.41	58½-60	9.49	50	[a] 11.97	60	17.17	56.38
					[b] 8.17	60		
Turners	9.02-9.41	58½-60	9.49	50	[a] 11.23	60	15.34	56.07
					[b] 8.17	60		
Smiths	7.30-7.58	58½-60	9.49	50	[a] 12.73	60	16.73	57.03
					[b] 9.05	60		
Pattern makers	8.77-9.01	58½-60	10.56	50	[a] 12.60	60	17.87	56.25
					[b] 8.88	60		
Brewers	7.79	57	7.30	54	6.43	60	17.54	58.20
Compositors (printing)	8.73	54	9.49	50	[c] 11.09	48	18.24	52.16
					[d] 12.86	42		
Street sweepers	5.11-5.84	63			6.59	60	9.50	58.28

[a] Piecework. [b] Time work. [c] Day. [d] Night.

Report of board of trade: Cost of living in German towns, 1908; cost of living in French towns, 1909; cost of living of working classes, United Kingdom, 1908.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

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

Mr. OWEN. With pleasure.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will ask the Senator if he has consulted Bulletin No. 80, published in January, 1909? It is four years later than the one he quoted from. If the Senator will turn to page 63, he will find that in Dundee male shifters are working for $2.29 a week in the textile mills, and male preparers are working for $2.51 a week. It seems to be an extraordinarily low wage. There is nothing like it in this country, I take it, and yet that is in the unprotected textile mills of Great Britain and from a recent publication by our Commissioner of Labor.

Mr. OWEN. I have these tables of 1904 and 1905, which compare the dates as nearly as they could be compared, and have not attempted to compare the tables of Great Britain, made by the board of trade there, with the tables made at a very different period. I have compared them as nearly as they were available of adjacent years. But, I will say to the Senator from New Hampshire, that the question of "the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad" is easily discovered, and he illustrates that he knows how to do it.

I now take a table—Exhibit No. 6, the wages and cost of living in the United Kingdom, Germany, and France—showing the average family income, the cost of living, the articles of food, and so forth. I ask that it may be printed in my remarks without reading.

As Exhibit No. 6, I submit the wages and cost of living in the United Kingdom, Germany, and France.

EXHIBIT 6.

Wages and cost of living in United Kingdom, Germany, and France.

Limit weekly income.	Under $6.08.			$6.08 and under $7.40.			$7.40 and under $8.52.			$8.52 and under $9.73.			$9.73 and over.		
	United Kingdom.	Germany.	France.	United Kingdom.	Germany.	France.	United Kingdom.	Germany.	France.	United Kingdom.	Germany.	France.	United Kingdom.	Germany.	France.
Number of returns	261	1,065	614	289	1,329	931	416	1,223	1,065	382	692	821	596	737	1,951
Average family weekly income	$5.20	$5.30	$5.58	$6.56	$6.59	$6.73	$7.77	$7.75	$7.87	$8.89	$8.92	$9.08	$12.65	$11.85	$12.88
Average number of children	3.1	2.3	1.77	3.3	2.5	1.80	3.2	2.5	1.92	3.4	2.8	2.13	4.4	3.8	2.91
COST OF LIVING.															
Bread and flour:															
Cost	$0.74	$0.64	$0.73	$0.81	$0.70	$0.76	$0.80	$0.74	$0.82	$0.82	$0.83	$0.89	$1.05	$1.09	$1.15
Amount.....pounds	28.44	23.04	24.10	29.97	25.05	24.58	29.44	26.06	26.19	29.99	29.83	27.62	37.76	38.21	35.89
Meat:															
Cost	$0.79	$0.99	$0.92	$1.01	$1.18	$1.12	$1.25	$1.41	$1.38	$1.32	$1.57	$1.55	$1.75	$2.10	$2.11
Amount.....pounds	6.42	5.83	5.55	7.57	6.60	6.49	8.66	7.82	7.81	9.25	8.77	8.57	11.87	11.35	11.55
Fish, cost	$0.15	$0.06		$0.18	$0.06		$0.29	$0.06		$0.24	$0.07		$0.32	$0.09	
Eggs:															
Cost	$0.12	$0.11	$0.13	$0.17	$0.15	$0.15	$0.22	$0.17	$0.18	$0.24	$0.19	$0.19	$0.34	$0.24	$0.26
Amount.....number	6.2	6.9	6.9	8.7	9.2	8.1	11.3	10.2	9.3	12.0	11.06	10.2	16.3	14.4	13.4
Milk:															
Cost	$0.16	$0.25	$0.15	$0.23	$0.31	$0.18	$0.31	$0.34	$0.20	$0.33	$0.40	$0.22	$0.41	$0.44	$0.27
Amount.....pints	5.54	10.57	5.81	7.72	12.30	6.88	9.85	12.83	7.6	10.34	14.45	8.1	12.63	16.10	9.73
Cheese:															
Cost	$0.10	$0.06	$0.08	$0.11	$0.08	$0.10	$0.12	$0.09	$0.12	$0.12	$0.10	$0.14	$0.16	$0.13	$0.19
Amount.....pounds	0.67	0.40	0.46	0.70	0.46	0.55	0.79	0.62	0.68	0.77	0.60	0.75	1.02	0.77	1.00
Butter, lard, etc.:															
Cost	$0.41	$0.49	$0.42	$0.51	$0.60	$0.47	$0.58	$0.65	$0.50	$0.62	$0.72	$0.55	$0.90	$0.90	$0.72
Amount.....pounds	2.05	2.56	2.25	2.47	2.79	2.41	2.67	3.07	2.59	2.87	3.45	2.80	3.96	4.23	3.62
Potatoes:															
Cost	$0.18	$0.20	$0.15	$0.20	$0.21	$0.16	$0.21	$0.21	$0.16	$0.20	$0.23	$0.18	$0.28	$0.29	$0.24
Amount.....pounds	14.05	26.04	12.20	15.84	23.96	13.93	16.11	23.81	14.64	15.87	24.63	15.85	19.93	33.55	20.50
Fruit, cost	$0.10	$0.11	$0.24	$0.14	$0.16	$0.28	$0.20	$0.19	$0.33	$0.23	$0.21	$0.35	$0.32	$0.27	$0.48
Macaroni, oat meal, etc., cost	$0.09	$0.07	$0.08	$0.10	$0.09	$0.10	$0.12	$0.09	$0.10	$0.11	$0.10	$0.11	$0.14	$0.12	$0.13
Coffee, cocoa, and tea:															
Cost	$0.23	$0.15	$0.15	$0.29	$0.19	$0.16	$0.33	$0.21	$0.20	$0.35	$0.24	$0.21	$0.46	$0.30	$0.30
Amount.....pounds			0.44			0.46			0.55			0.55			0.82
Sugar:															
Cost	$0.16	$0.09	$0.11	$0.20	$0.10	$0.11	$0.22	$0.10	$0.12	$0.23	$0.11	$0.13	$0.30	$0.13	$0.16
Amount.....pounds	3.87	1.83	1.48	4.62	1.96	1.50	4.97	1.98	1.72	5.21	2.14	1.83	6.70	2.67	2.22
Sirups, condiments, etc., cost	$0.26	$0.13	$0.01	$0.33	$0.17	$0.01	$0.41	$0.17	$0.02	$0.46	$0.20	$0.03	$0.62	$0.24	$0.04
Meals away from home	$0.03	$0.09	$0.22	$0.05	$0.13	$0.32	$0.08	$0.16	$0.42	$0.14	$0.18	$0.53	$0.18	$0.31	$0.75
Total expenditure for food:															
Per week	$3.50	$3.44	$3.38	$4.34	$4.10	$3.94	$5.05	$4.58	$4.56	$5.43	$5.14	$5.09	$7.22	$6.66	$6.81
Per year	$182.00	$178.88	$175.76	$225.68	$213.20	$204.88	$262.60	$238.16	$237.12	$282.36	$267.28		$375.44	$346.32	

NOTE.—Totals are found by converting the totals in foreign money into United States money, and may differ from true totals.

Authority for above table: Report of an inquiry by the Board of Trade for both Houses of the English Parliament, 1908, as to cost of living in German towns; 1909, as to cost of living in French towns.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

As Exhibit No. 7, I submit the income and cost of living in the United States of workingmen's families.

EXHIBIT 7.

Workingmen's families, income and cost of living in the United States, 1891.

Geographical division.	Number of families noted.	Average size of family.	Average income of family.		Average expenditure of family.		Average expenditure for food.	
			Annual.	Weekly.	Annual.	Weekly.	Annual.	Weekly.
North Atlantic States	1,415	5.25	$834.83	$16.05	$778.04	$14.96	$338.10	$6.50
South Atlantic States	219	5.30	762.68	14.67	700.62	13.47	298.64	5.74
North Central States	721	5.46	842.60	16.20	785.95	15.11	321.60	6.18
South Central States	122	5.65	715.46	13.76	690.11	13.27	292.68	5.36
Western States	90	4.69	891.52	17.15	751.46	14.45	308.53	5.32
United States	2,567	5.31	827.19	15.91	768.54	14.78	326.90	6.99

Authority for above table: Bulletin of the Bureau of Labor, United States, No. 59, July, 1905.

As Exhibit No. 8 I submit the quantity and value of the food consumed by workingmen's families in the United States per week, 1901:

EXHIBIT 8.

Quantity and value of certain articles of food consumed by workingmen's families in the United States per week, 1901.

(Average income, $14.78 per week. Number of families, 2,567.)

Article.	Amount.	Cost.
Bread and flour	17.95 pounds	$0.56
Meats	14.78 do	1.97
Fish	1.54 do	.15
Eggs	19.7 number	.32
Milk	13.7 pints	.41
Cheese	.31 pounds	.05
Butter and lard	3.87 do	.73
Potatoes	17.0 do	.25
Vegetables and fruit		.68
Rice	.48 pounds	.04
Coffee and tea	1.10 do	.31
Sugar	5.16 do	.30
Condiments, molasses, etc		.11
Other food		.39
Total expended for food per week		6.27
Total expended for food per year		326.90

Authority: Bulletin of the Bureau of Labor, No. 59, July, 1905.

As Exhibit No. 9 I submit the weekly rents workingmen pay in England, Germany, France, and United States.

EXHIBIT 9.

Weekly rents in England, Germany, France, and United States.

Tenements.	London.	Berlin.	Paris.	United States.
Two-room	$1.46	$1.34	$1.12	[a] $1.91
Three-room	1.82	1.98	1.46	
Four-room	2.19		1.67	

[a] Average of 2,567 families, 1901, irrespective of size of tenement, in total United States.

Report of board of trade to Parliament: (1908) cost of living in German towns; (1909) cost of living in French towns; (1908) cost of living of working classes, United Kingdom.

Exhibit No. 10 is the per cent of income of workingmen's families spent for food.

EXHIBIT 10.

Per cent of income of workingmen's families spent for food.

Limit of income.	United Kingdom, 1905.	Germany, 1905.	France, 1905.	United States.
	Per cent.	*Per cent.*	*Per cent.*	*Per cent.*
$6.08–$7.30 per week	66	62	59	[a] 42½
$7.30–$8.52 per week	65	59	58	
$8.52–$9.73 per week	61	58	56	

[a] 2,567 workingmen's families.

Authority: Bulletin of United States Bureau of Labor No. 59. Report of board of trade to Parliament on cost of living (1908–9).

IT WOULD NOT BE DIFFICULT TO DETERMINE WITH COMPARATIVE PRECISION THE DIFFERENCE IN THE COST OF PRODUCTION MEASURED BY THE COST OF MATERIALS AND OF WAGES, THE RELATIVE EFFICIENCY OF LABOR, AND THE PURCHASING POWER OF THE WAGE RECEIVED. FUTURE TARIFFS SHOULD BE BASED UPON SUCH INFORMATION COMPILED BY EXPERTS EMPLOYED FOR THE PURPOSE. THIS WOULD GIVE A PROPER BASIS FOR DETERMINING THE DIFFERENCE IN COST OF PRODUCTION AT HOME AND ABROAD, AND FOR DETERMINING THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE AMERICAN MANUFACTURER WOULD BE PROTECTED IN PERCENTAGES OVER AND ABOVE THE DIFFERENCE IN THE COST OF PRODUCTION, AND WOULD ESTABLISH A SOUND FOUNDATION UPON WHICH TO WRITE A TARIFF FOR REVENUE WHICH WOULD AFFORD A LEGITIMATE AND REASONABLE INCIDENTAL PROTECTION, WITHOUT GIVING SHELTER TO MONOPOLY.

It will be observed from these tables the vital fact that the American laborer in the protected industries, and especially in the cotton and woolen industries, does not receive the enormous wages in comparison with the European workman in like industries which the advocates of high tariff would have us believe. On the contrary, their wages are very little, if any, better than those of the European workman, and that the workman in the United States, especially in the textiles, has been compelled to supplement his own wages by compelling his wife and his daughter and his children of tender years to help earn sufficient to enable them to keep body and soul together.

THE EXTREME USE OF WOMEN AND CHILDREN IN THE RACE FOR MONEY-MAKING.

An untutored, full-blood Sioux Indian was taken East and shown the glories of its civilization and, when he had been surfeited with sight-seeing, the question was asked him, what had struck him as the most important thing he saw, and he replied: "The way in which the white man makes his little children work."

So evil has been this result of a monopoly-breaking tariff in this Nation that a general alarm has been widely excited, and various States and committees throughout the Nation are engaged in attempting its correction. (Proceedings of the fifth annual conference, Chicago, Ill., National Child Labor Committee, 105 East Twenty-second street, New York.)

Bulletin No. 69, on Child Labor, Department of Commerce and Labor, shows that 26 per cent of the male children of the United States between 10 and 15 years of age are breadwinners; 1,264,000 male children between 10 and 15 years are breadwinners; 485,000 female children between 10 and 15 years are breadwinners.

2. If the number of children over 15, wage-earners and not yet adults, were classified, it would be found very large. Table 164, Census Bulletin, page 69, for example, gives the number of children at home, at school, and employed as breadwinners in families in which there are female textile workers 10 to 14 years of age, for Chicago, and New York, and out of 3,595 children over 15 years of age, 190 were at home, 52 at school, and 3,353 employed in gainful occupations. No record is made by the census of children not employed in gainful occupations under 10 years of age, nor over 15 years of age; so that it is probably no exaggeration to state that four or five million of children are engaged in labor when they ought to be in school or at play.

By Census Volume 2, page cxxxi, it is shown that the number of females engaged in gainful occupations, outside of domestic service was 5,329,292, and the probable number of women and girls now engaged in gainful occupations will probably exceed seven millions; 28 per cent being so employed in Massachusetts, 29.6 per cent in Rhode Island, 24.3 per cent in Connecticut, 20.8 per cent in New Jersey, 23 per cent in New York and 7.9 per cent in Oklahoma. The reason for women being compelled to go into competition with men in the gainful occupations is largely because the men of the family do not receive enough to maintain the family and enable the women to have the means they require and to remain at home where they properly belong

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

in a civilization of a high order. The driving of the American woman from the home where her activities would best be employed in promoting her own happiness and the happiness of mankind, and where her services to the race would be best employed in raising children and teaching them the lessons of religion, morality, and the sturdy virtues taught by our forefathers, is not the least of the crushing effects of modern monopoly engendered by a monopoly protecting tariff, and by the unrestrained avarice and ambition with their false standards of life which are thus set up in a mad race for power.

It will be seen by the wages in the textile industries that the cotton spinners of Germany and France are paid more in money than in the United States, the weavers less, and the mule spinners of France more, than those of the United States; that the woolen spinners of Germany and France are paid more money than they are in the United States, while the weavers are paid less, but in considering the fact that the money of the cotton spinners and woolen spinners of France and Germany will buy 50 per cent more than in the United States, the wages they receive are decidedly better. When it is remembered the American workman turns out twice as much as the German or Frenchman, then the ungenerous treatment of the American cotton and woolen spinners is obvious. It is also obvious that the plea of the Massachusetts and Rhode Island *manufacturer* that the HIGHER WAGES he is compelled to pay his cotton and wool spinners in order to meet the pauper labor competition of France and Germany is a *monumental falsehood* used to hoodwink the patriotism of the American people and lead them to tax themselves for the poor spinner's sake who toil in the cotton and woolen mills.

It is interesting to observe that labor in the protected industries of Germany, France, and the United Kingdom are paid much smaller wages than in the unprotected industries, and labor might well question the value of a protective system which operates throughout the world to give them less remuneration for their labor than in the unprotected industries.

A COMPETITION-PROHIBITING TARIFF HAS SERVED TO INCREASE PRICES AND LOWER THE PURCHASING POWER OF ALL WAGES AND OF ALL INCOMES.

In the Journal of the Royal Statistical Society for March, 1909, page 68, A. Sauerbeck, an acknowledged authority, gives a comparison of world prices, based on 45 commodities, and using as an index the standards fixed by the period of eleven years, 1867–1877, which in the aggregate was the equivalent of the average of the twenty-five years preceding; that is, from 1853–1877. The index number is 100.

Prices of commodities in 1908.

[By A. Sauerbeck.]

The following table shows the course of prices of 45 commodities during the last twenty years as compared with the standard period of eleven years, 1867–1877, which in the aggregate is equivalent to the average of the twenty-five years, 1853–1877. (See the Society's Journal, 1886, pp. 592 and 648; and 1893, pp. 220 and 247.)

(Summary of index numbers. Groups of articles, 1867–1877=100.)

Year.	Vegetable food (corn, etc.).	Animal food (meat, etc.).	Sugar, coffee, and tea.	Total food.	Minerals.	Textiles.	Sundry materials.	Total materials.	Grand total.	Silver.	Wheat harvest.	Average price of consols.	Average Bank of England rate.
													Per cent.
1889	65	86	75	75	75	70	68	70	72	70.2	103	98	3⅜
1890	65	82	70	73	80	66	69	71	72	78.4	106	96½	4⅜
1891	75	81	71	77	76	59	69	68	72	74.1	108	95⅝	3⅜
1892	65	84	69	73	71	57	67	65	68	65.4	91	96¼	2⅜
1893	59	85	75	72	68	59	68	65	68	58.6	90	98½	3⅜
1894	55	80	65	66	64	53	64	60	63	47.6	106	101	2⅜
1895	54	78	62	64	62	52	65	60	62	49.1	91	106¼	2
1896	53	73	59	62	63	54	63	60	61	50.5	116	111	2½
1897	60	79	52	65	66	51	62	59	62	45.3	100	112½	2⅜
1898	67	77	51	68	70	51	63	61	64	44.3	120	111	3½
1899	60	79	53	65	92	58	65	70	68	45.1	113	107	3½
1900	62	85	54	69	108	66	71	80	75	46.4	99	99⅛	4
1901	62	85	46	67	89	60	71	72	70	44.7	106	94	3½
1902	63	87	41	67	82	71	71	71	69	39.6	113	94⅛	3⅜
1903	62	84	44	66	82	66	69	72	69	40.7	104	90⅜	3½
1904	63	83	50	68	81	71	67	72	70	43.4	93	88⅛	3⅜
1905	63	87	52	69	87	72	68	75	72	45.7	113	89⅜	3
1906	62	89	46	69	101	80	74	83	77	50.7	116	88⅛	4½
1907	69	88	48	72	107	77	78	86	80	49.6	117	84	4⅝
1908	70	89	48	72	89	62	73	74	73	40.1	111	86	3
Average:													
1890–1908	64	86	48	68	92	67	71	75	72	44.6	109	92¼	3⅞
1888–1897	62	81	66	70	70	59	66	65	67	61.0	101	101⅞	2⅝
1878–1887	79	95	76	84	73	71	81	76	79	82.1	97	99½	3⅝

It will thus be observed that as compared with 100 for 1853–1877, the grand total index number of world prices for 1889 was 72, and for 1899 to 1908 it was 72, a fall in prices due to the demonetization of silver throughout the world.

It will also be observed that the index number for 1889 and 1905 was 72; for 1908 it was 73, thus indicating a singular stability in the grand total of the world prices (London), since 1889, notwithstanding important intermediate variations.

Conceding that the volume of metallic money in the world, together with the law of supply and demand of other materials, are the determining factors fixing the average of world prices, it should be observed that the wonderful increase in the output of modern machinery as applied to all classes of products seems to have been about equaled by the output of metallic money, whose annual rate of gold output has approximately doubled since 1896.

This table also shows the effect upon world prices by the disturbance of commercial credits of the world by financial panic; the panic of 1893 being followed by the lowest world prices in a generation.

It would seem to follow that the lowering of prices stimulated purchases and exchanges and led to a corresponding reaction. The panic of 1907 was followed by an immediate reaction in world prices.

It is important to point out that, notwithstanding the increased output of merchantable articles, the increase of gold circulation available for the use of the world markets has been very large, and that this probably accounts for the substantial stability of world prices since 1889. These figures are of intense interest when compared with the changes in prices which have taken place in the United States. Taking the tables of the Statistical Abstract of 1907, it will be seen that middling cotton which was 11.07 cents in 1890 was 11.5 cents in in 1906, having reached a very low price of 6.94 cents in 1894, just after the panic, and a still lower point of 5.94 cents in 1898, just after the Dingley bill passed; while standard sheetings for 1890 was 7 cents, and 1906, 7.25 cents, reaching a low point of 5.11 cents in 1894, just after the panic, and its lowest point, 4.2 cents, in 1898, just after the passage of the Dingley bill.

In like manner standard drillings and other cotton cloths fluctuated similarly following the panic and following the Dingley bill.

Mr. President, I now submit a table (No. 202) from the Abstract of Our National Statistics (1907), giving the relative wholesale prices of raw and of manufactured commodities of 1890 to 1906 and per cent of increase in prices for 1906 over prices for each preceding year; and also Table 203, giving the relative wholesale prices of commodities from 1890 to 1906 and the per cent of increase in prices from 1906 over prices for each preceding year by group of commodities.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Great increase in prices under Dingley Act. Relative wholesale prices of raw and of manufactured commodities, 1890 to 1906, and per cent of increase in prices for 1906 over prices for each preceding year.

Calendar year.	Raw commodities.		Manufactured commodities.		All commodities.	
	Relative price.	Per cent of increase in 1906 over each preceding.	Relative price.	Per cent of increase in 1906 over each preceding.	Relative price.	Per cent of increase in 1906 over each preceding.
1890	115.0	9.5	112.3	8.3	112.9	8.4
1891	116.3	8.3	110.6	9.9	111.7	9.6
1892	107.9	16.7	105.6	15.2	106.1	15.4
1893	104.4	20.6	105.9	14.8	105.6	15.9
1894	93.2	35.1	96.8	25.6	96.1	27.4
1895	91.7	37.3	94.0	29.4	93.6	30.8
1896	84.0	49.9	91.9	32.3	90.4	35.4
1897	87.6	43.7	90.1	35.0	89.7	36.5
1898	94.0	33.9	93.3	30.3	93.4	31.0
1899	105.9	18.9	100.7	20.8	101.7	20.4
1900	111.9	12.5	110.2	10.3	110.5	10.8
1901	111.4	13.0	107.8	12.8	108.5	12.8
1902	122.4	2.9	110.6	9.9	112.9	8.4
1903	122.7	2.6	111.5	9.1	113.6	7.7
1904	119.7	5.2	111.3	9.3	113.0	8.3
1905	121.2	3.9	114.6	6.1	115.9	5.6
1906	125.9	.....	121.6	.....	122.4	.....

NOTE.—From reports of the Bureau of Labor, Department of Commerce and Labor. This table summarizes wholesale prices of 258 staple commodities. The commodities designated as "Raw" are such as are marketed in their natural state and also such as have been subjected to only a preliminary manufacturing process; this group includes 50 articles. The commodities designated as "Manufactured" are such as have been subjected to more than a preliminary factory manipulation and in which the manufacturing labor cost constitutes an important element in the price; this group includes 208 articles. A relative price, or index number, as it is technically called, of any article is the per cent which the price of that article at any date is of the price of the same article at a date or period which has been selected as the base or standard. The base selected by the Bureau of Labor for this compilation is the average price for the ten-year period 1890 to 1899. The relative prices shown under each group are simple averages of the relatives of all articles included within the group. Average price for 1890–1899=100.

EXHIBIT 6.

Relative wholesale prices of commodities, 1890 to 1906, and per cent of increase in prices for 1906 over prices for each preceding year, by groups of commodities.

Calendar year.	Farm products.		Food, etc.	
	Relative price.	Per cent of increase in 1906 over each preceding year.	Relative price.	Per cent of increase in 1906 over each preceding year.
1890	110.0	12.4	112.4	0.2
1891	121.5	1.7	115.7	a2.7
1892	111.7	10.7	103.6	8.7
1893	107.9	14.6	110.2	2.2
1894	95.9	28.9	99.8	12.8
1895	93.3	32.5	94.6	19.0
1896	78.3	57.9	83.8	34.4
1897	85.2	45.1	87.7	28.4
1898	96.1	28.6	94.4	19.3
1899	100.0	23.6	98.3	14.5
1900	109.5	12.9	104.2	8.1
1901	116.9	5.7	105.9	6.3
1902	130.5	a5.3	111.3	1.2
1903	118.8	4.0	107.1	5.1
1904	126.2	a2.1	107.2	5.0
1905	124.2	a.5	108.7	3.6
1906	123.6	.....	112.6	.....
1907	.....	.....	117.8	.....

Calendar year.	Cloths and clothing.		Fuel and lighting.	
	Relative price.	Per cent of increase in 1906 over each preceding year.	Relative price.	Per cent of increase in 1906 over each preceding year.
1890	113.5	5.7	104.7	23.7
1891	111.3	7.8	102.7	26.1
1892	109.0	10.1	101.1	28.1
1893	107.2	11.9	100.0	29.5
1894	96.1	24.9	92.4	40.2
1895	92.7	29.4	98.1	32.0
1896	91.3	31.4	104.3	24.2
1897	91.1	31.7	96.4	34.3
1898	93.4	28.5	95.4	35.7
1899	96.7	24.1	105.0	23.3
1900	106.8	12.4	120.9	7.1
1901	101.0	18.8	119.5	8.4
1902	102.0	17.6	134.3	a3.6
1903	106.6	12.6	149.3	a13.3
1904	109.8	9.3	132.6	a2.3
1905	112.0	7.1	128.8	.5
1906	120.0	.....	129.5	.....

a Decrease.

Relative wholesale prices of commodities, 1890 to 1906, etc.—Continued.

Calendar year.	Metals and implements.		Lumber and building materials.	
	Relative price.	Per cent of increase in 1906 over each preceding year.	Relative price.	Per cent of increase in 1906 over each preceding year.
1890	119.2	13.4	111.8	25.3
1891	111.7	21.0	108.4	29.2
1892	106.0	27.5	102.8	36.3
1893	100.7	34.3	101.9	37.5
1894	90.7	49.1	96.3	45.5
1895	92.0	47.0	94.1	48.9
1896	93.7	44.3	93.4	50.0
1897	86.6	56.1	90.4	55.0
1898	86.4	56.5	95.8	46.2
1899	114.7	17.9	105.8	32.4
1900	120.5	12.2	115.7	21.1
1901	111.9	20.8	116.7	20.1
1902	117.2	15.4	118.8	17.9
1903	117.6	15.0	121.4	15.4
1904	109.6	23.4	122.7	14.2
1905	122.5	10.4	127.7	9.6
1906	135.2	.....	140.1	.....

Calendar year.	Drugs and chemicals.		House furnishing goods.	
	Relative price.	Per cent of increase in 1906 over each preceding year.	Relative price.	Per cent of increase in 1906 over each preceding year.
1890	110.2	a8.2	111.1	a0.1
1891	103.6	a2.3	110.2	.7
1892	102.9	a1.7	106.5	4.2
1893	100.5	.7	104.9	5.8
1894	89.8	12.7	100.1	10.9
1895	87.9	15.1	96.5	15.0
1896	92.6	9.3	94.0	18.1
1897	94.4	7.2	89.8	23.6
1898	106.6	a5.1	92.0	20.7
1899	111.3	a9.1	95.1	16.7
1900	115.7	a12.5	106.1	4.6
1901	115.2	a12.2	110.9	.1
1902	114.2	a11.4	112.2	a1.1
1903	112.6	a10.1	113.0	a1.8
1904	110.0	a8.0	111.7	a.6
1905	109.1	a7.2	109.1	1.7
1906	101.2	.....	111.0	.....

Calendar year.	Miscellaneous.		All commodities.	
	Relative price.	Per cent of increase in 1906 over each preceding year.	Relative price.	Per cent of increase in 1906 over each preceding year.
1890	110.3	9.8	112.9	8.4
1891	109.4	10.7	111.7	9.6
1892	106.2	14.0	106.1	15.4
1893	105.9	14.4	105.6	15.9
1894	99.8	21.3	96.1	27.4
1895	94.5	28.1	93.6	30.8
1896	91.4	32.5	90.4	35.4
1897	92.1	31.5	89.7	36.5
1898	92.4	31.1	93.4	31.0
1899	97.7	24.0	101.7	20.4
1900	109.8	10.3	110.5	10.8
1901	107.4	12.8	108.5	12.8
1902	114.1	6.1	112.9	8.4
1903	113.6	6.6	113.6	7.7
1904	111.7	8.4	113.0	8.3
1905	112.8	7.4	115.9	5.6
1906	121.1	.....	122.4	.....

a Decrease.

NOTE.—From reports of the Bureau of Labor, Department of Commerce and Labor. The group farm products includes 16 commodities; food, etc., 53; cloths and clothing, 75; fuel and lighting, 13; metals and implements, 38; lumber and building material, 27; drugs and chemicals, 9; house furnishing goods, 14; and the miscellaneous group, 13. Average price for 1890–1899=100.

I also submit Dun's tables showing the variations in prices in the United States.

It should be kept clearly in mind that the federal census is, to a very appreciable degree, influenced by the manufacturing industries of the country favorably to themselves, and this dif-

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

ference is demonstrated by Dun's tables, which show the increase of prices to be much larger in the United States than as shown by Census Abstract Tables 202 and 203:

Leading classes of necessary articles of daily consumption—Prices, at primary markets, from July 1, 1860, to May 1, 1907.

[Index number, from Dun's Review.]

Date.	Breadstuffs.	Meats.	Dairy and garden.	Other food.	Clothing.	Metals.	Miscellaneous.	Total.
July 1—	*Dolls.*	*Dolls.*	*Dolls.*	*Dolls.*	*Dolls.*	*Dolls.*	*Dolls.*	*Dolls.*
1860	20.530	8.973	12.662	8.894	22.439	25.851	15.842	115.101
1861	15.749	7.485	10.813	7.653	21.147	22.500	16.573	101.920
1862	18.057	7.150	13.406	10.987	28.413	23.207	17.290	118.510
1863	26.154	10.115	13.530	16.359	45.679	37.079	24.264	173.180
1864	45.616	15.685	26.053	27.303	73.485	59.192	31.653	278.987
1865	25.404	16.112	18.049	21.057	49.307	38.956	25.551	194.436
1866	31.471	17.153	23.472	20.821	45.377	41.762	27.922	207.978
1867	36.537	14.278	18.418	20.167	38.169	35.426	25.529	188.524
1868	38.416	13.216	23.614	19.720	35.694	27.385	24.786	182.825
1869	29.116	13.181	18.121	16.347	35.309	28.355	24.201	164.630
1870	25.322	14.161	16.112	13.308	31.480	26.612	21.786	148.781
1871	24.809	12.177	20.799	13.823	30.624	27.371	21.907	151.510
1872	22.171	11.055	16.019	14.845	32.427	32.643	21.319	150.479
1873	20.460	10.114	15.629	13.625	29.411	32.298	21.355	143.089
1874	25.657	11.560	19.142	13.678	27.260	25.254	19.582	143.133
1875	24.848	13.287	14.918	14.418	25.318	23.515	18.398	134.702
1876	18.777	10.726	15.912	12.914	21.747	20.452	15.951	116.479
1877	21.812	10.036	11.790	13.321	21.850	15.578	15.160	109.547
1878	15.672	8.181	10.608	11.346	19.836	15.789	14.836	96.268
1879	17.054	8.239	10.253	9.884	20.420	15.149	16.286	97.285
1880	17.461	9.230	12.594	11.539	21.984	18.708	17.139	108.655
1881	20.369	11.381	11.311	11.663	20.982	19.295	16.900	111.901
1882	25.494	13.740	14.685	11.627	21.202	19.832	16.650	123.230
1883	19.018	11.210	12.250	10.726	20.209	18.071	15.764	107.248
1884	17.871	11.172	11.369	9.323	19.014	16.272	14.685	99.706
1885	16.370	9.205	10.872	8.712	17.740	14.132	13.666	90.697
1886	15.311	8.906	10.241	8.570	18.063	14.466	13.669	89.226
1887	15.156	8.667	11.188	9.252	18.174	16.035	15.153	93.624
1888	16.984	9.416	11.849	9.917	17.447	15.366	14.155	95.134
1889	14.351	8.244	9.695	10.912	17.107	14.782	14.600	89.691
1890	14.867	8.036	10.711	9.749	17.264	15.506	15.416	91.549
1891	19.782	9.217	12.455	9.339	16.501	15.107	13.691	96.092
1892	17.426	8.700	10.403	8.733	15.648	14.827	14.252	90.105
1893	14.963	10.135	11.710	9.188	15.871	14.030	14.716	90.613
1894	15.115	9.389	10.394	8.478	13.860	12.015	14.041	83.292
1895	14.765	8.622	9.874	8.689	15.315	11.021	13.233	81.519
1896	10.504	7.058	7.872	8.529	13.602	13.232	13.520	74.317
1897—January 1	11.729	7.327	10.456	8.170	12.407	13.014	12.399	75.502
July (low)	10.587	7.529	8.714	7.887	13.808	11.642	12.288	72.455
1898—January 1	13.511	7.336	12.371	8.312	14.654	11.572	12.184	79.940
July 1	12.783	7.694	9.437	8.826	14.663	11.843	12.822	77.768
1899—January 1	13.816	7.520	11.458	9.096	14.150	11.843	12.540	80.423
July 1	13.483	7.988	10.974	9.157	15.021	15.635	12.969	85.227
1900—January 1	13.254	7.258	13.702	9.200	17.484	18.085	16.312	95.295
July 1	14.898	8.906	10.901	9.482	16.324	14.834	16.070	91.415
1901—January 1	14.486	8.407	15.556	9.504	16.024	15.810	15.881	95.668
July 1	14.904	9.430	11.030	9.086	15.098	15.344	16.617	91.509
1902—January 1	20.002	9.670	15.248	8.952	15.547	15.375	16.793	101.587
July 1	20.534	11.628	12.557	8.748	15.533	16.084	16.826	101.910
1903—January 1	17.104	9.522	14.613	9.418	15.938	17.185	16.578	100.356
July 1	17.473	9.269	13.083	9.186	17.136	16.544	16.765	99.456
1904—January 1	17.102	8.138	15.287	9.653	17.316	15.887	16.759	100.142
July 1	18.244	9.033	10.648	10.406	16.514	15.428	16.919	97.192
1905—January 1	18.278	7.950	13.948	10.699	16.319	16.188	16.936	100.318
July 1	18.831	8.614	9.982	9.922	17.986	15.916	17.061	98.312
1906—January 1	16.554	8.426	14.399	9.822	19.313	17.141	18.809	104.464
July 1	17.923	9.677	12.590	9.645	19.177	16.649	19.555	105.216
1907—January 1	16.079	9.350	14.965	9.760	19.637	18.087	19.386	107.264
May 1	18.165	9.641	14.461	9.824	20.098	17.524	19.242	108.955

NOTE.—In the above table the course of prices of commodities is shown, and in each case the price is multiplied by the annual per capita consumption, which precludes any one commodity having more than its proper weight in the aggregate. Breadstuffs include many quotations of wheat, corn, oats, rye, barley, beans, and pease; meats include live hogs, beef, sheep, and many provisions, lard, tallow, etc.; dairy and garden products embrace eggs, vegetables, fruits, milk, butter, cheese, etc.; other food includes fish, liquors, condiments, sugar, rice, tobacco, etc.; clothing covers the raw material of each industry, and many quotations of woolen, cotton, silk, and rubber goods, as well as hides, leather, boots, and shoes; metals include various quotations of pig iron and partially manufactured and finished products, as well as the minor metals, tin, lead, copper, etc., and coal and petroleum; miscellaneous includes many grades of hard and soft lumber, laths, brick, lime, glass, turpentine, hemp, linseed oil, paints, fertilizers, and drugs. The third decimal is given for accuracy of comparison.

There thus appears by Dun's more accurate tables an increase from 1896 to May 1, 1907, of 46.7 per cent on total average of prices of 1896, and on clothing the increase from January 1, 1897, to May 1, 1907, was 69 per cent, and on miscellaneous articles was 55 per cent.

The two tables from our own census contain overwhelming evidence of the injurious results of the Dingley bill upon labor; it shows, for example, Mr. President, that prices have been increased on raw commodities 25.9 per cent over the average prices from 1890 to 1900, and 49.9 per cent over the prices of raw commodities under the Wilson bill.

Our prices were already in 1906 much higher than in Europe, so that these increases are the more striking.

Mr. President, do not the manufacturing classes themselves see that such an enormous raise in prices of raw commodities is injurious both to their domestic and foreign trade? Do they not see it necessarily limits the consumption of the people, whose little salaries are fixed, whose little pension can not be increased in dollars and cents, whose purchasing power is limited to a fixed wage, a wage not exceeding, among the manufacturing laboring classes, $160 per annum per capita?

The obvious result is to restrict consumption of goods, limit the output of goods, lower the factory output, and limit the demand for labor.

Mr. President, in like manner the increase of manufactured commodities in price, including a group of 208 articles, has been 35 per cent since the lower prices under the Wilson bill and an increase of 36.5 per cent upon all commodities above the more reasonable prices under the Wilson bill.

What corresponding increase of wages has labor received? Their wages are relatively less than they were ten years ago, both in relation to the output of labor and in relation to the purchasing power of the wage received; and the demand for labor has been necessarily diminished by preventing the consumption of manufactured and other commodities, because of prices which could not be paid out of the limited number of dollars the ordinary American has received. Such a policy is injurious to the manufacturer, to the wage-earner, to the common citizen consumer, to the business men of the entire Nation, and to our national growth and development.

And differentiating these increases of prices, it will be seen by Table 203 that the prices of 1906 for food are 34 per cent higher than they were in 1896 under the Wilson bill; the cloths and clothing have increased 31.4 per cent above the prices of 1896 under the Wilson bill; that fuel and lighting have increased 40 per cent since 1894 under the Wilson bill; that metals and metal implements have increased 56 per cent above the prices under the Wilson bill; that lumber and building material have increased 55 per cent over the prices under the Wilson bill; that house furnishings have increased 23.6 per cent above the lower prices of the Wilson bill; and miscellaneous articles of various kinds have increased 32.5 per cent above the more reasonable prices of the Wilson bill. Are the American people utterly oblivious to these striking and conclusive facts?

It is perfectly obvious from Sauerbeck tables of the prices of the world and from Dun's table of American (United States) prices that American (United States) prices have increased far beyond European prices since the low price of 1896, notwithstanding American (United States) prices were then much higher than they were in Europe. It therefore follows, beyond question, that the purchasing power of American wages, even of the starvation wages paid in the cotton and woolen mills, has been lowered in such a way as to greatly harm the American workmen, even in protected industries, and has harmed equally the entire American people, workmen, consumers generally, and even the manufacturers, who are severely taxing each other by high prices—the finished product of the one being the raw material of the other. The only people who have a net profit are those who own and control the successful monopolies.

Is the Finance Committee so committed to the demands of the representatives of organized greed in this country that they will refuse to deal justly by the American people?

Or do they believe that by making the rich richer and the poor poorer they will receive adequate political benefit at the hands of those whom they enrich?

I know, Mr. President, that it has been easy to finance Republican campaigns, and I know many good men have not stopped to think that this money was extorted from the misery and sweat of helpless men, women, and children.

Members of the Senate do not often visit the sweat shops; nor do they often see the sorrow and distress of the individuals who compose the weaker elements of our great Nation. I remind them that 500,000 die annually by our neglect, as shown by the comparison between the death rate of New Zealand and Australia, where better laws prevail, where the maxim of the law is "Better reduce want than increase wealth."

Mr. President, I feel charged with a solemn duty to make a record before the Senate of these conditions, and I deem it a great opportunity to have the privilege of submitting a prayer to the leaders of the Senate that they do not be unmindful or inconsiderate of the need and the rights of the inarticulate mass, and that they do not lend too complacent attention to the trained advocates of unsatisfied greed.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Senator Orville H. Platt, the late distinguished Senator from Connecticut, once said, in substance, in commenting on the faults of the American legislator, that "The American legislator should not be charged with incompetency. As a rule, he is fairly well qualified; neither can he be justly charged with dishonesty. There are a few who may be dishonest, perhaps, but they do not exercise any control of legislation. The fault of the American legislator is 'good-fellowship' and doing for a friend what under no other circumstances would the legislator for a moment consider. For that reason," said he, "I deem it the highest legislative virtue to be cross and crabbed to all the world, especially in the last ten days of the session."

It will be thus seen that, from Sauerbeck's tables, the increase of the world prices has been much lower than the increases of prices in the United States, and that this difference must be accounted for in some reasonable manner.

The most natural way in which to account for it is to show that the prices in the United States are artificially controlled by monopoly.

And this average high increase must be interpreted in the light of a great offset of the lowering of prices of all products produced by the American people of which monopoly controls the price. For example, crude oil is produced by Oklahoma in vast quantities—approximately 50,000,000 barrels per annum—which sells for less than 1 cent a gallon, while the refined product retails for over 11 cents a gallon. It costs half a cent a gallon to refine it. The low price is fixed by the Standard on the crude and the high price is fixed by the Standard on the refined. And the increase of all prices is in the face of the vital fact that monopoly fixes an extremely low price on the articles produced by the people of which the monopoly controls the price. *The average high price would be far higher except for the very low price* fixed by monopoly on its purchases, as on crude oil. This is not only true with regard to oil, but also is true with regard to cattle, hogs, sheep, hides, wool, various minerals, tobacco, and so forth. That this low price of articles bought by monopoly prevented the general average from reaching the high point which they would otherwise reach in the statistical tables is a factor of great importance.

Without regard to statistics, everybody knows that the prices are now very much higher than they have ever been.

The schedules of this bill are approximately 50 per cent on the value of proposed imports, and this is proof that the prices in the United States are 50 per cent higher than they are in Europe and abroad on the articles of these schedules by the open confession of the managers of this bill, and I therefore do not need to furnish further proof of this matter as the schedules confess that the prices in this country are approximately 50 per cent higher than they are abroad on articles affected by the present tariff law.

Mr. President, it is of great importance to observe these differences between our present prices and the increase of our present prices as compared with the increase of the prices of the world, because it thus enables us to determine to what extent local conditions have raised our prices above the level of the prices of the world.

WORLD PRICES AND PRICES IN THE UNITED STATES—RISE IN PRICES IN THE UNITED STATES NOT DUE TO INCREASE IN PER CAPITA CIRCULATION.

At first thought it might occur to some one that the higher prices in the United States were due to the larger per capita circulation, but this conclusion is impossible because, while our per capita circulation December 31, 1906 (Statistical Abstract, 1907, Table 269), was $33.99 per capita, France had a per capita of $40.88 and Germany $25.03 and the British Empire $28.12, with no substantial differences in competitive prices at London, thus exhibiting the interesting fact that this enormous increase of prices in the United States, and the fact that United States prices are much higher than the level of world prices, is not due to our increased circulating medium, but is due to the monopolies in this country which have for commercial purposes raised these prices in America far above the prices in the markets of the world.

That these high prices are not necessary for the maintenance of a reasonable profit is shown by the table of lower prices at which these same American goods are sold abroad by the protected monopolies in this country.

A few of these prices are submitted to prove that the prices in the United States under monopoly will average 50 per cent higher than in the markets of the world.

As evidence of this I submit a table from James G. Parsons showing the differences in discounts between export and home prices.

TABLE I.—*Showing differences in discounts between export and home prices.*

[By James G. Parsons, Senate Document No. 54, Sixty-first Congress, first session.]

Articles and description.	Export discount from list.	Home discount from list.	Per cent difference.
	Per cent.	*Per cent.*	
Auger bits:			
Irwin's solid center	60, 10, and 10	50 and 10	39
Snell's	70	60	33⅓
Snell's "King"	60 and 10	50	39
Auger handles, Gunn's No. 5, adjustable and ratchet	35	15 and 10	18
Bells, Texas cow	50 and 10	50	11
Bird cages, Hendryx's brass	50	30	40
Bolt clippers, "New Easy"	60, 10, and 5	50, 10, and 10	18
Bolts:			
Carriage, ⅜ by 6 inches and smaller	80 and 10	75 and 10	25
Machine, ⅜ by 4 inches and smaller	80 and 10	75, 10, and 5	19
Tire	80, 10, and 5	80	17
Borers, bunghole, Enterprise	40 and 2	25	27
Braces:			
Fray's genuine "Spoffords"	70	60	33⅓
Fray's ratchet, Nos. 81–161	60 and 10	50	39
Fray's ratchet, Nos. 83–143	60 and 10	50	39
Fray's ratchet, Nos. 62–142	70	50	66⅔
Fray's ratchet, Nos. 66–166	60 and 10	50	39
Fray's sleeve, Nos. 207–214	60, 10, and 10	50	54
Fray's sleeve, Nos. 407–414	60 and 10	50	39
Fray's sleeve, Nos. 606–614	60 and 10	50	39
Fray's plain, Nos. 306–314	70	50	66⅔
Can openers, "King"	25	0	33⅓
Cartridges, rim fire	60, 10, 10, and 6	50	64
Chains, kennel	60 and 10	60	11
Coffee mills, Enterprise	40 and 10	20 and 25	11
Door rollers and hangers, Lane's	60, 10, 10, and 5	60 and 10	17
Gauges, Disston's steel and center	45	25, 7½, and 10	12
Harness snaps:			
Covert's "Trojan"	50 and 10	40	33⅓
Covert's "Yankee"	50	30 and 2	37
Covert's "Derby"	40 and 10	25	39
Lawn sprinklers, Enterprise	40 and 2	30	19
Levels, Starrett's bench and pocket	40 and 5	33⅓ and 5	11
Oilstones, "Lily White" and "Washita" No. 1	50	33⅓	33⅓
Plumbs, levels, etc., Disston's	70, 10, 10, 10, and 5	60 and 10	72
Sausage stuffers, Enterprise	40 and 2	25 and 7½	18
Saws:			
Disston's Nos. 7, 107, 107½, 3, and 1	45 and 7½	30 and 7½	27
Disston's combination	45 and 7½	30 and 7½	27
Disston's Nos. 12, 16, D8, 120, 76, 8	40 and 10	25 and 7½	28
Disston's compass and keyhole	40 and 10	25 and 7½	28
Disston's butcher	50	30	40
Disston's framed wood	50	25	50
Disston's band	70, 10, and 10	60	65
Scroll saws, Barnes's velocipede	30	20	14
Screw-drivers, Disston's electric	70, 10, 10, and 10	70	37
Smoked beef shavers, Enterprise	40 and 10	25 and 7½	28
Squares:			
Disston's try, rosewood handle	70, 10, 10, 10, and 5	60 and 10	72
Disston's steel	45	25, 7½, and 10	13
Traps, Lovell's rat and mouse	50	33⅓	33⅓
Trowels, Disston's brick	45 and 7½	25	47
Vises:			
Armstrong's plain and hinged	80 and 10	60	122
Armstrong's pipe	60	50	25
Bonney's	50	30 and 10	26

TABLE II.—*Showing difference between export and home prices of certain specified articles.*

Articles and description.	Export price.	Home price.	Difference.
			P. ct.
Auger bits:			
Irwin's solid center, 4-16 ... per doz.	$1.30	$1.80	39
Irwin's solid center, 16-16 ... do	2.92	4.05	39
Auger handles, Gunn's No. 5 ... do	9.75	11.48	18
Bird cages, Hendryx's No. 316 ... do	13.00	18.20	40
Bolt clippers, "Easy" and "New Easy," No. 1 ... each	1.71	2.03	18
Bolts:			
Carriage, ⅜ by 6 inches ... per 100	.60	.75	25
Machine, ⅜ by 4 inches ... do	.57	.68	19
Tire, ⅜ by 6 inches ... do	.65	.76	17
Braces:			
Fray's genuine "Spofford," No. 107 ... per doz.	6.30	8.40	33⅓
Fray's ratchet, No. 81 ... do	10.44	14.50	39
Fray's ratchet, No. 62 ... do	6.90	11.50	66⅔
Fray's sleeve, No. 207 ... do	7.13	11.00	54
Fray's sleeve, No. 606 ... do	7.56	10.50	39
Fray's plain, No. 306 ... do	3.60	6.00	66⅔
Bunghole borers, Enterprise, No. 1 ... do	.74	.94	27
Can openers, "King" ... per gross	4.50	6.00	33⅓
Coffee mills, Enterprise, No. 1 ... each	1.22	1.35	11
Files, Nicholson's:			
Mill and round bastard, 3 to 4 inch ... per doz.	.40	.64	60
Mill and round bastard 5-inch ... do	.48	.68	45
Mill and round bastard, 6-inch ... do	.59	.75	27
Flat bastard, 3 to 4 inch ... do	.40	.79	98
Flat bastard, 5-inch ... do	.48	.83	73
Flat bastard, 6-inch ... do	.59	.92	56
Flat bastard, 7-inch ... do	.75	1.03	37
Flat bastard, 8-inch ... do	.88	1.13	28
Flat bastard, 9-inch ... do	1.01	1.35	34

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

TABLE II.—*Showing difference between export and home prices of certain specified articles*—Continued.

Articles and description.	Export price.	Home price.	Difference.
			P. ct.
Files, Nicholson's—Continued.			
Flat bastard, 11-inch.....per doz..	$1.51	$1.84	22
Flat bastard, 13-inch.....do....	2.11	2.52	19
Square bastard, 3 to 4 inch.....do....	.40	.81	102
Square bastard, 5-inch.....do....	.48	.88	83
Square bastard, 6-inch.....do....	.59	.98	66
Square bastard, 7-inch.....do....	.75	1.09	45
Square bastard, 8-inch.....do....	.88	1.18	34
Square bastard, 9-inch.....do....	1.01	1.41	40
Square bastard, 10-inch.....do....	1.26	1.58	25
Square bastard, 11-inch.....do....	1.51	1.94	29
Square bastard, 12-inch.....do....	1.82	2.18	20
Square bastard, 13-inch.....do....	2.11	2.67	27
Gauges:			
Disston's combined steel.....each..	.55	.62	12
Disston's center.....do....	.17	.19	12
Harness snaps:			
"Trojan," 1¼ loop.....per gross..	2.70	3.60	33⅓
"Yankee," 1⅛ loop.....do....	2.90	3.98	37
"Derby," No. 733.....do....	2.70	3.75	39
Lamp chimneys:			
Macbeth's No. 502.....per doz..	.40	.68	70
Macbeth's No. 504.....do....	.50	.82	64
Lawn sprinklers, Enterprise, No. 2.....each..	1.76	2.10	19
Levels, Starrett's 24-inch bench.....do....	1.28	1.42	11
Plumbs and levels, Disston, No. 12.....per doz..	5.82	10.08	72
Pocketknife and tool kit, Ulery's.....per set..	1.15	1.50	30
Rifles:			
Stevens's "Little Scout," No. 14.....each..	1.35	1.75	30
Stevens's "Maynard Jr.," No. 14.....do....	1.80	2.20	22
Stevens's No. 16.....do....	2.00	2.60	30
Stevens's "Little Krag," No. 65.....do....	2.50	3.00	20
Stevens's "Favorite".....do....	3.47	4.50	30
Sausage stuffers, Enterprise, No. 5.....do....	2.20	2.61	18
Saws:			
Disston's hand, 30-inch, No. 7.....per doz..	13.74	17.48	27
Disston's hand, 30-inch, No. 16.....do....	15.39	19.98	28
Disston's combination, No. 43.....do....	15.23	19.42	27
Disston's butcher, 24-inch, No. 7.....do....	8.50	11.90	40
Disston's framed wood, No. 60.....do....	6.00	9.00	50
Disston's band, 2-inch, 18-gauge.....per foot..	.157	.26	65
Barnes's combined scroll and circular.....each..	28.00	32.00	14
Screws, flat-head iron wood:			
Size, ¼ inch, Nos. 1 to 4.....per gross..	.034	.073	115
Size, ⅜ inch, Nos. 1 to 4.....do....	.034	.073	115
Size, ½ inch, Nos. 1 to 3.....do....	.034	.073	115
Size, ⅝ inch, No. 4.....do....	.038	.076	100
Size, ¾ inch, No. 4.....do....	.04	.079	97½
Screws, flat-head brass wood:			
Size, ¼ inch, No. 1.....do....	.072	.136	89
Size, ⅜ inch, No. 6.....do....	.084	.195	132
Size, ½ inch, No. 6.....do....	.084	.211	151
Size, ⅝ inch, No. 6.....do....	.096	.227	136
Size, ¾ inch, No. 6.....do....	.108	.251	132
Screws, round-head iron wood:			
Size, ¼ inch, No. 1.....do....	.034	.087	156
Size, 1 inch, No. 6.....do....	.06	.112	87
Size, 1½ inches, No. 10.....do....	.10	.17	70
Size, 2 inches, No. 16.....do....	.228	.378	66
Size, 3 inches, No. 18.....do....	.412	.67	63
Screws, round-head brass wood:			
Size, ¼ inch, No. 1.....do....	.072	.168	133
Size, 1 inch, No. 6.....do....	.16	.329	106
Size, 1½ inches, No. 10.....do....	.336	.776	131
Size, 2 inches, No. 16.....do....	.768	1.955	155
Size 3 inches, No. 18.....do....	1.24	3.646	194
Screw-drivers, Disston's electric, 12-inch.....per doz..	1.36	1.86	37
Shoe dressing:			
Whittemore's "Gilt Edge".....do....	1.20	1.75	46
Whittemore's "Baby Elite".....do....	.60	.67	12
Shotguns:			
Stevens' No. 105.....each..	2.80	4.25	52
Stevens' No. 107.....do....	3.00	4.50	50
Stevens' No. 225.....do....	8.67	9.75	12
Smoked-beef shavers, Enterprise, No. 23.....do....	4.32	5.55	28
Squares:			
Disston's try, rosewood, 10-inch, No. 1.....per doz..	1.66	2.88	72
Disston's steel, 4-inch.....each..	1.10	1.46	13
Traps, Lovell's mouse and rat, metallic.....per gross..	5.50	7.33	33⅓
Trowels, Disston's brick, 8-inch, No. 1.....per doz..	4.07	6.00	47
Vises:			
Armstrong's hinged, No. 1.....each..	1.80	4.00	122
Armstrong's combination, with leg sockets.....do....	6.40	8.00	25
Bonney's No. 112.....per doz..	2.25	2.84	26
Watches:			
Elgin movement, 20-year gold-filled case.....each..	7.98	10.23	28
Elgin movement, silveroid case.....do....	3.04	4.47	47
Wrenches, Hawkeye "5 in 1".....per doz....	3.60	4.50	25

(Senate Document No. 54, Sixty-first Congress, first session.)

It is thus seen that our own manufacturers, to obtain the protection from foreign competition, not only do not give American consumers the low prices they are entitled to, but they give all the benefit to foreigners. These tables demonstrate that the pretense of high tariff to protect themselves against the cheap labor of Europe is false; that our manufacturers can compete and do compete in the open markets of the world, and that they actually do give to foreigners the benefits they deny to Americans, of whose patriotic self-sacrifice they take wrongful advantage.

Protection's favors to foreigners is strongly set forth in Senate Document No. 54, Sixty-first Congress, first session, prepared by James G. Parsons, and submitted by me to the Senate, and to which I refer for the most abounding evidence for the truth of my contention—that this bill and its immediate predecessors, the Dingley bill and the McKinley bill, were written under the color of serving the American laborer, when, in point of fact, it has done nothing of the kind, but, on the contrary, favors the foreigner at the expense of the American.

The defense of this indecent practice has been abundantly answered in Document 54, and I shall not take the time to further comment upon it.

A similar table, showing that our prices are 50 per cent higher than world prices, is submitted (Exhibit 12), prepared by Byron W. Holt, of New York.

Our great agricultural products have their prices fixed by the markets of the world, except where freight prevents.

The price of corn per bushel was 55 cents in 1892 and 53 cents in 1906, and wheat was 93 cents in 1891 and 82 cents in 1906, and exported cattle in 1891, $81.25, and $93.17 in 1906 under improved methods of feeding and transportation, while cotton was 10 cents in 1890 and 11 cents in 1906.

We have a right to expect cheapening of manufactured products because of the constant increasing improvements in machinery—and in this we are disappointed—and a rise in the price of agricultural products produced from an area necessarily limited, and in this we are not gratified.

The prohibitive tariff has increased the cost of living of the workman and of every other person in the United States, and, therefore, *has diminished the purchasing power of the wages received.*

I have submitted Table No. 202, Abstract of Census, 1907, page 577, which shows that raw commodities have increased since the Dingley bill went into effect 49.9 per cent, manufacturers' commodities have increased 32.3 per cent up to 1906, and all commodities have increased 35.4 per cent up to 1906, and still higher in 1909.

Mr. President, I now submit Tables 197 and 206, which show in detail the increase of price of food products, showing lard to have increased, since 1896, 38 per cent, corn meal 29 per cent, fresh pork 41 per cent, salt pork 55 per cent (Statistical Abstract of Census, 1907), and similar increases in other things required by the consumer.

LABOR IS HARMED BY THESE HIGH PRICES.

Mr. President, it is obvious that the laboring man who receives a fixed wage, or the laboring woman who receives a given number of dollars, whether in the factory, on the farm, in the mine, in the forest, or in domestic service, by an increase of 34 per cent in the price of all articles to be bought with wages received will be required to pay $134 to buy the same amount of goods which cost $100 in 1896 under the Wilson bill.

This means the equivalent of a flat loss of 25 per cent of the narrow wages received by the working people, and shows that the results of this tariff have been seriously injurious to the working people, because of these artificial prices.

HIGH PRICES INJURIOUS TO SALARIED PEOPLE.

Under these high prices it would take, in 1906, $1,354 to buy as much as $1,000 bought in 1896; in other words, a salaried man who received a salary of $1,354 in 1896 could save out of it $354, but to buy the same things in 1906 would take his entire salary of $1,354, and leave him nothing saved.

The effect of these high prices on the salaried man is to diminish the purchasing power of his salary 25 per cent.

This is the probable reason why Congress raised the salaries of Members of Congress and of Senators 50 per cent; it was to keep the Senators and Members of Congress from suffering the injury which the Dingley bill inflicted on the balance of the country.

HIGH PRICES ARE INJURIOUS TO THE MANUFACTURERS.

High prices on raw material (and one manufacturer's raw material is the finished product of another manufacturer) has the effect of making it more difficult for American manufacturers to compete in the markets of the world, because their first cost on this very account is heavier than would be the case with their foreign competitors.

Our manufacturers do compete, however, on a considerable scale, because of the greater efficiency of the American workman and of American invention and improved processes, and because of rebates in *foreign material* bought and reshipped in manufactures.

In this way a market is afforded foreign material and denied our own materials unless they compete with foreign material at world prices.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

But if the manufacturers could obtain a uniform cost of material 35 per cent less than it is now our commerce would be greatly multiplied, the activity of our factories wonderfully stimulated, all of America's laboring elements would be employed, and the productive energies of the Nation brought to the highest degree of activity and efficiency.

If lower prices should prevail, we would avoid the evil of underconsumption and need have no fear of overproduction.

The percentage of weekly earnings, retail prices, and the weekly earnings as measured by retail prices is shown by the Bureau of Labor bulletin, July, 1905:

	Weekly earnings per employee.	Retail prices.	Weekly earnings as measured by retail prices.
	Per cent.	*Per cent.*	*Per cent.*
1890	101.0	102.4	98.6
1891	100.8	103.8	97.1
1892	101.3	101.9	99.4
1893	101.2	104.4	96.9
1894	97.7	99.7	98.0
1895	98.4	97.8	100.6
1896	99.5	95.5	104.2
1897	99.2	96.3	103.0
1898	99.9	98.7	101.2
1899	101.2	99.5	101.7
1900	104.1	101.1	103.0
1901	105.9	105.2	100.7
1902	109.2	110.9	98.5
1903	112.3	110.3	101.8
1904	112.2	111.7	100.4

100 equals the standard prices averaged between 1890–1900.

It will be observed that even by these tables, coming from sources interested in putting the best face on the matter, the weekly earnings bought no more in 1904 than they did between 1890 and 1900, while they rose in 1896 to 104.2 from 96.9 in 1894, showing an increased purchasing power of over 7 per cent following the passage of the Wilson—lower tariff—Act.

Mr. President, the tables prepared by Edward Atkinson, of Boston (Exhibit 2), showing the relative number of persons who could be affected by a tariff as far as their wages are concerned in the so-called "protected or partially protected industries," should not be forgotten. It will be shown by these tables that 10,381,765 persons are farmers, planters, overseers, agricultural laborers, gardeners, florists, nurserymen, dairy men and women, and other agricultural pursuits; lumbermen and raftsmen, stock raisers, herders and drovers, turpentine farmers and laborers, and wood choppers, to which must be added all persons in professional service, 1,258,739; all persons in domestic and personal service, 5,580,657; and all persons in trade and transportation, 4,766,964; making a total of 21,788,125; and estimating those who are engaged in other services which could not be regarded as in any degree open to competition, it is found that out of a total of 29,074,117 there could not be exceeding 600,000 persons occupied in arts which would require a protective duty. This table is very carefully drawn and is convincing to a sincere and disinterested student. It therefore appears that very little over 2 per cent of the American people are employed in such a way as to really require any measure of so-called "protection," while 100 per cent of our people are taxed about 50 per cent on an average on all dutiable goods, to their very great injury, and without even benefiting the 2 per cent who are employees, mostly of foreign birth or parentage, in the so-called "protected industries," while nearly all of such industries are owned by monopolies who give their foreign employees the lowest wages in America and keep millions for themselves.

MONOPOLY.

This bill ought not to pass, because similar bills heretofore have established, and this bill will continue to maintain, monopoly, labor's chief oppressor, and will be followed by high prices, low wages, greater mortality to labor, increased crime, and extravagant and corrupt standards.

Mr. President, no man familiar with history of his country will seriously question that when the tariff has its schedules so high as to prevent competition from abroad it must engender monopoly at home.

The first step of triumphant monopoly is to cut off foreign competition; the next step is easily effected by any of a variety of successful expedients.

First. By the policy of placing a control of the stock of competing companies in the hands of a trustee for the purpose of preventing competition. This was nothing more nor less than a conspiracy in restraint of trade. The courts in due time pronounced the so-called "trust" an unlawful combination. The reason why it was unlawful was because it violated the common law of the English-speaking people. *It violated the common law, which holds as void any contract in restraint of trade.* The common law of our States holds a man is entitled to buy at a price fixed in a free competitive market, and that any restraint of trade denying the citizen this common-law right is a fraud upon him. *The present tariff law and the proposed law is conspicuously guilty of this sin,* although its error has not yet been declared by the courts. A test case should be brought.

Indeed it is a form of robbery under the color of law and carried on under the safeguards of organized society; *it is a fraud to impose a prohibitive tax under the pretense of raising revenue, but in reality to protect monopoly.* It is a species of immoral conspiracy which ought not to be endured by any nation of intelligent and liberty-loving men.

The contracts putting the control of the stock of competing companies in the hands of a "trustee," being the first form in which organized monopoly became conspicuously bad, has led to the term "trust" being loosely and incorrectly used to describe any monopoly.

Second. Another expedient by which monopoly was established was "a gentleman's agreement," by which prices were fixed by verbal agreement and not by contract. This was nothing more nor less than a verbal conspiracy, and was no less a fraud and unlawful than if the verbal agreement had been a legal contract in writing. The only difference between the two was the greater difficulty of detection of the combination.

The gentleman's agreement usually proved inefficient, because men engaged in this character of fraud could not trust each other.

Third. Another form by which the American people have been defrauded by monopoly is where a giant corporation, like the Standard Oil Company, sets a fixed price on crude oil and a price on the refined products, and because of its power intimidates the independent refiner and compels the refiner through fear of destruction, in the crafty ways so fully described by Ida Tarbell in the history of Standard Oil, to recognize and maintain the prices so fixed. In this way the Standard Oil Company, through its subsidiary companies, sets the price of crude oil in Oklahoma of the best quality at 41 cents a barrel. No refiner wishes to violate this rule for fear of the Standard, and no refiner dares to offer to sell refined oil at less than the Standard price for fear of the Standard. It only costs one-half cent a gallon to refine petroleum, and crude oil costs 41 cents a barrel in Oklahoma. The people ought to get very cheap oil, but they do not get it, because the Standard Oil Company overshadows the land and controls the market, both of crude oil and of the refined products.

It is a common practice for the independent refiners to stand on the prices fixed by the Standard, both on crude and refined, for fear that they will be destroyed. The history of the past is strewn with the wreckage of companies who have ventured to cut the prices of the Standard Oil Company.

I think the Congress of the United States ought to impose a rule on interstate corporations using the mails and enjoying public protection that they shall not vary their price to the consumers of the United States, except in so far as the difference in freight justifies. In this way the Standard Oil Company could not put the price of refined below cost locally for the purpose of running out an independent competitor in a local field while the Standard at the same time raises the price in another field, with which to make the consumer pay the cost of this illegitimate warfare on a competitor. If the Standard were compelled to give the same price plus freight in all parts of the United States to the consumer, the Standard could not in that event afford to lower its local price for the purpose of killing off a petty competitor. And I appeal to the leaders of the Republican party in the Senate of the United States to bring in an amendment to this bill providing this remedy.

I am sure the chairman of the Committee on Finance will appreciate the force of this observation, and if he does not afford the country the relief which I invite him to do he at least shall have no complaint of me that he did not receive a wise and virtuous suggestion from Oklahoma. I assure him that if he will submit the proper amendment he can rely upon the Senators from Oklahoma giving him enthusiastic support in such a policy.

I pause to ask the chairman of the Committee on Finance whether he will bring in or support such an amendment.

I appeal to the leaders of the Republican party in the Senate of the United States to bring in an amendment to the bill providing this simple, effective remedy against monopoly. If we want to establish competition in the United States, if we hope

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

to maintain competition in the United States, we must protect the little competitor and not permit him to be killed off by ingenious processes. Otherwise we might as well recognize now that monopoly is fixed and is to be dealt with as monopoly. If we deal with it as monopoly, then a different process would be available, which I suggest to the Senate of the United States, and that is, conceding monopoly to be established, conceding that we can not control or that we will not control monopoly, I suggest that monopoly, having the power of taxation of the American people without limitations, shall be controlled by being limited in the dividends it may pay upon its invested capital, determined by physical valuation.

Fourth. But another and far more dangerous form of monopoly, skillfully drawn to avoid the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States with regard to contracts in restraint of trade, is the more recent successful plan of merging one corporation with another, such as illustrated in the United States Steel Corporation, by which all competitors of any importance were absorbed. It was organized in 1901, and at that time absorbed a number of gigantic concerns, to wit: Federal Steel, National Tube, American Steel and Wire Company, National Steel, American Tin Plate, American Steel Hook, American Sheet Steel, American Bridge, Shelby Steel Tube, The Carnegie Company, The Lake Superior Consolidated Iron Mines, and acquired interests in numerous other companies, such as the Pittsburg Steamship Company, The Oliver Iron Mining Company, The National Steel Company, including The Sharon Steel Company, The Union Steel Company, The Donora Mining Company, The Republic Coke Company, The River Coal Company, The Sharon Coke Company, The Sharon Ore Company, The Sharon Sheet Steel Company, and a controlling interest in the companies of the Sharon Coal and Limestone Company and the Sharon Tin Plate Company, and directly and indirectly controlling the American Coke Company, The Continental Coke Company, The H. C. Frick Coke Company, The McClure Coke Company, The Southwest Connellsville Coke Company and the United Coal and Coke Company, consolidated under the title of H. C. Frick Coke Company, acquiring also the Clairton Steel Company in May, 1904, The St. Clair Furnace Company. This contract carried with it the stock of the Champion Iron Company, The Clairton Land Company, the St. Clair Terminal Railroad Company, and 51 per cent of the stock of the St. Clair Limestone Company; in April, 1905, the Heckler Coke Company was acquired. On April 15, 1907, by lease United States Steel obtained the control of the Great Northern Railroad Company ore properties through the Great Western Mining Company, a subsidiary company of the United States Steel Corporation, and so forth.

These gigantic mergers of the various companies, by which their competition with each other was effectually destroyed, formed the new company, which issued a total of stocks and bonds of about fourteen hundred millions, a large part of which was "watered," having no physical value corresponding with the face values of the stocks and bonds issued.

In 1907 this gigantic merger company took over the Tennessee Coal, Iron and Railroad Company, which was itself composed of various companies merged together in the same fashion as the United States Steel Corporation, and was its only great competitor; under the control of this great merger company are various water-supply plants, natural-gas properties, pipe lines, ore docks, a multitude of iron mines, and some 25 railroad companies.

By these gigantic mergers competition is effectually controlled under the forms of law, and the resulting giant corporation has such a dominating and masterful position that smaller corporations dare not compete or cut the price or attempt to do so. Competition is thus utterly destroyed.

Moody's Manual for 1907, page 2320, gives over 1,000 companies absorbed or merged by or into other companies for 1907.

The smaller corporations engaged in the same business are indeed of some use to the giant monopoly, because the smaller corporation being in existence and doing business at the same prices fixed by the larger corporation, the greater concern can point to the smaller concern as evidence to the common people that there is active competition in the field. The common people may accept the testimony, but it will be a Barmecide feast when they test the prices.

When the people threaten to remove the monopoly tariff, which shelters monopoly, all of the agents of monopoly join in one mighty chorus in defense of the poor little independent man who will be utterly ruined if the tariff is lowered a particle. But the smaller concern is used as a highwayman might hold up a child to ward off a merited chastisement. It is, however, no chastisement and no injustice whatever to the monopoly to take down the tariff wall that shelters monopoly from reasonable competition, but merely a just action in restoring the competition which never should have been interfered with.

The United States Steel Corporation, I am informed, permits no organized labor in its service. The thoughtlessness of this monopoly of its labor, and its forgetfulness of its moral obligation toward poor human beings engaged in its service has been shown with great force in a recent philanthropic investigation conducted under the Russell Sage Foundation in the "Pittsburg Survey." What these giant monopolies are capable of doing when not restrained by any other consideration than what is called "business" and the pressure for "dividends," "dividends," "dividends," is set forth in great detail in the Journal of Constructive Philanthropy, published by the Charity Organization Society of the City of New York, 105 East Twenty-second street, New York; Robert W. deForest, president; J. P. Morgan, treasurer; Edwin T. Devine, general secretary, 105 East Twenty-second street, New York City, in "Charities and the Commons" in the issues of January, February, and March, 1909.

What a monopoly tariff does for its protected workmen is abundantly set forth in this wonderful report of the unspeakable conditions which have grown up under our system of government, where the beneficiaries of the tariff have forgotten manhood, and have forgotten womanhood, and even childhood in their insane pursuit of wealth and power.

Ida M. Tarbell, a critical and learned student of sociology, has described it in a few words in the American Magazine of May, 1909:

A TARIFF-MADE CITY—WHAT IT DOES FOR ITS WORKMEN.

The city of Pittsburg is the greatest monument in this country to the practice of high protection. For fifty years it has been the stronghold of the doctrine. For fifty years it has reaped, as no other center in the United States, the benefits of prohibitive duties.

The town lies at the heart of a district in which is produced from one-quarter to one-half of all the various kinds of American iron and steel, as well as a goodly proportion of all our tin, plate glass, and machine-shop products. All of these articles have for years had the American market practically to themselves. All of these articles have for years been exported and sold at less prices than the American consumer can buy them. All these industries have produced enormous fortunes. So many, so conspicuous are they, that a recognized American type in Europe and the United States is the "Pittsburg millionaire." Now, it is certain the tariff produced the Pittsburg millionaire, but that was not what the tariff was fixed for by the Congress of the United States. The tariff was laid to protect and help the Pittsburg workman. According to the protectionist argument, Pittsburg, as the bulwark and center of protected industries, should produce the happiest, most prosperous, and best conditioned workmen in the United States. How is it?

There has just been published in *Charities and The Commons* (now *The Survey*) one of the most significant pieces of investigation the country has seen. It is the result of a year or more of work on the part of a band of trained investigators commissioned by the Charities Publication committee. It gives a blueprint of Pittsburg—the place itself, the people, and their work. What does this blueprint show of the workingman under protection?

It shows him working *twelve* hours a day for SEVEN days in the week, and once in two weeks filling a "long turn," or a twenty-four-hour shift. It is not simply the exceptional man who overworks in this cruel fashion. The twelve-hour day is the extreme of an "altogether incredible amount of overwork by everybody," so the Survey declares. Can you make a man by these hours? Is it any wonder that those who lived and walked among these men preparing this Survey report their saying: "Too tired to read—too tired to think. I work and eat and sleep." Any wonder that they report the God-fearing women crying out for the old country: "We might not have been able to live so well there; but, oh, man, we could have brought up the children in the fear o' God and in a land where men reverence the Sabbath." Any wonder that those men who have not the restraining influence of a family drown fatigue at night in saloons and brothels?

And what do they earn for their toil? In the tariff-protected industries, steel and iron, the greatest number receive a wage, says the report, "so low as to be inadequate to the maintenance of a normal American standard of living—wages adjusted to the single man in the lodging house, not to the responsible head of a family." And this in industries where "to protect the workingman" this country has for years taxed itself millions upon millions of dollars. The estimated tariff profit in the steel trust alone in 1907 was $80,000,000. Who got the money? Go look at the steel palaces and chateaux in New York and Paris. Go ask the Pittsburg millionaires who fill the glittering places of pleasure in the great cities of Europe and this country, who figure in divorce and murder trials, who are writing their names on foundations and bequests and institutions.

How does this "protected" workingman live? What kind of households are these "builded on steel?" The reporter of the situation summarizes them: "*Evil conditions were found to exist in every section of the city. Over the omnipresent vaults graceless privy sheds flouted one's sense of decency. Eyrie rookeries perched on the hillsides were swarming with men, women, and children—entire families living in one room and accommodating boarders in a corner thereof. Cellar rooms were the abiding places of other families. In many houses water was a luxury, to be obtained only through much effort of toiling steps and straining muscles. Courts and alleys fouled by bad drainage and piles of rubbish were playing grounds for rickety, pale-faced, grimy children. An enveloping cloud of smoke and dust, through which light and air must filter, made housekeeping a travesty in many neighborhoods; and every phase of the situation was intensified by the evil of overcrowding—of houses upon lots, of families into houses, of people into rooms.*"

Among the worst illustrations of these *typical* conditions are certain properties owned by the very corporations who are reaping wealth from the tariff-protected products. These beneficiaries of the generosity of the American people, these gentlemen who, when they see the taxation in their interest threatened, hold up the laborer and his good as a reason for continuing it, what do *they* say when these conditions are pointed out to them: "*We don't want to go into the housing business.*

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

We are manufacturers, not real estate dealers. We may be forced to build houses in certain new districts in order to attract and hold labor, but in an old, settled community let the laboring man take care of himself. We don't believe in paternalism."

They have had no more interest in preserving the lives of the men who do the terrible toil necessary to their wealth than in giving them decent housing. For years the death rate from typhoid fever in Pittsburg has been the highest of any city in the civilized world. Everybody knew it. Everybody knew why. There was no supply of pure drinking water. A filtration plant was needed. Did any Pittsburg millionaire offer to build it—insist that the industries which called the vast army of labor to Pittsburg should build it? No; they left a corrupted city government to fight over the appropriations for the work and scattered in endowments and in institutions in other cities and other States many times the five millions needed in Pittsburg to save the lives of the workmen. They hold up to the world for admiration their love of great material problems—they argue with the American people that their skill in solving these problems is a good and sufficient reason for continuing general taxation in their favor. But a problem which, worked out, would benefit nobody but the humble two-dollar-a-day man who sweats out his life in the heat of their profitable furnaces does not interest them. It might savor of paternalism!

Not even the child has touched them. The conditions under which the children of the poor are brought up in Pittsburg are such that babies die like flies. Of those along the river, a settlement worker told Samuel Hopkins Adams, when he was working on health conditions for the Survey: "*Not one child in ten comes to us from the river-bottom section without a blood or skin disease, usually of long standing. Not one out of ten comes to us physically up to the normal for his or her age. Worse than that, few of them are up to the mental standard, and an increasing percentage are imbecile.*"

As to the schools, here is what an authority says: "*The school buildings are in many cases crowded, dark, dirty, often of three stories, and bad fire risks. The condition of the children in these schools, good and bad, rich and poor, may be known by the large proportion having defective teeth, reduced hearing, imperfect vision. An excessively large number of them are mouth breathers, partially so because they are unable to breathe through their noses in the smoky air of Pittsburg, and a very considerable number are below the stature and the weight determined for the average child. In a large percentage the defects of teeth, nose, and throat bring them below the physical normal. These are the children that wear out in childhood.*"

Is it a wonder that this gentleman suggested:

"*Ought not the Pittsburg schools to be closed and the children repaired?*"

This Pittsburg Survey is the most awful arraignment of an American institution and its resulting class pronounced since the days of slavery. It puts upon the Pittsburg millionaire the awful stamp of greed, of stupidity, and of heartless pride. But what should we expect of him? He is the creature of a special privilege which for years he has not needed. He has fought for it because he fattened on it. He must have it for labor. But look at him and look at his laborer and believe him if you can.

Justice takes a terrible revenge on those who thrive by privilege. She blinds their eyes until they no longer see human misery. She dulls their hearts until they no longer beat with humanity. She benumbs their senses until they respond only to the narrow horizon of what they can individually possess, touch, feel. She makes, as she has in Pittsburg, a generation of men and women who day by day can pass hundreds of tumbled-down and filthy homes, in which the men and women who make their wealth live, and feel no shock; who can know that deadly fevers and diseases which are preventable are wiping out hundreds of those who do their tasks, and raise no hand. Little children may die or grow up stunted and evil within their sight and no penny of their wealth, no hour of their leisure, is given them. Women may pass hours of incessant toil and die, broken and unhonored, within their sight, and they raise no hand. Wealth which comes by privilege kills. The curse of Justice on those who will not recognize injustice is the sodden mind, the dulled vision, the unfeeling heart.

I. M. T.

I was interested after reading this distressing record of the misery and degradation of the employees in protected industries at Pittsburg, and their great poverty, to observe, in striking contrast, that Mr. H. C. Frick, one of the masters of the iron, steel, and coke monopoly, was reported by the public press as trying to buy an oil painting by Holbein from the Duke of Norfolk for $350,000. I could not help thinking how scandalous it was to take the labor of these poor people and dissipate it in such folly.

The papers announce also that Mr. Schwab, another steel magnate, was successfully "bucking the tiger" at Monte Carlo, and gambling on a gigantic scale. No doubt he has millions which he may hazard at the gambling table and not feel the loss, but where does he get it? He gets it out of the grimy sweat of a labor so poorly paid that the women and children must, of necessity, suffer degradation and physical, social, and spiritual degeneration.

The morning papers state that a New York lady now suing her husband for divorce has spent in the last ten years $770,000 in various interesting and fanciful extravagances, paying from $500 to $800 for dresses, having scores of servants to dance attendance and promote the wildest vagaries of fashion. One can not pick up a paper without reading the unseemly and indecent waste of the national resources by those beneficiaries who profit by monopolies sheltered under a noncompetitive tariff, one which prevents all competition, and gives them the power to combine at home for the purpose of fleecing the American people and picking their pockets wholesale by prices which are 50 per cent higher than the prices in the markets of the world. Side by side are babies dying like flies for want of proper food and air and decent environment. The omnipotent God will surely punish a nation or a party that sees these evils with callous heart and offers no remedy.

Some one might say that Ida Tarbell's picture is too graphic. I do not think it possible to convey in two pages the terrific arraignment of our civilization which is exhibited in the Pittsburg Survey.

But I submit another authority, whose calm and disinterested judgment and statement of the facts ought to command the attention of the entire nation.

RESULTS OF PITTSBURG SURVEY.

Prof. Edward T. Devine, of New York City, general secretary of the Charity Organization Society of the City of New York (see Vol. III, Amer. Sociological Soc., May 1, 1909), gives a sketch of the results of the Pittsburg Survey, describing what was found to be the actual fact at this great center of the protective industries. He says they found the following results:

I. An altogether *incredible amount of overwork* by everybody, reaching its extreme in the twelve-hour shift for seven days in the week in the steel mills and the railway switch yards.

II. *Low wages for the great majority* of the laborers employed by the mills; not lower than in other large cities, but low compared with the prices—so low as to be *inadequate to the maintenance of a normal American standard of living; wages adjusted to the single man,* not to the responsible head of a family.

III. Still *lower wages for women,* who receive, for example, in one of the metal trades in which the proportion of women is great enough to be menacing, *one-half as much as unorganized men in the same shops* and *one-third as much as the men in the union.*

IV. *An absentee capitalism,* with bad effects strikingly analogous to those of absentee landlordism, of which also Pittsburg furnishes noteworthy examples.

V. A *continuous inflow of immigrants with low standards* attracted by a wage which is high by the standards of southeastern Europe, and which yields a net pecuniary advantage because of *abnormally low expenditures for food and shelter,* an inadequate provision for *sickness, accident, and death.*

VI. The *destruction of family life,* not in any imaginary or mystical sense, but by the demands of the day's work, and by the very demonstrable and material method of typhoid fever and industrial accidents, both preventable, but costing last year in Pittsburg considerably more than a thousand lives, and irretrievably shattering many homes.

VII. *Archaic social institutions* such as the aldermanic court, the ward school district, the family garbage disposal, and the unregenerate charitable institution, still surviving after the conditions to which they were adapted have disappeared.

VIII. *The contrast*—which does not become blurred by familiarity with details, but on the contrary becomes more vivid as the outlines are filled in—*the contrast* between the *prosperity* on the one hand *of the most prosperous of all the communities* of our western civilization, with its vast natural resources, the generous fostering of government, the human energy, the technical development, the gigantic tonnage of the mines and mills, the enormous capital of which the bank balances afford an indication, and, *on the other hand, the neglect of life, of health, of physical vigor, even of the industrial efficiency of the individual.* Certainly no community before in America or Europe has ever had such a surplus, and *never before has a great community applied what it had so meagerly to the rational purposes of human life.* Not by gifts of libraries, galleries, technical schools, and parks, but by *the cessation of toil one day in seven, and sixteen hours in the twenty-four, by the increase of wages, by the sparing of lives, by the prevention of accidents, and by raising the standards of domestic life, should the surplus come back to the people of the community in which it is created.*

The details of this tragic condition is found in the January, February, and March numbers of Charities and Commons, 1909, published in New York.

Mr. President, I have not the slightest doubt that the great and powerful city of Pittsburg, supplied as it is with some of the best brains and best men in the world, will correct, or at least abate, in some degree these conditions. I have no doubt that public sentiment throughout the United States will so influence our great commercial monopolies that they themselves will be led to a more considerate treatment of their laborers and cease to regard them as machines of iron or wood, to be worn-out in production and renewed by others. I have the confidence in the patriotism and good sense of the leaders of both of the great parties of our country to believe that they will not endure the prolonged continuance of these conditions.

THE PROFITS OF MONOPOLY.

The Senator from Iowa gave us a graphic description of the unreasonable profits of the United States Steel upon its watered stock. Its net earnings after paying interest on bonds of subsidiary companies and the accounts of miscellaneous expenditures and charges amounted to one hundred and fifty-six millions. Its products for 1906 amounted to 13,511,149 tons of ingots, out of which was produced 10,578,433 tons of finished products.

Its assets for 1906 are stated (Moody's Manual, p. 2282) at $1,681,309,769; its net profits for dividends 1906 were $98,219,088, exceeding $9 a ton on 10,578,433 tons of product, not counting profits to subordinate corporations.

Its profit on the finished product has exceeded $9 a ton, collected from the consumers of the United States under a tariff which prohibits the consumer buying elsewhere, and thus

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

enables this gigantic corporation and its independent allies to exercise a complete monopoly of all our people.

The proposed schedule in this bill of 31.65 per cent average tariff upon all metal and all manufactures of metal operates not for the benefit of labor, but to establish monopolies which control labor, compel it to disorganize, imposes cruelty and extraordinary conditions upon labor, and, together with other monopolies, established in like manner, pick the pockets of the laboring men and of all other men from the Atlantic to the Pacific by artificial prices, which the retailer and jobber is compelled by penalties to observe, so that the wages received by labor is craftily and fraudulently taken out of his pockets by these stealthy organizations, whose lobbyists now infest this capital and falsely advise Senators and Members with regard to their duty in the premises.

Side by side with these abnormal developments will be found hundreds of thousands of honest companies, working at reasonable profits, engaging in legitimate competition, content with the ancient maxim of—

Live and let live,

and who are also victimized by the exactions of monopoly in greater or less degree as the case may be.

The prices which are lowered in the United States by legitimate competition are so far offset by the unreasonable high prices of monopoly that the general average has gone far above the markets of the world, as I have heretofore shown.

Mr. President, several Senators have shown on the floor the enormous profits made by various monopolies.

The authoritative record can be found in Moody's Manual of 1907, a volume of twenty-five hundred pages, giving the accounts of the corporations doing business in the country, but not by any means all of the monopolies. In these tables will be found the enormous profits which have been advertised to the public stating what they have made. The record does not tell the entire story by any means, but it tells enough. The manner in which the people of the United States are unjustly taxed by these artificial high prices in the interest of monopoly is shown by sugar.

Our record shows that the people of the United States consume 2,993,979 tons of sugar per annum. The London price is 2 cents a pound less than the New York price, so that the people pay about $40 a ton for sugar in excess of the London price—approximately one hundred and thirty millions of dollars—while the duty collected is only sixty millions, leaving a profit of seventy millions to the monopolies and interests protected by the tariff, amounting in this one item to about $5 per annum for every family in the United States.

In similar manner will be shown the profits to the trusts on pig iron, on steel billets, on steel rails, as compiled by the Actuary of the Treasury. (S. Doc. 45, 61st Cong., 1st sess.)

PIG IRON.	Per ton.
United States	$17.75
United States duty	4.00
United States price, less duty	13.75
Germany	11.21
France	11.25
Belgium	11.75
England	11.00

United States production of pig iron, 1907, 25,781,361 tons; duty, $4 per ton; tax on consumer, $103,125,444; government revenue, 1907, $1,466,825.

BILLETS, STEEL.	Per ton.
United States	$24.71
United States duty	6.72
United States value, less duty	17.99
Germany	14.88
France	15.00
Belgium	15.50
England	15.14

United States production, 1906, 23,398,136 tons; duty, $6.72 per ton; tax on consumers, $157,235,474; government revenue, 1906, $590,663.

RAILS, STEEL.	Per ton.
United States	$25.41
United States duty	7.84
United States price, less duty	17.57
Germany	17.84
France	17.99
Belgium	18.59
England	18.14
Average of above—Europe	18.14
United States price	25.41
Difference	7.27

United States production of steel rails, 1907, 3,977,872 tons; difference in price, home and abroad, $7.27; tax on consumer, $28,919,129; government revenue, 1907, $30,670.

NAILS.	Per ton.
United States	$47.13
United States duty	11.20
United States price, less duty	35.93
Germany	33.60
France	34.60
Belgium	33.00

United States production, wire nails, 1906, 512,800 tons; United States duty, $11.20 per ton; tax on consumer, $5,743,360; government revenue, 1907, $91; cost to the people for each dollar collected by the Government, $63,114.85.

RÉSUMÉ.

	United States revenue.	People pay additional.	Cost to the people for each $1 tax collected by the Government.
Sugar	$60,135,181.00	$70,641,821.00	$2.17
Pig iron	1,466,825.00	103,125,444.00	71.23
Steel billets, etc	590,663.00	157,235,474.00	267.05
Steel rails	30,670.00	28,919,129.00	943.91
Nails, wire	91.00	5,743,360.00	63,114.85

Census Bulletin No. 57, 1905, points out the confessed profits on various manufacturing enterprises, a few of which I give.

CENSUS PROFITS ON WOOL MANUFACTURING, CLOTHING, AND TILE.

Census Bulletin No. 57, 1905, gives the following statistics on woolen and worsted goods and clothing manufactures, and so forth, from which the profit can be calculated:

Number of establishments	8,873	
Expenses:		
Salaries paid 28,454 officials and clerks		$30,015,521
Wages paid 394,893 workmen		163,503,042
Miscellaneous expenses		98,564,867
Cost of materials		514,002,738
Total expenses		806,086,168
Value of product		911,399,841
Profit		105,313,673
Capital		529,892,740

Approximately 20 per cent.

MEN'S CLOTHING.

Number of establishments	4,504	
Expenses:		
Salaries paid 13,210 officials and clerks		$13,703,162
Wages paid 137,190 workmen		57,225,506
Men over 16	58,769	
Women over 16	75,468	
Children under 16	2,963	
Miscellaneous expenses		57,695,240
Materials		185,793,436
Total expenses		314,417,344
Value of product		355,796,571
Profit		41,379,227
Capital		153,177,500

About 27 per cent.

WOMEN'S CLOTHING.

Number establishments	3,351	
Salaries paid 10,920 officials and clerks		$9,975,944
Wages paid 115,705 workmen		51,180,193
Men over 16	42,614	
Women over 16	72,242	
Children under 16	849	
Miscellaneous expenses		24,349,282
Materials		130,719,996
Total expenses		216,225,415
Value product		247,661,560
Profit		31,436,145
Capital		73,947,823

About 42 per cent.

BRICK AND TILE.

Number of establishments	4,634	
Salaries paid 3,690 officials and clerks		$3,530,474
Wages paid 66,021 workmen		28,646,005
Miscellaneous expenses		6,969,161
Cost of materials		16,316,499
Total expense		55,462,139
Value product		71,152,062
Profit		15,689,923

About 22 per cent.

The profit on men's clothing amounts to 27 per cent, on women's clothing 42 per cent, and yet side by side with this manufacturer's profit the sweating system is in full force (an interesting account of which will be found in H. Rept. No. 2309, 52d Cong., 2d sess.), with ruinous conditions under which oppressed labor earns its miserable bread; industrious young

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

women, twelve hours a day in the shops of unremitting industry, and increasing speed, earning $4, $5, and $6 a week. For a $10 suit 85 cents is paid for the making of a coat, 25 to 35 cents for the pants, and 20 to 25 cents for the vest; for a $15 suit $1.50 is paid for making the coat, and so on. It is no wonder, of course, people living in abject wretchedness of the sweat shops exhibit a very great mortality as compared with other people, and develop tuberculosis and other diseases.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 4, 1909, gives a table of some of the profits of the cotton mills of the country, submitted by Senator SMITH of South Carolina. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

Statistics relative to cotton-mill stocks as investments.

Name of company.	Date of incorporation.	Capital.	Surplus.	Debt.	Earnings per share, 1907.	Dividends, 1907.	Total dividends for eight years.	Average dividends for eight years.	Book surplus per share.	Capitalization per spindle.	Par value.
							Per cent.	*Per cent.*			
Amoskeag	1831	$5,760,000.00	$3,720,691.00	$1,425,000.00	$21.30	$16.00	126	15.75	$64.59	$10.76	$100.00
Androscoggin	1860	1,000,000.00	1,123,864.00	16,559.00	24.91	10.00	75	9.37	112.38	13.98	100.00
Bates	1852	1,200,000.00	1,376,361.00	117,565.00	41.87	35.00	130	16.25	114.61	14.61	100.00
Border City	1880	1,000,000.00	333,598.00	500,000.00	37.50	23.50	119	14.87	33.35	12.51	100.00
Richard Borden	1871	1,000,000.00	502,174.00	541.00	32.62	20.00	[a]101	12.62	50.21	10.37	100.00
King Philip	1871	1,500,000.00	851,765.00	150,431.00	25.65	6.00	168½	21.25	56.78	11.10	100.00
Dartmouth	1895	600,000.00	685,105.00	470,529.00	82.50	66.00	158	19.75	114.18	5.00	100.00
Dwight	1841	1,200,000.00	1,299,219.00	735,740.00	103.94	12.00	100	12.50	108.26	5.45	500.00
Great Falls	1823	1,500,000.00	960,000.00	338,603.00	21.33	12.00	117	14.62	64.00	11.36	100.00
Laurel Lake	1881	600,000.00	184,251.00	None.	28.24	14.00	[b]190½	23.75	37.08	10.03	100.00
Massachusetts Cotton	1839	1,800,000.00	1,431,690.00	2,160,763.00	41.30	5.00	50	6.25	79.53	14.13	100.00
Lawrence	1831	1,250,000.00	787,000.00	500,000.00	25.27	8.00	122	15.25	62.96	12.50	100.00
Pacific	1853	3,000,000.00	6,332,354.00	None.	550.00	320.00	124	15.50	2,110.95	.....	1,000.00
Pepperell	1899	2,556,000.00	1,628,487.00	117,940.00	.....	12.00	158	19.75	63.71	10.27	100.00
Sagamore	1879	900,000.00	355,693.00	607,899.00	48.53	30.00	85	10.63	39.53	9.80	100.00
Troy	1814	300,000.00	474,294.00	2,816.00	335.00	67.00	189	23.62	794.99	6.31	500.00
Union	1879	1,200,000.00	584,044.00	None.	46.00	35.50	183	22.87	48.67	10.89	100.00
Whitman	1895	1,500,000.00	945,411.00	474,245.00	29.76	8.00	58½	7.25	63.02	11.35	100.00

[a] In addition to which a 25 per cent dividend was paid.
For eight years average annual dividends for group, 15.65 per cent.

[b] In addition to which a 100 per cent dividend was paid.

The merger in the capital of earnings is not shown, nor in plant improvements out of earnings, which would make the earnings still larger. W. Irving Bullard, of Danielson, Conn., a great cotton manufacturer, is quoted as saying at Boston April 16, 1908:

A summary of 100 cotton mills in Oldham district, in England, shows the following remarkable facts: Capital invested, $30,501,230; net earnings, $6,605,785; average earning per mill, $66,055; dividend, 15¾ per cent.

The average dividend disbursements for these 100 mills was 15¾ per cent, while the net earnings show an average of 35½ per cent.

The indecent treatment of helpless labor by organized capital is not confined to America, but we ought to lead the world in the conservation of human life and unrewarded toil by laws wisely and humanely drawn.

The recent giant monopolies, engendered and sheltered by the prohibitive tariff, are responsible for the unrest of the country.

The American Tobacco Company, which has become sufficiently powerful to fix the price of all tobacco raised in the United States, advertises its assets for 1906 at $278,628,564. By merger and otherwise it controls the American Cigar Company, American Stogie Company, the Havana Tobacco Company, with various subcompanies, the American Snuff Company, the Lorillard Company, and so forth. The impatience and violence of the tobacco raisers in Kentucky and Tennessee, known as the "Night Riders," is due directly to the tyranny of this company, which, being strong enough to control prices, is enabled to exercise its will on the tobacco growers, who have been making a blind effort to protect themselves by force. In like manner the crushing effect of extreme poverty, due to the processes which I have described, is leading to actual crime in many ways and is responsible for the growth of radical socialism and anarchism throughout the world.

DISTRIBUTION OF WEALTH.

In The Social Unrest, John Graham Brooks, on page 161, quoting Thorold Rogers (Oxford Economy), says:

In a vague way they (the laborers) are under the impression that the greater part of the misery which they see is the direct product of the laws enacted and maintained in the interest of particular classes. *And on the whole they are in the right.*

Quoting Professor Smart, of Glasgow:

But when machinery is replacing man and doing the heavy work of industry, it is time to get rid of that ancient prejudice that men must work ten hours a day to keep the world up to the level of the comfort it has attained. Possibly, if we clear our minds of cant, we may see the reason why we still wish the laborer to work ten hours a day is that we, the comfortable classes, may go on receiving the lion's share of the wealth these machines, iron and human, are turning out.

So Professor Cairnes, an economist noted for ability and caution, in his Leading Principles (ibid., 162), says:

Unequal as is the distribution of wealth already in the country, the tendency of industrial progress—on the supposition that the present separation between industrial classes is maintained—is toward an inequality still greater. The rich will be growing richer; the poor at least relatively poorer. It seems to me, apart altogether from the question of the laborers' interest, that these are not conditions which furnish a solid basis for a progressive social state; but, having regard to that interest, I think the considerations adduced show that the first and indispensable step toward any serious amendment of the laborer's lot is that he should be, in one way or another, lifted out of the groove in which he at present works and placed in a position compatible with his becoming a sharer in equal proportion with others in the general advantages arising from industrial progress.

Spahrs's table for the distribution of wealth in the United States, taken from his work, "The Present Distribution of Wealth in the United States," when our national wealth was $60,000,000, is as follows:

Class.	Families.	Per cent.	Average wealth.	Aggregate wealth.	Per cent.
Rich	125,000	1.0	$263,040	$32,880,000,000	54.8
Middle	1,362,500	10.9	14,180	19,320,000,000	32.2
Poor	4,762,500	38.1	1,639	7,800,000,000	13.0
Very poor	6,250,000	50.0	.....	.....	.....
Total	13,500,000	100.0	4,800	60,000,000,000	100.0

The inequalities have been steadily growing worse, and when a single person's fortune is estimated at a thousand millions and is gathering in $50,000,000 per annum of the net proceeds of the products of the labor of this country, while millions of human beings can not lay aside $50 apiece per annum, what must be the inevitable result? It is this condition, half understood, that is developing rapidly a sentiment of radical socialism, discontent, and social unrest.

Moody's Manual of 1907, page 30, presents a "General Summary" of corporations offering stocks and bonds for sale to the stock exchanges and recorded by him in great detail in a volume of nearly 3,000 pages, as follows:

	Total stocks and bonds.
Steam railroad division	$15,436,758,000
Public utilities division	8,130,464,000
Industrial division	10,156,333,000
Mining division	2,525,173,000
	36,248,668,000
Page 10, Report (1907) Comptroller of the Currency, resources national banks	8,390,328,402
Page 35, Report (1907) Comptroller of the Currency, resources other banks and trust companies	11,168,511,516

In addition to this enormous volume of corporate wealth, which comprises a registered one-third of our national wealth, there is an unregistered volume of corporations which are close corporations which do not sell stock, which are personal corporations, amounting to thousands of millions of dollars.

I respectfully call your attention to the Statistical Abstract of 1907, Table 244, which sets forth the wealth of the United

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

States, which shows clearly where its approximate ownership may be found, to wit:

Table 244, Statistical Abstract, 1907.

Total wealth in United States	$107,104,211,917
Real property	62,341,492,134
Live stock	4,073,791,736
Farm implements and machinery	844,989,863
Manufacturing machinery, tools, etc	3,297,754,180
Railroad equipment	11,244,752,000
Street railway, shipping, waterworks	4,840,546,909
Agricultural products	1,899,379,652
Manufactured products	7,409,291,668
Imported merchandise	495,543,685
Mining products	326,851,517
Clothing and personal ornaments	2,000,000,000
Furniture, carriages	5,750,000,000
Total for United States	107,104,211,917

Where do the city laborers under protection come in as joint heirs of modern prosperity?

What part of this wealth created by labor is theirs?

They have no real estate, no live stock, farm machinery, manufacturing machinery, railroads, or under any visible classification. The only thing that they can have under this tabulation is clothing and a little personal property.

And yet the products of the labor in our specified manufacturing industries of 1905 reached a total of $14,802,147,087, for 5,470,321 wage-earners, whose product was therefore worth $2,708 per capita.

These people received $2,611,540,532 in wages (Stat. Abst. U. S., 1907, p. 144), or $479 per capita.

This $479 each must feed and shelter and clothe and educate and provide leisure and the joyous participation in the common providences of God for an average of three people, on about $160 each per annum, or about an average of $13.33 per month.

There can hardly be much margin of saving under the circumstances for sickness, ill health, accident, or loss of employment.

In New York City, with over four millions of people, less than 1 in 40 has any real estate.

LESS THAN 100,000 OWN CITY.

[From the New York Times.]

Lawson Purdy, president of the board of taxes and assessments, in a speech at the City Planning Municipal Art Exhibition, said that the value of the taxable property in New York City is now estimated to be about $6,800,000,000. Two-thirds, or 67 per cent, of this property, he added, is land. Mr. Purdy said that it is estimated that less than 100,000 persons own every particle of the land.

Our wealth increases over $4,500,000,000 every year over and above our expenses. What proportion does labor, the creator of wealth, retain net out of its own creation?

A beggarly part, Mr. President. Our national policy can be improved; our national policy should be changed.

We ought not to persist in a policy artfully designed to make the rich richer and the poor poorer.

FALSE STANDARDS OF LIFE.

Piling up enormous wealth in few hands is setting false standards of life and making classes whose sympathies are very far apart.

One can not help but be struck with the enormous cost of hotel services, for example, in the New York hotels conducted expressly for the patronage of the rich; $15 to $20 a day for a bedroom, sitting room, and bath is nothing unusual; $15 for a dinner for two persons is not regarded as extravagant; and side by side with this will be found families who can not save $30 net out of their labor of a year's time.

This may seem unimportant; I regard it as a matter of very great importance, illustrating the grossly unequal distribution of the proceeds of human labor; a condition which pampers one class and starves another; a condition which ought not to be encouraged by a nation which desires to preserve its liberties.

TIPPING.

The whole tipping system which in sections where these differences of wealth are most pronounced is an evidence offering itself on every hand to show that the servants who render service are not properly paid, and that the well-to-do class ought voluntarily to pay the servants for every little act. This system degrades the servant and puts him in an attitude of a beggar—a beggary which the giver of tips encourages in spite of himself. The whole practice which universally prevails in Europe emphasizes the relation of master and servant, of master and dependent, in which the servant is to be thankful for gifts, and it is injurious both to the one who gives and the one who receives and illustrates the false standards of living which are being established in this country. Men who serve ought to be properly paid in the first instance and not compelled to be put in the attitude of beggars in order to make a living. It lowers the moral tone of the American Republic.

MONOPOLIES' EVIL AND DANGEROUS METHODS.

Mr. President, piling up stupendous wealth in a few hands is dangerous to the welfare of the country. The Senator from Wisconsin, in his remarks on Senate bill 3023 a year ago, pointed out that practically 100 directors, interlocked with each other, controlled all of the great corporations of transportation, telegraph, telephone, express, and industrials in the United States. He gave their names and the corporations which they controlled in part.

In the remarks which I had the honor to submit on February 25, 1908, upon this bill (S. 3023), I pointed out the ability of a few men in New York to create a panic whenever they wanted to, and I pointed out how they could profit by it.

A few men control the management of the banks in New York City, Boston, Philadelphia, and Chicago, with associate banks throughout the country, and can make the stock market go up or down as they please by the simplest of all processes, to wit:

BY RESTRICTING CREDITS

when they want the market to go down—

BY EXTENDING CREDITS FREELY

when they want the market to go up.

The panic of 1893 was an artificial panic, because it was brought about in this manner for the purpose of putting an end to the talk of remonetizing silver, and as a political argument, ingeniously and powerfully exerted, it did finally put an end to it.

I was in the banking business myself at that time, and received a circular letter from New York pointing out the mischievous character of the discussion favoring remonetization of silver; that it was driving gold abroad. Several letters followed along the same line, and, I am informed, and believe, that these circulars were sent out at the instance of a committee representing banks belonging to the New York clearing house; that it was the definite and predetermined policy then and there to constrict credits; and that, finally, these banks struck the crowning blow by "calling," in June, 1893, the large volume of demand loans then on the street for immediate payment, when the usual credit accommodations were already quite cut off by these banks and their associate institutions and other associated financiers.

When this panic was over the weaker elements of the financial world by thousands had been compelled to give up their properties to the financial masters, who had accumulated cash for the purpose of taking over the property of less farsighted and powerful operators.

I pointed out in my remarks February 25, 1908, the astonishing manner in which these forces had caused the stock market to go up and down by which the unwary have been fleeced of their property during the preceding ten years.

The panic of 1907 was an artificial panic, brought about by conspiracy, in my opinion, of men discussed by President Roosevelt as "malefactors of great wealth."

I think his description was precise and apt, and I think that the Senate ought never to be content until a proper inquiry has been made into the panic of 1907, to determine who the beneficiaries were of that artful, crafty, far-reaching, and terrible conspiracy, which has thrown millions of men out of employment and brought tears and grief to the unnumbered women and children in this land who have suffered the consequence of that financial panic.

I was informed with regard to what might be expected to happen nearly a year before it did happen.

The panic of 1907 was brought about by a prolonged bull movement, free extension of credits, maintaining stocks and bonds at a high figure until in sufficient volume they were loaded upon the unwary, to whom money was freely loaned on a proper margin, and then began the process of restricting credits, slowly, steadily, firmly, the masters of the market, the high priests of monopoly, having accumulated an immense volume of cash and cash credits, to be used when the market struck bottom. This they did, with the most magnificent results, making unnumbered millions out of the weaker elements who had been led into the trap of obtaining credits.

It is true that the panic resulted in paralyzing productive energies of the American people, disturbing credits throughout the whole world, and throwing millions of men out of employment and causing unspeakable suffering to many millions of women and children. But monopoly had its reward, if the accumulation of money beyond the needs of a human being can be called a reward; if a callous heart and deadened sensibilities to the sufferings of human kind can be called a reward.

I wish to say to the chairman of the Committee on Finance that his committee is, in my judgment, honor bound to determine who the beneficiaries of that financial panic were and to take steps against the possibility of its repetition. There was a double purpose in this panic. One was that the very powerful financially might double their holdings of property by smashing values, accumulating cash and cash credits, and buying

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

in the stocks and bonds of weak financiers who could not stand the storm.

Another purpose was to discredit Theodore Roosevelt, whose heart had been moved by a resolute purpose to protect the people against such sinister forces.

In his message of January 31, 1908, he said:

WHO COMMIT HIDEOUS WRONG.

The attacks by these great corporations on the administration's actions have been given a wide circulation through the country, in the newspapers and otherwise, by those writers and speakers who, consciously or unconsciously, act as the representatives of predatory wealth—of the wealth accumulated on a giant scale by all forms of iniquity, ranging from the oppression of wage-workers to unfair and unwholesome methods of crushing out competition, and to defrauding the public by stockjobbing and the manipulation of securities. Certain wealthy men of this stamp, whose conduct should be abhorrent to every man of ordinary decent conscience and who commit the hideous wrong of teaching our young men that phenomenal business success must ordinarily be based on dishonesty, have during the last few months made it apparent that they have banded together to work for a reaction. Their endeavor is to overthrow and discredit all who honestly administer the law, to prevent any additional legislation which would check and restrain them, and to secure, if possible, a freedom from all restraint, which will permit every unscrupulous wrongdoer to do what he wishes unchecked provided he has enough money. The only way to counteract the movement in which these men are engaged is to make clear to the public just what they are seeking to accomplish in the present.

The absurd fluctuations of stocks controlled by these high financiers, I set forth at the time, illustrate the unspeakable folly of any citizen trusting himself upon a market capable of such uncontrolled manipulation. Monte Carlo is perfectly innocent by the side of this gigantic gambling house with its wonderfully improved modern machinery for misleading the judgment of the ordinary citizen, with its secret pitfalls and ingenious traps by which to defraud our people.

The spirit of monopoly—the idea of getting something for nothing—has done a great harm to the American people. Hundreds of thousands of people are the beneficiaries of it and many millions are the victims of it. Those who are enriched by it set new standards of extravagant living, of wasteful expenditure, and of false pride and bad example, the imitation of which has made the American citizen notorious throughout the whole world.

This bill, Mr. President, is a taproot from which monopoly partly draws its power, fattens, grows strong, and overshadows the land like an evil tree killing and impairing the life of those who stand beneath.

The violent manner in which the monopolists of this country juggle the stock market subjects it to tremendous changes from time to time, as shown in the following quotations:

These ranges are since 1900, and will be found in the New York Times Weekly National Quotation Review, page 13, of October 21, 1907:

	High.	Low.
Adams Express	315	114
Allis Chalmers Co	27	4
Amalgamated Copper	130	33
American Beet Sugar Co	36	9
American Cotton Oil	57	24
American Express	272	142
American Grass Twine	62	3
American Hide and Leather	13	2
American Ice Securities	94	20
American Linseed Co	30	5
American Snuff Co	250	26
American Steel Foundries	18	3
American Woolen Co	48	7
Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe	110	18
Baltimore and Ohio	125	55
Delaware, Lackawanna and Western	560	171
Denver and Rio Grande	53	16
Duluth, South Shore and Atlantic	24	4
General Electric	334	109
Great Northern preferred	348	140
Iowa Central	57	11
Kanawha and Michigan	76	10
Kansas City Southern	39	7
Knickerbocker Ice	85	8
Lake Erie and Western	76	12
Manhattan Beach	22	4
Missouri, Kansas and Texas R. R	43	9
National Biscuit Co	86	23
New York, Chicago and St. Louis	76	11
New York Central	174	99
Norfolk and Western	97	22
Northern Pacific	700	45
Northern Central	250	150
Ontario Mining	13	1
Pennsylvania Railroad	170	110
Peoria and Eastern	50	5
Pere Marquette	106	20
Pullman Co	268	148
Reading	164	15
Tennessee Coal and Iron	166	25
United Railways Investment	98	9
United States Cast Iron	53	6
United States Express	160	45
United States Leather	20	6
United States Steel	55	8

I call attention to some of these figures, however: Adams Express went from 114 to 315, about 300 per cent; the Allis-Chalmers Company went from 4 to 27, over 600 per cent. Amalgamated Copper, one of the giant concerns of this country, from 33 to 130, 400 per cent. And so it goes on through the list.

The monopoly protecting tariff shortens the life of labor and exposes it to greater mortality.

Mr. President, in the last forty years the world has wonderfully improved in medical knowledge. It has wonderfully improved in inventive processes, which have led to increased conveniences of life, which have developed the most important economies of production, manufacture, and distribution.

All of these things have tended to the prolongation of human life where people could receive the full benefit of them; so much so, that it is probably no excessive estimate to say that the average of human life in the well-to-do classes has been increased by a period of ten years. It has been one of the wonderful developments of increasing modern intelligence.

It is a grievous thing, therefore, to observe that notwithstanding these great benefits, which ought to be a common heritage of the human race, and notwithstanding the increasing longevity of the well-to-do classes, the entire average of life shown by the mortality tables has not been improved. The number of persons who die per thousand is substantially the same.

Mr. President, I submit the comparative mortality statistics of our country and the other civilized nations of the world.

The mortality statistics exhibit the remarkable fact that just in degree as poverty obtains and governments permit monopoly, without protecting the weaker elements from dangerous exposure, just in that degree the number of deaths from all causes rises in the annual average.

It is a very important matter, and it shows that just in degree as thoughtful men write their laws for the preservation of human life to that degree is human longevity extended; to that degree there is the conservation of the best of all national resources—the lives of the children, the lives of the workingmen and working women of the country.

The following table gives the number of people per thousand who died in the following countries from 1903 to 1906 (p. 28 of the Mortality Statistics of the Census Office for 1907):

Country.	1903.	1904.	1905.	1906.
Ceylon	25.9	24.9	27.7	34.3
Hungary	26.1	24.8	27.8	24.8
Roumania	24.8	24.4	25.4	
Spain	25	25.8	25.9	26.2
Austria	23.8	23.7	25	
Italy	22.4	21.1	21.9	20.8
Japan	20	21.2	21.9	
France	19.2	19.4	19.6	19.9
German Empire	20	19.6	19.8	
United States	16.1	16.6	16.2	16.1
Netherlands	15.6	15.9	15.3	14.8
Norway	14.8	14.3	14.8	13.7
Denmark	14.7	14.1	15	13.5
United Kingdom	15.8	16.5	15.5	15.6
Australasia	11.8	10.8	10.5	10.6
New Zealand	10.4	9.6	9.3	9.3

There is no table which has ever been read in this body that has such vital significance as that table, which shows that if the people of the United States took the same pains to preserve the life of the Nation that New Zealand has done, we would save over six to the thousand; and, measured by our 80,000,000 people, it would mean a saving to this country of over 500,000 lives annually. Pittsburg is no exception in the exposure of human life to bad conditions. It is merely illustrative.

The policy of New Zealand is expressed in their great motto, "Better reduce want than increase wealth;" and when you reduce want, even if it be at the expense of increasing wealth, you prolong human life. You make life worthy to be lived, and you raise the standard of men physically, morally, and spiritually.

Let our national standard be "*Men first, then wealth.*"

New Zealand has abolished monopoly and given a more even distribution of the opportunities of life to willing labor than any other country in the world, and it offers to the United States an example of how to care for its people, because the difference of these vital statistics of an average of 9.9 deaths per annum out of a thousand and 16.3 per thousand, makes a difference of 6.4 per thousand, or the vast multitude of 512,000 people who annually die in the United States in excess of the deaths that would occur under more favorable conditions of life. Are they not worth preserving as fully as we agree on the conservation of our other national resources?

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

The death rate in our cities, especially the industrial cities, seems to run still higher than the general average; for example, the annual average number of deaths from all causes, per thousand population for 1901 to 1905, was as follows (id., pp. 91 and 92):

In Massachusetts:	
Boston	18.8
Fall River	20.3
Lowell	20.2
Providence, R. I.	18.8
New York City	19.0
Pittsburg, Pa	20.7
Philadelphia	18.2
Norristown, Pa	24.5

Notwithstanding the fact that the cities with their opportunity of cooperation in improved water supply, sewerage, hospital service, and sanitary supervision ought to have better health than those less favorably situated. The heavy death rate in cities is due to the extreme high death rate among the very poor, who are compelled to live in insanitary places and are otherwise exposed, while the more favored population of the cities would show a better rate than the average.

TABLE 21.—*Death rates from all causes per 1,000 population in registration States in 1900.*

Connecticut	16.977
Maine	17.493
Massachusetts	17.736
Michigan	13.867
New Hampshire	17.979
New Jersey	17.378
New York	17.921
Rhode Island	19.078
Vermont	16.962

Table 95, Abstract of the Census, 1900, shows a heavy mortality in manufacturing cities and in cities where negroes live. For example, per thousand, from all causes:

Augusta, Me.	26.4
Baltimore, Md.	21.0
Biddeford, Me.	23.2
Boston, Mass.	21.1
Cincinnati, Ohio	19.1
Hoboken, N. J.	21.1
Jersey City, N. J.	20.7
Pittsburg, Pa.	20.0
Philadelphia, Pa.	21.2

Census Bulletin No. 77 gives an interesting account of 42 of the so-called "dusty trades," showing, for example, that of polishers who die between 25 and 34 years, 56 per cent of such deaths are due to consumption. The per cent of like deaths due to consumption in each age group is very high; for example, between the ages of 25 and 34 years, 70 per cent of the grinders who die, die of consumption; 59 per cent of the tool makers, 50 per cent of the gold-leaf makers, 50 per cent of brass workers, 56 per cent of printers, 66 per cent of compositors, 61 per cent of engravers, 52 per cent of stone workers, 50 per cent of marble workers, 56 per cent of glass blowers, 46 per cent of glass cutters, 44 per cent of plasterers, 49 per cent of paper hangers, 62 per cent of lithographers, 68 per cent of the hosiery and knitting mill employees, 50 per cent of spinners, 53 per cent of weavers, 50 per cent of rope makers, 55 per cent of cabinetmakers, 62 per cent of wood turners, 55 per cent of hatters, 52 per cent of silk-mill employees, 58 per cent of upholsterers, showing that workers in these dusty trades are very liable to die of tuberculosis.

This table shows that the exposure of human life to dust and hard conditions leads to the destruction of human life by tuberculosis in a serious way. I think these tables are of interest.

Mr. President, I deem it my duty to call the attention of the country to the fact that this death rate stands in startling contrast to the death rate of New Zealand, where the average for 1901 to 1906 was less than 10 deaths per thousand. It is equally important, in considering the reason for the greater security of life in New Zealand, to remember that in New Zealand the people take great care to prevent the destruction of human life by the extremes of poverty.

Finally, Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that in New Zealand great pains are taken to protect the people against monopoly, against the appropriation of everything in heaven and on earth, everything visible or invisible by men, because they happen to have piled up available credit at their command. In New Zealand they believe that the land was made for the use and benefit of the living generation, who make it desirable to live in. Therefore they control monopoly in that great republic. We have copied them before in their political processes when we adopted the greatest of all means for the control of fraud in elections by the adoption of the Australian ballot, and we will do well to imitate them in other matters, where they protect the living generation against the uncontrolled and natural ambition and greed of man for wealth and power.

BETTER REDUCE WANT THAN INCREASE WEALTH.

In New Zealand they do not impose a tariff tax artfully drawn to make the poor poorer and the rich richer. In New Zealand they do not establish a tariff under the false pretense of raising revenue, where the legislator openly or secretly intends the tariff rate not to raise revenue, but to prevent importation, to prevent competition, and to protect monopoly in the home market.

THE PURPOSES OF TAXATION.

Constitutionally, a tax can have no other basis than the raising of a revenue for public purposes, and whatever governmental exaction has not this basis is tyrannical and unlawful. A tax on imports, therefore, the purpose of which is not to raise a revenue, *but to discourage and indirectly prohibit some particular import for the benefit of some home manufacture, may well be questioned as being merely colorable,* and *therefore not warranted by constitutional principles.* (Cooley, Prin. Con. Law, 57.)

The Supreme Court of the United States, in the Topeka case, said:

"To lay with one hand the power of the Government on the property of the citizen and with the other to bestow it upon favored individuals to aid private enterprises and *build up private fortunes is none the less a robbery because it is done under the forms of law and is called 'taxation.'* This is not legislation; it is a decree under legislative forms." (20 Wall., 664, in Loan Asso. *v.* Topeka.)

New Zealand pursues the policy

BETTER REDUCE WANT THAN INCREASE WEALTH

and imposes a 10 per cent inheritance tax on estates of one hundred thousand and more, and imposes also an income tax.

New Zealand does not hesitate to protect her working units from excessive house rent, providing concrete houses at a low rate of interest.

I am not unaware of the fact that this latter suggestion will furnish occasion to the clamorous advocates of special privileges to burst into a chorus of denunciation against New Zealand, that this is socialism. It is true that it is socialistic. But no wise policy should be condemned by a mere epithet "socialism," for our post-office system and common-school system, and municipal waterworks, sewers and streets system are "socialistic." New Zealand believes that the land upon which the New Zealanders live and move and have their being ought not to be monopolized by the very rich, nor used by them through the acquirement of titles to dictate terms upon which the New Zealanders shall be allowed to live.

The New Zealanders must be a very foolish people. They actually believe that the land upon which they live should be controlled in the interest of the living generation of men who cultivate it and make it beautiful. I understand that this foolish doctrine is contrary to the fundamental canons of monopoly.

It violates the fundamental law of continental Europe and of Great Britain. It would overthrow the idea of the good old days of William the Conqueror when he took charge of Britain and parceled the lands among his warlike leaders.

These titles have thence come down in the good old way, and the dukes and princes of England, and of Germany, of Austria, and of Russia still hold the titles and in measure still impose their will upon the inhabitants thereof. It is also true that this special class of landed nobles, who exercised monopoly of the land, having finally learned that they could only eat so much and only wear so much and only occupy a given number of palaces, were obliged to throw out the younger brothers of each succeeding family, and, human selfishness having become satiated in princely and luxurious living, have turned themselves to some extent to the service of their fellow-men. But they have had the wisdom and been compelled to limit the extortion which their legal rights made possible.

Indeed, they had a great example in France, which was serviceable in teaching them not to go too far. It was this monopoly of land—the Senator from New York [Mr. DEPEW] to the contrary notwithstanding—which caused the French revolution, sending the land monopolists to the guillotine, and resulted in the minute subdivision of the lands of France among those who tilled the soil and made it productive.

Mr. President, one might be misunderstood in discussing the greed of modern times. I do not blame an individual for exhibiting the natural tendency of human life. I do not blame a man for becoming greedy for wealth and power; all of us have these impulses; but I do blame the laws which persist in sheltering him at the expense of those who are entitled to protection in the constitutional right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

I wish to call attention to what is the effect of monopoly. Monopoly is worse in Europe than in our country because under the rule in Europe the land was monopolized in the first place by imperial power, and the control of the land was handed down to dukes, princes, and various others, and those people who come to our shores and are willing to submit to any kind of treatment do so because they come from conditions of monopoly more severe than those which we have in our own country.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

It was the monopoly of land which led to the French revolution, notwithstanding the comments of the Senator from New York, who attributed it to other reasons. Thomas Jefferson, when minister to France in 1785, pointed out the terrific effect of land monopoly in that Empire. He said:

The property of France is absolutely concentrated in a very few hands, having revenues of from half a million of guineas a year downward. These employ the flower of the country as servants, some of them having as many as 200 domestics, not laboring. They employ also a great number of manufacturers and tradesmen, and, lastly, the class of laboring husbandmen. But, after all, there comes the most numerous of all the classes; that is, the poor, who can not find work. I asked myself what could be the reason that so many should be permitted to beg who are willing to work in a country where there is a very considerable proportion of uncultivated lands? Those lands are undistributed only for the sake of game. It should seem, then, that it must be because of the enormous wealth of the proprietors, which places them above attention to the increase of their revenues by permitting these lands to be labored.

I have always felt sorry for the French nobility, for the so-called "flower of France," and have wondered why it was they were incapable of realizing the fatal danger which their greed, their extravagance, and their frivolity engendered. They played with a powder magazine of human passion which finally exploded.

Our laws should protect the people in the peaceful enjoyment of life, liberty, the pursuit of happiness, and of the fruits of their own industry. If the laws fail, there will be built up in this country a powder magazine of human passion that may some day explode with fatal consequences.

A safety valve has been furnished, for possible danger to the land monopolist and other thence engendered monopolists of continental Europe, by modern transportation, which has permitted their great surplus of population to go to other parts of the world and build up homes by their peaceful labor, where they would not be subject to princes or potentates or to tyranny in any form, whether governmental, religious, or plutocratic; and our forefathers came to this land to free themselves from this tyranny and to establish a government whose fundamental doctrine was that the precious privileges of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness were inalienable. That is to say, Mr. President, the individual could not deprive himself of them if he would; that he had no right to deprive himself of these things.

It has remained for the representatives of the people in Congress to permit the dangers of monopoly to grow up by special privileges granted by statute, by building up a monopoly breeding tariff, by which foreign competition has been cut off and home competition controlled and commercial mastery of our people established by the organization of trusts, by secret agreements, and by gigantic mergers, which embraced in one corporate body every competitor.

Mr. President, there is no evil to a free people more dangerous in every way than financial and commercial monopoly.

When a monopoly is organized strong enough to dictate the prices of the product of labor, or to dictate the prices of the necessaries of life to the laborer and the entire people, there has also been established a *commercial master on the one side and a commercial slavery on the other.* The Standard Oil Company, which fixes the price of crude oil to the producer and fixes the price of kerosene and gasoline to the consumer, regardless of values either to one or the other, exercises a commercial mastery that differs in degree, but does not differ in kind, with the mastery which Pharaoh exercised over the Egyptians when he established a monopoly in corn in Egypt.

Mr. President, under the advice of Joseph, Pharaoh and his captains stored all the surplus corn of Egypt during seven years of plenty. They exercised their legal rights. During the seven years of drought which followed they had the richest monopoly recorded in history.

The price of corn went up; the price of corn went sky-high under this monopoly of the home market. The Holy Bible advises us that, in exchange for enough of this monopolized product—

Joseph gathered up all the money that was found in the land of Egypt, and in the land of Canaan, for the corn which they bought. * * *

And when money failed in the land of Egypt, and in the land of Canaan, all the Egyptians came unto Joseph and said, "Give us bread, for why should we die in thy presence? for the money faileth."

And Joseph said, "Give your cattle; and I will give you for your cattle, if money fail."

And they brought their cattle unto Joseph, and Joseph gave them bread in exchange for horses, and for the flocks, and for the cattle of the herds, and for the asses.

And the Egyptians then gave up to this triumphant monopoly all of their land in exchange for corn for bread.

And Joseph bought all the land of Egypt for Pharaoh, for the Egyptians sold every man his field because the famine prevailed over them, so the land became Pharaoh's.

Then Joseph said unto the people, "Behold I have bought you this day, and your land for Pharaoh: lo, here is seed for you, and ye shall sow the land.

"And it shall come to pass in the increase, that ye shall give the fifth part unto Pharaoh, and four parts shall be your own, for seed of the field, and for your food, and for them of your households, and for food for your little ones."

Mr. President, we probably in this day of greater liberty and greater enlightenment would rise in revolution against the dictation of Pharaoh in this form, but the practice upon which Pharaoh acted, the principle upon which he established a monopoly in a necessary of life by the exercise of his legal rights and thereby acquired, by mastery of prices, all of the property of the Egyptians and made them his commercial servants and slaves, are in full play in this Republic under the operation of a thousand varieties of monopolies, dictating prices upon all of the necessaries of life and gradually absorbing—I may say, Mr. President, rapidly absorbing—all of the property of this Republic.

Pharaoh and his captains gave the Egyptians four-fifths of what they produced. The present masters of monopoly do not give to labor so large a part of what it produces. I have demonstrated by Exhibit 1 the wages paid as compared to the value of the gross product, and have demonstrated by those tables that taking the raw materials at the factory and calculating the additional value created directly by labor, it does not receive one-half of the value it actually creates, much less four-fifths, which was the rule established by Pharaoh.

Mr. President, it may seem austere to recall the monopoly of Pharaoh, but I think it very important that the Senate of the United States should consider and feel itself more actively responsible for the development and care of the interest of the productive masses of the Republic. I have no desire to hold the leaders of the Republican party responsible for the drift of modern times. I shall be content to see them exert themselves to retain its good features and restrain its bad features.

I am willing to exculpate them. I will be very glad to see them take advantage of a great opportunity to make themselves permanently the representatives of the people if they will only give those things to the people which they are in honor bound to give to enable them to enjoy life, liberty, the pursuit of happiness, and the fruits of their own industry, which are now filched from them by prices 50 per cent higher than the prices of the world.

WHO IS GETTING ALL THE NET PRODUCTS OF LABOR IN THIS COUNTRY?

Mr. President, it is perfectly obvious to thoughtful men that the tremendous accumulation of wealth in a few hands is leading to the rapid monopolization of every natural opportunity. Nearly all of our national transportation is so controlled. There is obvious control by monopoly of telegraph, telephone, the express, of lumber, of building material, of coal, of cotton manufactures and woolen manufactures, of farm machinery, of oil, of iron, of steel and their products; and on the other hand we have a rather pitiful condition of extreme poverty exhibiting itself in all of our great cities, side by side with this enormous concentration of wealth.

Mr. President, I believe we have the best people in the world; that even our masters of monopoly have shown a greater measure of liberality in their gigantic benefactions to the people from whom their fortunes have been drawn than any men in the history of the world. I rejoice in their benevolence. I know that they are neither hard-hearted nor lacking in generous impulse; they have simply been following the rules of business established by a rigorous commercial age, where "dividends" were emblazoned on every battle flag and "success"—"financial success"—was the only standard. It is no wonder that the weak and the poor and the inarticulate mass have been forgotten in the fierce contest for wealth and power.

We have a wonderful country and a great and magnificent people. We have a great mass of the middle classes of people, who are not in penury, have neither riches nor poverty, but comprise the bulwark of this Republic, whose patriotism, whose wisdom, whose penetrating intelligence can be perfectly relied upon; and the petty larceny of the two millions of our revenue by the sugar trust, to which they pleaded guilty in New York within the last few days, being but a trivial circumstance beside the universal plundering of the national pocketbook by the wholesale fraudulent prices fixed by the monopolies of this country, our great middle class, conservative and sound, will soon correct these evils at the ballot box.

I am deeply disappointed that the party in power has apparently lost its opportunity to serve the people by removing the tariff wall sheltering monopoly and by lowering prices in the United States.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

MONOPOLY HAS SUBJECTED LABOR TO IRREGULAR EMPLOYMENT.

The panic of 1907 was caused by monopoly and by the dangerous plutocracy our system has erected in the United States, as I fully set forth on February 25, 1908. This panic threw out of employment millions of men, two millions of whom are out of employment now, according to the recent report of Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor, from whose report I quote:

Permit me to call attention to this: At the beginning of December, 1908, I sent out a circular letter to the executive officers of a number of international trade unions of America and got from them a report as to the state of employment and unemployment, and from the reports which were made to me within fifteen or twenty days I culled the following information:

The blacksmiths report during the past year about 50 per cent of the trade unemployed; those employed averaging about four days a week.

Boiler makers and iron-ship builders, 30 per cent unemployed.
Boot and shoe workers, 25 per cent unemployed.
Bridge and structural-iron workers, 25 per cent unemployed.
Carpenters and joiners, 40 per cent unemployed.
Wood carvers, 30 per cent unemployed.
Cement workers, 30 per cent unemployed.
Cigar makers, 10 per cent unemployed.
Commercial telegraphers, 15 per cent unemployed.
Coopers, 15 per cent unemployed; two-thirds of the employed working half time.
Elevator constructors, 40 per cent unemployed.
Steam and hot-water fitters, employment in the West fair; in the East fully 40 per cent unemployed and working about one hundred and eighty days a year.
Freight handlers, about 30 per cent unemployed.
Glass-bottle blowers, about 20 per cent unemployed. On account of conditions of the trade, no work is performed during July or August.
Window-glass blowers, 20 per cent unemployed.
Granite cutters, about 15 per cent unemployed.
Hatters, men working about three-fourths time.
Hod carriers and building laborers, 60 per cent unemployed.
Hotel and restaurant employees, 30 per cent unemployed.
Machinists, 20 per cent unemployed.
Railway maintenance-of-way employees, 25 per cent unemployed.
Butcher workmen, 40 per cent unemployed.
Coal miners, work about two hundred days during the year.
Painters and decorators, 70 per cent unemployed.
Pattern makers, 30 per cent unemployed.
Pavers and rammer men, 25 per cent unemployed.
Printing pressmen, 20 per cent unemployed.
Shipwrights, joiners, and calkers, 50 per cent unemployed.
Tile layers, "state of employment very poor."
Tin-plate workers, 40 per cent unemployed.
Tobacco workers, working on two-thirds time.
Iron molders, 70 per cent unemployed.

I am sure it is not an exaggeration to say that there are now in our country, and have been with little variation since October, 1907, nearly 2,000,000 of wage-earners unemployed.

Secretary STRAUS. Do you mean by that that before that period those 2,000,000 were employed?

Mr. GOMPERS. I do, sir.

Secretary STRAUS. Are there not always some unemployed?

Mr. GOMPERS. In some trades, some callings, and seasons, yes, sir; but up to October, 1907, and for a few years just prior thereto, it was a practical fact that any man who could work could find work to do. I refer to the condition now of the men who want to work and who can find no work to do.

It is probably one of the greatest tributes that can be paid to all our people—and I think in a great measure that credit belongs to the organized workers, organized labor—that during that whole period of nearly eighteen months, and two winters, with so vast a number of unemployed, life and property have been secure and public order has been maintained; and I know of no force in all our country so potent as a conservator of the public peace as the much-abused and maligned labor organizations. In this morning's papers we read of a demonstration of the unemployed in Berlin yesterday, where the sabers of the soldiery were drawn to disperse hungry crowds. It is set forth in the cablegrams that the unemployed there proposed socialistic remedies for relief. I do not know of what those remedies or propositions for relief consisted. I take it that any proposition coming from the poor crowd of fellows who want work or relief would be regarded as extremely radical. But the American workmen ask for no relief that can at all be construed as socialistic. The relief which we ask for the men and women of our country who have been walking the streets in idleness for eighteen months we ask upon high patriotic, practical, and humane grounds, and for good economic reasons. I know, of course, that we are often met, when these matters are presented, with the statement that they are paternalistic, and that our form of government does not admit of the Government undertaking projects that would smack of paternalism. Yet in the great calamity which overtook the people of Italy quite recently the Government of our country generously and promptly appropriated $800,000 as the direct gift of the American people as a whole—this in addition to the many generous contributions of our people in their individual capacity. No word of adverse criticism has been indulged in. On the contrary, the appropriation of this vast sum of money was looked upon as a duty which in common humanity the people of our country owed to a stricken people. It is only referred to to illustrate the thought that the lingering hunger and misery due to the unemployment of our people, brought about by forces entirely beyond their control, should receive consideration at the hands of our government, both national and state.

THE MONOPOLY PROHIBITIVE TARIFF HAS EXPOSED AMERICAN LABOR TO TYRANNY.

Mr. President, the monopolies established under the prohibitive tariff have almost entirely destroyed the organizations of labor among their employees and have driven out in large measure the liberty-loving Americans and have introduced in their place foreigners who know but little of liberty—Slovaks, Bulgarians, Hungarians, Poles, Greeks, Italians.

The American workman has been subjected to foreign pauper competition; he has been refused the right to organize for his own protection.

He has been denied his political liberty.

He has been compelled to march in political parades against his will.

He has been compelled to vote against his conscience under the threat of being discharged or denied the opportunity of working for his living.

THE DEFENSE OF THESE SCHEDULES UNSOUND.

Mr. President, the chairman of the Committee on Finance, on June 4, made the only defense which has been offered of these high schedules, and in discussing the matter he said:

In general, it may be stated that the wages of textile operatives in America are double those of England, France, and Germany. A very exhaustive inquiry has recently been made into the subject of wages by the British Board of Trade, which shows that in Germany the wages of cotton weavers run from 16s. 6d. to 19s. 6d., or from $4.12 to $4.87 per week; that in France the wages run from 16s. 10d. to 19s. 2d., or from $4.20 to $4.79 per week; that in Great Britain the wages run from 16s. to 24s. 11d., or from $4 to $6.22 per week.

For the United States the Bureau of Labor, in Bulletin No. 77, July, 1908, shows that the average wages of all cotton weavers for the year 1907 was $9.74. In addition, I may state that in many of the fine yarn mills of New England making high-priced fancy fabrics the weavers earn from $11 to $13 per week.

Many of the fabrics that will be dutiable under these provisions are valued at a dollar a pound. The cost of the cotton is 20 cents a pound at the outside, leaving 80 cents a pound for cost of labor in various forms in this country. Suppose that that labor costs twice as much in the cotton-manufacturing States of the United States as it does in our competing countries abroad, it is easy to see by a mathematical calculation that 50 per cent ad valorem, to say nothing about 45 per cent, will not equalize the conditions on these various high-priced goods between our own and competing countries.

If this was an original proposition, and we were to submit to the Senate rates which were protective and adequate, in view of the difference in the cost of production, we could not make them any lower than those fixed in these specific rates which we have asked the Senate to adopt.

The chairman takes the wages of the cotton weavers of Germany, France, and Great Britain for 1905, reported by the British Board of Trade to Parliament, just after the panic, and compares these wages with the weavers in the United States for 1907, and withholds the statement made in the report from which he quotes that the wages of ribbon weavers at St. Etienne, France, was twice as great in 1906 as in 1905 and 50 per cent higher in 1907 than in 1905.

The chairman does not point out that the spinners, both male and female, in the United States, by these same tables, were paid less wages in the cotton industry in the United States than they were in Germany or France. The male spinners received $4.12 a week in the United States, $5.91 in France, and $6.57 in Germany, and the spinners in the woolen industries were paid $6.52 in the United States, $6.22 to $6.81 in France, and $7.20 to $7.79 in Germany. The foreign weavers were paid less than our weavers and the foreign spinners were paid more than our spinners, and the chairman of the Committee on Finance withholds this important fact.

It is impossible to follow a leadership that is either careless or inaccurate in making statements for the guidance of the Senate. The chairman has withheld information from this body, and the quotations he offers, being a partial truth, are wholly untrustworthy and misleading.

Mr. President, this is the only defense that has been made, and in effect it amounts to this, that a pound of fabric of cotton costs 20 cents a pound for the cotton and 80 cents a pound for the cost of labor.

The chairman proves too much; he leaves nothing for capital. The statement is obviously false. He leaves nothing for capital, for the enormous dividends paid by the cotton mills of his State.

He is flatly contradicted by the census, which shows that the total labor cost in the entire textile industry is 19.5 per cent of the gross value of the product.

He is flatly contradicted in his contention by the census reports as to every schedule.

He is flatly contradicted by Carroll D. Wright's report on relative labor cost in 446 individaul cases.

The aggregate value of the products of cotton mills for 1900 was $332,806,156 (vol. 10, Table 14). The materials used cost $116,108,879 (Table 13), and the total wages (Table 9) amounted to $86,689,752, and for cotton small wares amounted to $63,194.

Total cost	$332,806,156
Material cost	$116,108,879
Total wages	$86,689,752
Per cent of labor to gross product	26
Average per cent of tariff rate fixed by the Senate bill	47.14

Approximately twice as much as the total wages paid the American workmen, thus sheltering the manufacturer in monopoly by excluding foreign goods.

The chairman of the Committee on Finance, in the face of these census reports, rises in his place as an expert and tells

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

this Senate that the labor cost of these manufactures is 80 per cent, when the truth is 26 per cent, and he justifies the cotton schedules upon this gross and indefensible error.

Granting that foreign goods have no labor cost whatever, 26 per cent is the maximum schedule to protect the American workmen; 26 per cent is the maximum average rate required if the Republican platform is to be carried out of providing the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad.

If the labor cost abroad is one-half the labor cost in the United States, the rate required to prevent the foreign manufacturer from having the advantage in cheaper labor would be 26 per cent, the American cost, less 13 per cent, the European cost, or a net rate of 13 per cent.

The difference in the labor cost at home and abroad would therefore be 13 per cent and not 47 per cent, as the schedule is written.

Mr. President, the gross error, to use the mildest terms possible, of the Committee on Finance and the advocates of a prohibitive tariff runs in like manner through other schedules, the proof of which I submit. Taking the table of the committee itself in print No. 3 of April 12, 1909, page 68, I place side by side with the proposed ad valorem rate the total percentage of labor cost to the value of the product, the proof of which will be found in Exhibit 1, taken from the census reports, and in the volumes on manufactures, of census, 1900, and is verified by the figures of the Committee on Finance giving wages and the value of products in columns 8 and 9.

I ask attention to the recapitulation compiled by the Committee on Finance April 12, 1909, and ask permission to print that table with an interlineation which I have placed in it showing, from the figures submitted by the chairman of the Committee on Finance in that table, what is the percentage of wages to value of product as shown in 1904.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oklahoma? The Chair hears none.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Estimated revenues.

RECAPITULATION.

[Compiled by Committee on Finance, April 12, 1909. The ad valorems are based on the dutiable values.]

Schedules.	Value of merchandise (dutiable and free).	Revenue under—		Equivalent ad valorems.		Volume IX, Census 1900.[h]	Census of manufactures, 1905[a] (calendar year 1904).		Percentage of labor cost to value of products by wages and value, as shown, 1904.[h]
		Present law (act of 1897).	Proposed bill (H. R. 1438).	Present.	Proposed.	Percentage of labor cost to value of product.	Wages.	Value of products, including custom work and repairing.	
				Per ct.	*Per ct.*				
A—Chemicals, oils, and paints	$42,067,649.85	$11,187,405.69	$11,754,112.86	27.62	28.20	8	[b]$44,258,256	[c]$572,848,476	7.5
B—Earths, earthenware, and glassware	31,306,008.97	15,350,019.67	15,247,487.70	49.03	48.70	37.1	154,652,719	420,944,049	36.7
C—Metals, and manufactures of	68,016,829.55	21,812,195.72	21,523,669.22	32.44	31.65	12.7	652,109,633	3,130,253,195	20.8
D—Wood, and manufactures of	24,493,810.90	3,705,024.34	2,723,058.08	15.12	11.21	--------	378,461,021	1,393,489,978	27.1
E—Sugar, molasses, and manufactures of	92,784,081.69	60,338,523.31	59,635,940.54	65.03	65.30	--------	23,536,189	413,333,428	5.6
F—Tobacco, and manufactures of	29,959,081.79	26,125,037.41	26,113,185.29	87.20	87.18	18.9	62,640,303	331,117,681	18.9
G—Agricultural products and provisions	63,925,575.39	19,181,915.96	20,594,283.57	30.16	32.28	5.7	100,889,004	2,194,833,894	4.5
H—Spirits, wines, and other beverages	23,083,420.03	16,318,120.14	20,518,168.77	70.69	88.89	8.9	43,924,676	474,487,379	9.2
I—Cotton manufactures	31,869,814.07	14,291,026.65	15,023,742.16	44.84	47.14	26.0	217,955,322	1,014,094,237	21.4
J—Flax, hemp, and jute, and manufactures of	114,172,202.94	49,900,580.31	50,353,163.25	43.67	44.07	13.3	27,223,574	185,094,092	14.6
K—Wool, and manufactures of	62,818,797.81	36,554,815.89	36,554,815.89	58.19	58.19	19.7	135,069,063	767,210,990	17.6
L—Silks and silk goods	38,816,839.20	20,313,706.39	23,581,996.60	52.33	60.76	22.6	26,767,943	133,288,072	20.0
M—Pulp papers and books	20,005,025.62	4,136,029.42	4,042,076.14	20.67	21.88	16.2	123,903,633	548,957,239	22.5
N—Sundries	135,821,484.06	29,896,513.49	31,307,603.27	22.50	23.06	19.9	[d]340,596,182	[e]1,954,228,027	18.3
Total from customs	779,140,621.87	329,110,914.39	338,973,303.34	--------	--------	--------	[f]2,331,938,518	[g]13,534,180,743	--------
Net increase	----------	----------	9,862,388.95	--------	--------	--------	----------	----------	--------
Total luxuries, articles of voluntary use, dutiable	289,411,904.28	149,837,286.47	160,454,103.74	52.48	55.47	--------	----------	----------	--------
Total necessaries, dutiable	489,728,717.59	179,273,627.92	178,519,199.60	36.77	36.69	--------	----------	----------	--------
Total entries for consumption, dutiable and free	1,415,402,284.78	----------	338,945,001.07	--------	23.95	--------	----------	----------	--------
Total necessaries, dutiable and free	1,125,990,380.50	----------	178,519,199.60	--------	15.85	--------	----------	----------	--------

[a] Industries grouped to conform as nearly as possible with the articles enumerated in the respective schedules of the tariff law. Industries with products named in two or more schedules are credited to the schedule which includes the major product. The value of products for each group is the sum of all products of all industries in the group, and hence includes a large amount of duplication due to the product of one industry serving as material for another.

[b] Should be $56,796,143; addition erroneous.

[c] Should be $767,401,417; addition erroneous.

[d] Should be $273,959,320 (see page 67).

[e] Should be $1,495,686,437 (see page 67).

[f] Should be $2,277,838,543.

[g] Should be $13,270,192,088.

[h] Percentage of wages to value of product calculated and inserted by R. L. OWEN.

SCHEDULE A—CHEMICALS, ETC.

Mr. OWEN. This table shows that the percentage of labor to the value of the product in Schedule A, for example, by the very figures given by the Finance Committee itself, is only 7.5 per cent, while the proposed schedule is 28 per cent—four times as high as the entire labor cost involved in the product.

SCHEDULE B—GLASSWARE, ETC.

In like manner in Schedule B the total labor cost is 36 per cent. The total labor cost in Europe, if it were half as much, would leave the net difference in labor cost only 18 per cent, while the proposed tariff is 48 per cent for Schedule B.

SCHEDULE C—METALS, ETC.

In like manner Schedule C exhibits a total labor cost of 20 per cent. The difference in this labor cost and the European labor cost, accepting the statement of the chairman of the Committee on Finance that the labor cost in Europe is only half as much, would be 10 per cent, and the difference in labor cost for which the protection might be required would not exceed 10 per cent, but the proposed rate is 31 per cent—three times as high as it ought to be for protective purposes.

SCHEDULE D—WOOD, ETC.

In Schedule D the total labor cost is 27 per cent, and the difference in labor cost in this country and abroad would be 13½ per cent, not counting freight, which would be as much more in favor of this heavy material; and here the proposed rate is 11 per cent, and this schedule ought to be absolutely free in order to protect our forest and conserve our natural resources otherwise, as well as supply our people with cheap building material and our publishers with cheap paper.

SCHEDULE E—SUGAR, ETC.

In Schedule E, sugar, and so forth, the labor cost is 5.6 per cent; the difference in labor cost would be less than 3 per cent, which would be more than offset by freight, and here the proposed duty is 65 per cent, giving a complete monopoly to the sugar trust, which takes nearly all the profit, leaving a small fraction of the profit to the sugar planter.

SCHEDULE F—TOBACCO, ETC.

The total percentage of labor cost in tobacco manufactures is 18.9 per cent. The difference in this country and abroad, taking the word of the chairman of the Committee on Finance,

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

would be approximately 9½ per cent; the ad valorem rate of the Senate bill is 87 per cent.

SCHEDULE G—AGRICULTURAL, ETC.

Here the labor cost is 4.5 per cent; the difference in labor cost could not possibly equal the freight, and these products might as well be free, with some very minor exceptions, even from a standpoint of absolute protection.

But instead of corresponding with the rate required to protect, the rate is put at 32 per cent, which is perfectly silly, and should not deceive the most stupid man that ever plowed a furrow. For example, the tariff on corn is 15 cents a bushel (par. 227), and the total amount imported in 1907 was 9,000 bushels, and the amount raised was 2,595,320,000 bushels.

And the farmers of the country are flattered with 15 cents a bushel tax to keep the pauper labor of Europe from running them out of their cornfields. The American farmer who does not see the hypocrisy of this schedule and the profound contempt which it exhibits for his intelligence is assuredly incapable of reason.

SCHEDULE I—COTTON MANUFACTURES.

The labor cost in cotton manufactures, according to the figures of the chairman of the Committee on Finance, is 21.4 per cent. The difference in the labor cost in the United States and abroad would be between 10 and 11 per cent. The schedule is put at 47 per cent.

SCHEDULE J—FLAX, ETC.

In like manner the difference in the cost of labor in the production of flax, hemp, and jute goods is 7 per cent. The schedule is 44 per cent.

SCHEDULE K—WOOL, ETC.

The difference in the cost of production measured by labor in this country and abroad is about 8 per cent. The tariff is 58 per cent.

SCHEDULE L—SILK, ETC.

Silk and silk goods: The difference in labor cost of production is 10 per cent, but the proposed tariff is 60 per cent, so as to insure a monopoly.

SCHEDULE M—PAPER, ETC.

Pulp, paper, and books: In this schedule the difference in the labor cost of production at home and abroad is between 11 and 12 per cent. The tariff schedule is 21 per cent.

SCHEDULE N—SUNDRIES.

And, finally, in sundries the difference of labor cost in this country and abroad is 9 per cent, while the Committee on Finance imposed an equivalent ad valorem of 23 per cent.

I challenge the chairman of the Committee on Finance to answer this exhibit, and invite him to use all of his experts, and to put on the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD his answer, where it may be critically examined by the scholars of the country.

I charge him before the country and before the eyes of civilized mankind with writing these schedules, under the pretense of protecting the American workingman, far above the total cost of the labor in the gross product, which would not be justified even if the percentage of labor cost in similar articles abroad was absolutely nothing. But granted that the labor cost abroad is one-half what it is in the United States, I put in this table the maximum average rate, thus measuring the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad, and call the attention of the country to it.

The defense of these monopoly protecting schedules has been as remarkable as the schedules themselves. To my inquiry as to why the rates were not adjusted to the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad, the first defense was that of the Senator from New Hampshire, that the inquiry as to what was the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad was absurd.

Mr. President, I have demonstrated that the answer of the Senator from New Hampshire is itself absurd, if it were offered in perfect good faith, as I am sure it was.

The next answer would appear to come from the Senator from Massachusetts, who, having explained a question I did not ask, saw fit to suggest he could not give the Senator from Oklahoma the understanding with which to comprehend, and when I succeeded in enabling him to understand my question he confessed that he was not prepared to answer it.

The Senator from Rhode Island, the chairman of the Committee on Finance, whose genuine good temper at least I always admire, suggested as a proper answer to my inquiry that I was "new to the Senate," a polite way of suggesting a lack of learning and understanding which is commonly practiced by the managers of the committee on committees when they can not answer intelligently an embarrassing question.

The Senator from Montana, another one of the able defendants of this totally indefensible bill, with its monopoly-protecting schedules, thought it a sufficient answer to suggest that the Senator from Oklahoma could not expect to be furnished with intelligence.

Mr. President, I invite the defenders of this bill to put upon the face of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an answer to these tables which I have submitted, showing the relative labor cost of our manufactures and the gross disparity of the schedules they submit in comparison with the lower rates which would properly measure the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad.

The proponents of these schedules, in my opinion, can not answer my objections without putting themselves to utter confusion, if they answer in a spirit of perfect moral and intellectual integrity and frankness, because it contains a multitude of items which are practically prohibitive, which produce no revenue worth mentioning, and has resulted necessarily in the exclusion of foreign competition, followed by combinations in restraint of trade and the establishment of monopoly prices—charging the people too much for what they buy from monopoly and paying them too little for what they sell to monopoly. This is why the Republican organization pledged itself to revise the tariff and made the people believe it would be a downward revision.

I give a table of examples of these prohibitive duties, together with the paragraph of the bill, duty, the revenue, and the table from which the information is drawn.

These are but a few of the items which might be multiplied indefinitely.

EXHIBIT 14.

It should be remembered that in products of wholesale international use our imports may be prevented by a small tax where it makes the imports unprofitable, so that the prohibitive rates which average just high enough to prevent competition, as shown by the table below, serve as a great check to international commerce and lower the amount of revenue which we ought to receive under a system of liberal imports and exports.

The trivial reductions claimed to have been made by the Senate bill as amended are of no consequence, because the rates lowered were so far above the prohibitive point that lowering the rates leaves them still prohibitive and reminds me of the quotation of my colleague from Macbeth:

> Then be these juggling fiends no more believed,
> Who palter with us in a double sense,
> Who keep the word of promise to our ear,
> And break it to our hope.

TAXING RAW MATERIALS INJURIOUS TO AMERICAN MANUFACTURERS AND NATIONAL COMMERCE.

Mr. President, when we tax by the tariff the materials needed by our manufacturers, whether such materials are raw materials or partly in the process of manufacture, we put our American manufacturers at a serious disadvantage in competing with foreign manufacturers in the markets of the United States and obstruct our own commercial expansion.

Foreign countries provide their manufacturers in large degree with free raw material, and therefore with cheaper materials needed for manufacture. Foreign manufacturers have, therefore, this advantage over our manufacturers in competing for the markets. Taxing raw materials used by our manufacturers will, for this reason, limit our foreign exports of manufactured goods. This means limiting the production of American factories. This means restricting the number of our workmen, lessening the demand for their labor, lowering their wages; and, what is more, means also a smaller output and a consequent greater cost to the consumer (over and above the increased cost imposed by higher raw materials), for the reason that the greater the output the more economic the production.

Cheaper material means a greater foreign market for American productions; it means increased demand for American labor; it means higher wages for American labor; and it means cheaper prices for American consumers, always believing, as I believe, that the artificial prices now fixed by monopoly will be in due season abated.

American manufacturers are at a further disadvantage because *they sell to foreigners* the goods needed in more advanced manufactures *cheaper than they do to each other within our own borders.* Because of this, millions of capital created by American labor is going abroad to get the advantage of these cheaper prices and to employ, not American workmen, but foreign workmen. (See North's report.)

ANY OBSTRUCTION TO COMMERCE LIMITS THE OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE LEGITIMATE EMPLOYMENT OF BOTH CAPITAL AND LABOR.

Mr. President, it is perfectly obvious, that having provided a tariff high enough to equal "the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad," so as to put our manufacturers

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

on a perfect level with the manufacturers of foreign lands in the cost of production, that any further tax upon our imports or our exports, or upon their imports or exports is merely a barrier to a free interchange of commerce, limiting both our commerce and their commerce.

There is a very important factor in commerce separate and apart from the question of equality of cost. We import woolen goods, cotton goods, silk goods, and we export goods of the same material to the very countries from which we import such goods. The factor entering into this proposition is not one of cold economy alone, for it obviously would be more economical to buy our woolen goods in our own country and save the difference of freight and the same thing would be true for the Europeans—that it would be better for them to keep their goods at home from a standpoint purely of economy.

But the question of economy is not the only factor controlling or guiding exports and imports. It is a question of taste and of personal fancy that causes Americans to buy French, Scotch, or English goods, and which causes the Scotch, English, and French to buy American goods. We enlarge their markets by buying their stuff. They enlarge our markets by buying our stuff. We increase the demand for their labor; they increase the demand for our labor; and we export no more than we import, for the volume of our exports is determined by the volume of our imports (using these terms to cover credits and expenditures).

VOLUME OF EXPORTS CONTROLLED BY VOLUME OF IMPORTS.

This question can be reduced to a mathematical demonstration, properly interpreted. It is only necessary to take the unit of the export or of the import to determine this question. When the American exports $100,000 worth of goods in any form, whether in cotton bales or in cotton cloth, he receives from his foreign customer a hundred thousand dollars in money, or credit, which he may convert at his will into cash or into goods, and his export will be balanced with an import or its mercantile equivalent in cash, in credit, or expenditure abroad, or with work performed, as in carrying freights, and so forth.

A vast multitude of such transactions do not alter this substantial truth. It merely enlarges and emphasizes it, and it may be taken as a sound commercial maxim that our exports are balanced by our imports and our imports are balanced by our exports, and when we obstruct our imports we obstruct our exports, and thereby diminish the world's demand for the goods of our manufacturers; we thereby diminish the world's demand for the products of American labor; we thereby diminish the demand for American labor; we thereby diminish the employment of American labor and lower the wages of American labor.

BALANCE OF TRADE.

[Giffen Essays in Finance, 161.]

Tables showing the balance of trade are apt to mislead men. For example, our statistics will exhibit in one column our imports, in another column our exports, and the balance is called the "balance of trade." If we have exports more than we have imports in these tables the balance of trade is said to be in our favor.

This conclusion of the balance being in our favor is unmitigated nonsense. Whenever we ship goods from the United States we get what our citizens regard as the equivalent, in cash, credits, or other property.

He who attempts to draw any conclusion whatever as to a nation's wealth or poverty from the mere fact of a favorable or unfavorable balance of trade has not grasped the first fundamental principle of political economy. (R. T. Ely, Problems of To-day, p. 28.)

The plain truth is our statistics, showing merely "exports" and "imports," do not and can not take into account our credits abroad or the credits of foreigners in the United States.

They do not and they can not take into account the payment by the United States of exceeding $100,000,000 annually for ocean-going freight and passengers carried exclusively in foreign bottoms. These tables can not take into account expenditures of citizens of the United States abroad, which probably exceed $100,000,000 per annum.

These tables do not take into account millions of dollars shipped abroad by foreigners working in the United States.

These tables do not take into account numerous foreign investments made by citizens of the United States in foreign lands and by foreigners in our land.

These tables do not take into account even the transfer of great estates from the United States abroad by international marriages.

The plain truth, which can not be disputed without stultification, is this, that for every export we receive its equivalent in cash or credit, and for every import we pay in cash or credit.

The available gold in the world, which is the basis of what we call "cash," is a comparatively small amount. The total gold in the United States amounted to one thousand five hundred and ninety-three millions December 31, 1906. (Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1907, pp. 742.)

The annual production of gold in the world amounted to four hundred millions in 1906. Germany had over a thousand millions in gold, and France about a thousand millions in gold, and the British Empire about a thousand millions in gold in 1906, and all of the gold money on earth combined did not exceed seven billions.

No thoughtful man will pretend that we can pursue a policy by which our exports would be paid in gold and not paid in the goods and credits and properties of foreign countries. It can therefore be taken as true *that our exports are paid for by imports*, and that *when we limit our imports we limit our exports* and our national commerce under *a law as fixed as the law of gravitation.*

Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire made a single defense with regard to these schedules which I desire to answer, and it is the only defense, outside of that of the chairman, so far as I have observed in the RECORD, that I regard as meeting the matter in any degree, and that is the statement, in effect, that by lowering these schedules we would invite into this country the imports of other countries, which would throw out of employment our own laborers.

This theory, Mr. President, is not sustained by the theory of economic teaching which shows that inevitably exports are always paid for by imports and imports are paid for by exports. If we examine into the individual transactions of which the aggregate is composed, we will observe that when any American ships abroad any export, whether it be cotton or cotton goods of any kind, he is immediately paid in cash or cash credits or its equivalent, and therefore there comes back to the United States the immediate equivalent of that which the American exports. That individual export is instantly balanced. Since the whole must be composed of its several parts, it follows that exports are paid for by imports and imports are paid for by exports, and when we reduce the tariff and invite into our country foreign exports in effect we stimulate American industries; we enlarge the productive power of the American factory; we increase the demand for labor and the employment of capital; and we put ourselves in the attitude of shipping abroad more things than we now ship and enlarging both our exports and imports in like volume. I think the reason why our imports and our exports compare so unfavorably with the other nations of the earth is largely because we have followed the Chinese method of excluding, in large measure, the products of other lands.

I wish to call attention to our status as to imports and exports per capita.

COMPARISON OF THE COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES AND OTHER COUNTRIES.

We plume ourselves on our tremendous commerce in exports and imports when, in point of fact, our rank among other nations of the world in the quantity of our foreign commerce per capita is entirely discreditable to us. In the quantity of our exports and imports we rank far inferior to every highly civilized country in Europe, as the following table will exhibit, taken from the Statistical Abstract of the United States for 1907, page 738:

Imports and exports per capita of countries, 1906.

Country.	Imports.	Exports.
United States	17.30	22.10
Argentina	34.87	54.87
New Zealand	70.23	85.70
Australia	53.77	79.70
Belgium	93.90	75.30
Canada	45.08	39.84
Costa Rica	22.53	29.25
Chile	21.25	29.89
Cuba	62.31	66.06
Denmark	64.82	55.55
France	25.86	24.77
German Empire	28.05	22.56
Netherlands	184.36	143.01
Norway	36.22	21.91
Sweden	29.23	22.93
Switzerland	81.97	59.97
United Kingdom	68.45	42.49
Uruguay	21.13	38.34

The imports of the German Empire, of France, United Kingdom, of the Netherlands, of Norway and Sweden, of Switzerland, exceed their exports by hundreds of millions, but the exports of Siam, Egypt, Peru, British Indies, Haiti, Cuba, Mexico, Russia, Santo Domingo, and the Kongo have their exports exceeding their imports, and we are not in a good class if civilization and intelligence are considered.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

We are in the activity of our foreign commerce, however, decidedly ahead of the Kongo Free State, Persia, Peru, Paraguay, India, Siam, and Turkey. Our country can feel but little pride in the school of political economy, if organized blind greed can be called a school of political economy, controlling the United States and its pitiful comparison with the foreign output of the other intelligent nations of the world. Let us at least equal Great Britain, which has learned the economic truth that prohibitive tariffs obstruct and do not promote commerce, and let us act upon that policy, retaining our tariff for revenue, high enough for honest incidental protection and no higher.

Our patriotic citizenship has been grossly misled by the leaders of the party in power as to our comparative commercial activities.

The growth of our exports and imports show a small relative increase:

Our total imports:	
1881	650,000,000
1890	773,000,000
1900	830,000,000
1907	1,415,000,000
Our total exports:	
1881	883,000,000
1890	845,000,000
1900	1,370,000,000
1907	1,853,000,000
Population in—	
1881	58,000,000
1890	62,000,000
1900	75,000,000
1907 (estimated)	88,000,000

It will be seen from these tables that notwithstanding the tremendous improvement in modern machinery and the increased output from that source, and the wonderful growth of seagoing vessels and their freight-carrying capacity, our exports and imports have about doubled in twenty-six years and have not increased much faster than our population. This is a discreditable showing to the intelligence of the American people.

It will thus be seen, Mr. President, that our exports and imports are small compared to the exports and imports of nations whom we have been taught to believe inferior to us; but in the building of a nation we are ourselves vast consumers of our own products, and this must stand to our credit.

It will also be seen that our exports and imports have not grown in the last quarter of a century much more rapidly than our population, which shows in fact that we have not kept pace in foreign exports with the enormous productive capacity of modern machinery and invention.

These are facts worthy of consideration, which tend to show the natural consequences of obstructing our imports by prohibitive taxes, by vexatious and difficult regulations; and the present bill is peculiarly unwise because instead of providing a substantial reduction on the prohibitive tariff rates and removing the obstructions to our commerce it has utterly failed to do so. On the contrary, it has increased many items and the average of all items, and the crowning absurdity is offered in proposing to penalize foreign countries, who are already largely excluded from our markets, by threatening them with a 25 per cent advance on rates now largely prohibitive unless they promptly remove within the year the tariff obstructions which are obnoxious to us, and thus we invite the retaliation of the nations of all the world. Nations are composed of individuals, and the law of human nature which governs the individual will govern nations to a substantial degree.

OUR NATIONAL PROSPERITY IS NOT DUE TO A PROHIBITIVE TARIFF, BUT IN SPITE OF IT.

Mr. President, it has been a common practice for the advocates of the high tariff to claim that the prosperity of the people of the United States and the employment of its people is due to the so-called "protective tariff;" nothing could be more utterly fallacious.

Modern prosperity is due to the dissemination of human knowledge through the printing press, inventions of labor-saving machinery, hundreds of thousands of inventions under the reward of personal patents granted by the United States, granted by Great Britain, by Germany, by France, by Norway and Sweden, by Italy, by Japan, by every civilized country in the world.

The United States has granted over 900,000 different patents covering art in manufacture, but the art to which we are chiefly indebted for our modern prosperity is the development of paper making and the printing presses, by which the learning and the knowledge of all men is made the common property of every man and enriched him beyond all computation.

Out of these inventions have sprung the incredibly cheap manufacture of cloth and fabrics of every description; of metals in a multitude of forms, from Bessemer steel to the Waterbury watch, made by machinery and distributed to man at an incredibly cheap price. The telegraph, the telephone, the modern railway, the mail service, and every agency of civilization have been brought into service by the wonderful increase of the intelligence of man. China has just completed its first railway built by Chinese engineers and workmen, and soon will be the joint heir of the wonderful increase in human knowledge.

All of the nations of the world prosper in this magnificent development of the human race, due to the increased intelligence of man, due to modern processes, springing chiefly, and above all, from the great invention of Gutenberg.

Mr. President, not long since I stood upon the banks of the Niagara River. Down the canal below the great falls I saw a great wood yard, and saw two men passing pieces of wood to an endless belt. I followed it down the bluff nearly 200 feet; below a giant penstock of 7 feet in diameter delivered a column of water upon a turbine wheel developing over 1,000 horsepower, which caused to spin with lightning speed French burr wheels, against which these pieces of wood were placed and pressed by hydraulic pressure.

They melted almost instantly, and the macerated fiber by an endless belt, passing immediately to the paper factory on top of the bluff, was automatically delivered into a circular vat with moving arms; adjacent was a man engaged in putting into this vat sizing; the prepared mixture was fed upon an endless belt, porous—the water dripped through, the sheet of wet paper emerged, passing through a series of rolls, the last ones heated by steam, and at the end of the comparatively small room the material which a few minutes before had been logs of wood appeared as rolls of news paper ready for the Hoe press.

At Herald square, New York, I saw these same rolls being fed like lightning into giant printing presses and emerging a modern newspaper, a miracle of design; hundreds of thousands of copies turned out in a few short hours, full of learning, literature, art, full of business, full of wit and humor, full of the news of the whole world gathered together by the ablest men with the aid of the telephone and telegraph; filled with beautiful illustrations and photographs of everything conceivable.

Mr. President, where is the advocate of the prohibitive tariff so lacking in common sense or intellectual integrity that he will assert that these great advances of the human race, which are common to all the civilized nations, whether they have or whether they have not a protective tariff, nevertheless enjoy all of these things. Let those who believe that these things are due to the protective tariff support this bill and applaud it. But those that see that these things are due to the development of the human race and to the providence of God can be misled by no such shallow sophistry.

Mr. President, England has been very prosperous; she is the mistress of the seas; the sun never sets upon her dominions; her wealth is enormous. The prosperity of England is not due to the protective tariff, but to the policy of the greatest freedom of international commerce.

France and Germany have the protective tariff and are likewise prosperous, but they are prosperous in spite of the protective tariff and not because of it. The prosperity of the whole world is due to the increasing intelligence of the human race, its mastery over the forces of nature, its substitution of machinery for the labor of man.

"Protectionists justly contend that the high tariff of 1897 has not ruined the foreign trade of the United States, which on both its import and export sides has exhibited a great advance." Undoubtedly this contention is true, but the obstructions interposed in commerce has not served to make the imports and exports of the United States contrast favorably with the exports and imports of other nations. The imports and exports of the United States do not compare favorably with those of the civilized nations of the world, as I have already shown.

One thing should be settled for all time, and that is such prosperity as we have can not be due to the artificial obstruction of our international commerce.

HOW THE PRESENT SYSTEM WAS ESTABLISHED.

It would seem incredible that the monopoly engendering policy could be established and persisted in against the will of the people, and I shall endeavor to show how this has occurred and its proper remedy.

In 1856 both parties were agreed on a low revenue-producing tariff. For fifteen year everybody had been content with the low Walker tariff of 1846. The exigency of the civil war required a high tariff for the extra revenues demanded at that time.

Like all tariffs this Morrill tariff of 1861 raised the prices on the consumer and gave the American manufacturer a special opportunity to make money at the expense of the consumer.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

When the war was over the question of lowering the tariff began to be considered.

The Protective Tariff League was thereupon organized, with far-reaching affiliations, powerful press agencies, with an educational bureau which instructed every boy who approached the voting age throughout the United States in the sophistry of a high tariff, appealing to his patriotism to stand by American labor. This policy has had abundant success, but it could not have succeeded except for the political changes in party administration which had taken place prior to the war.

This change to which I refer was the transfer of the power directly from the people through the agencies of precinct conventions, nominating delegates to county conventions, county conventions composed of delegated delegates to select delegates for the state convention, state conventions composed of delegates delegated by delegated delegates.

These political functionaries were thrice removed from the people, the state delegates being delegated by county delegates, the county delegates being delegated by precinct delegates, and the precinct delegates probably delegated by the local representatives of what is known as the "machine politician" and his petty circle.

In machine politics the precinct manager will call a primary at some place convenient for his control and probably inconvenient for the attendance of the people. He will notify his strikers in advance and be sure of a sufficient number to put through a slate and plan agreed upon. In this manner the machine can evade a wholesome public opinion and manipulate the delegates to the county convention, and with this machine county convention a machine state convention is assured.

In this manner any person having an important material interest to serve, such as establishing or maintaining a policy of government, permitting some people to tax other people for their benefit, have a political opportunity.

All that the Protective Tariff League and its commercial and political allies had to do under this system of government was to have a proper bureau established, see to it that representatives of the system were in place to manage the machine politics; and in this way they have been able to control nominating conventions—county, State, and national—and the will of the great body of the people could not make itself freely felt, being unorganized and not clearly realizing the manner in which the monopoly-producing system was taxing them.

The Protective Tariff League and the representatives of selfish commercial interests, the beneficiaries of the manipulations of our statutes, have intertwined and interwoven themselves with the organization of the Republican party in such a manner as to be inextricable. They have successfully appealed to the well-known patriotism of the great body of Republican citizens and skillfully trained them to believe as true, things which were not true in fact, and were sophistical in reason and unsound in conclusion. This process has gone on until it has become impossible to separate the political and patriotic impulse from the commercial, so that men of high character and upright purposes find themselves used against their will and are more often used in total unconsciousness of the fact that they are being used by commercial interests under the color of patriotism and party pride. The machine method of politics is a bad method and ought to be abated.

BOTH PARTIES HAVE BEEN AFFECTED BY THIS EVIL.

It is this method which sometimes sends to the Senate of the United States representatives who would not be the choice of the people at a popular election.

It is natural therefore that the election of Senators by direct vote, or the nomination of Senators by direct vote, should not be approved by those who have been or might expect to be indebted to machine politics hereafter for their own preferment.

It was a recognition of this abuse, which has grown up in our country, that led the Democratic party at Denver, which, I freely confess, is not entirely purged of this evil of machine politics, to put the query to the people of the United States, Shall the people rule?

The true remedy for this condition is not by an inconsequential debate with the chairman of the Committee on Finance, who has spent months and years over these schedules without ever touching the only question of importance, to wit, the difference in the cost of the production at home and abroad, but it is to be found by reducing the political machine to innocuous desuetude and the restoration of the people's rule by the direct primary, allowing each citizen, regardless of party, to nominate and elect his representative in county, State, and Nation, and to establish an "initiative and referendum," with its salutary check on the representatives of the people.

Machine politics glorifies organization and forgets that the best safeguard of society is to allow the actual sentiment of the majority of the people having appreciable education to rule and not take that power out of their hands by clever machine manipulation.

When we follow delegation of power from the citizen to the primary delegate, from the primary delegate to the county delegate, from the county delegate to the nominee for the legislature, from the member of the legislature to the United States Senate, a Senator chosen in this manner is four degrees removed from the people.

Through machine politics selfish interests can exercise an undue influence in our parties and in our administration of government. I can not but feel that the influences of monopoly in this country are in present control; that this bill is written to serve their purposes; to make the rich richer and the poor poorer; to benefit the few at the expense of the many.

In making this comment I do so with the profound conviction that this condition can not be greatly prolonged, but that the American people will in a short time cause the laws to be so amended as to promote the greatest of all modern needs—*the more equitable distribution of the proceeds of human labor.*

> Ill fares the land to hastening ills a prey,
> Where wealth accumulates and men decay.

Mr. President, I do not desire to detain the Senate longer. I have taken some pains to show that in the protected industries the labor of the country is not paid as well as in the unprotected industries; that labor has continued to receive a diminishing part of the proceeds of labor; that labor has not received a fair share of its own product. I have undertaken to show how labor was naturally oppressed by the upbuilding of gigantic monopolies in this country, whose policy was to close up factories, to pay labor as small a wage as possible, to raise prices, and to limit the output; to tax the people as high as they thought the "traffic would bear," and to control their wage-earners, both commercially and politically. That is a very natural thing for them to do. They are not greatly to blame if the law permit. The lawmaker is greatly to blame if the law continues to permit.

But I have also demonstrated that our census shows, in the most overwhelming and convincing manner, that this bill has paid no attention whatever to "the difference in cost of production at home and abroad;" that that difference, even if the foreign manufacturer paid nothing whatever for his labor, could not exceed nineteen and a fraction per cent for pure protective purposes, while many of the rates in this bill exceed 100 per cent. Having shown this, having pointed out what the effect has been upon the wages and general conditions of labor and upon the mortality of human life under this system of government which we have been following; having submitted the suggestions for the amendment of these conditions, in the hope that perhaps in the future they may be of some use to future students of these questions, I am done.

I have called attention to the policy of New Zealand, which protects human life first, which has controlled monopoly, in order that the poorer and the weaker elements of society may have a better opportunity to live. I have called attention to what the necessary result is of gigantic fortunes piling up until the fortune of a single individual will reach nearly a thousand millions; that its only effect upon this country must be to absorb all of the transportation and transmission companies, all the coal mines, all of the purchasable lumber and ores, all of the purchasable real estate, all of the things visible and invisible desired by men and generally grouped together and called the "opportunities of life."

There can be but one result, and the Senate is in honor bound to consider this and to find a way to control it and correct it, in order to protect the children and the women, as well as the men of this country.

I can do nothing more than appeal to the Senate and to call their attention to their responsibility in this matter. Having done so, I have discharged the only duty which it is possible for me to discharge. I have given many days of hard labor to this question, and of unremitting industry, in a desire to place upon this record the truth, and nothing but the truth, in the hope that it might appeal to the leaders of the Senate, and, if it did not, that it might appeal to the people of the United States.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

APPENDIX.

EXHIBIT 2.

Tables prepared by Edward Atkinson, of Boston, showing the relative number of employees in the so-called "protected or partially protected industries." (S. Doc. 46, 61st Cong., 1st sess.)

CLASS I.

Persons occupied for gain who are free from the competition of an import from a foreign country:

(We sell to Canada twice the quantity of the products of agriculture and of manufactures that we import. In ratio to numbers the Canadians are now our best foreign customers, and there is little opposition to the treaty of reciprocity.)

Free of foreign competition in agriculture or listed under that title.

Farmers, planters, and overseers	5,674,875	
Agricultural laborers	4,410,877	
Gardeners, florists, and nurserymen	61,788	
Dairy men and women	10,875	
Other agricultural pursuits	5,530	
		10,163,945
Lumbermen and raftsmen		72,020
Stock raisers, herders, and drovers		84,988
Turpentine farmers and laborers		24,737
Wood choppers		36,075
		10,381,765
Less the number subject to competition removed to Class III		200,000
		10,181,765

Also free of foreign competition.

All persons in professional service	1,258,739
All persons in domestic and personal service	5,580,657
All persons in trade and transportation	4,766,964
	21,788,125

Free from foreign competition in manufactures and the mechanic arts.

Persons occupied in building trades		1,212,526
Oil wells and employees		24,626
Brick and tile makers (with a few exceptions)		49,933
Miners and quarrymen (with a few exceptions)		563,866
Bakers		79,188
Butchers		113,956
Confectioners (with a few exceptions)		31,194
Millers		40,548
Blacksmiths		226,477
Iron and steel workers (with a few exceptions)		290,611
Steam boiler makers		33,046
Stove, furnace, and grate manufacturers		12,473
Wheelwrights		13,505
Boot and shoe makers (with a few exceptions)		208,912
Leather curriers and tanners (with a few exceptions)		42,671
Bottlers and soda-water manufacturers		10,519
Cabinetmakers (with a few exceptions)		35,619
Coopers		37,200
Saw and planing mill operatives		161,624
Other woodworkers		111,273
Paper-box makers		21,098
Charcoal, coke, and lime burners		14,448
Model and pattern makers		15,073
Rubber factory operatives (with a few exceptions)		21,866
Upholsterers		30,821
Small miscellaneous industries (with a few exceptions)		471,300
Printers, lithographers, and pressmen (with a few exceptions)		155,147
Fishermen and oystermen	68,177	
Less the small number in deep-sea fisheries transferred to Class III numbering not over	8,000	
		60,177
Engineers and firemen	223,495	
Less the proportion probably occupied in arts in Classes II and III in part or fully subject to foreign competition	23,495	
		200,000
		4,289,697

CLASS II.

Persons occupied for gain who would be practically free from foreign competition if materials of foreign origin used in their processes were free of duty:

Chemicals (other than oil wells and oils)		14,814
Glass workers (subject to a few exceptions)		49,998
Marble and stone cutters (subject to a few exceptions)		54,460
Potters (mostly making tiles, drainpipes, etc.) (subject to a few exceptions)		16,140
Butter and cheese (subject to a few exceptions)		19,241
Food preparations (subject to a few exceptions)		28,782
Machinists (subject to a few exceptions)		283,145
Tool and cutlery makers (subject to a few exceptions)		28,122
Wire-workers (subject to a few exceptions)		18,487
Harness and saddle (subject to a few exceptions)		40,101
Trunk and leather case (subject to a few exceptions)		7,051
Brewers and maltsters (subject to a few exceptions)		20,962
Distillers and rectifiers (subject to a few exceptions)		3,144
Brass workers (subject to a few exceptions)		26,760
Clock and watch makers (subject to a few exceptions)		24,120
Gold and silver workers (subject to a few exceptions)		26,112
Tin plate and tinware (subject to a few exceptions)		70,505
Other metal workers (subject to a few exceptions)		56,602
Bookbinders (subject to a few exceptions)		30,278
Engravers (subject to a few exceptions)		11,151
Paper and pulp mills (subject to a few exceptions)		36,328
Textile industries	567,065	
Less those occupied in the finer and fancy fabrics, say, removed to Class III	67,065	
		500,000
Tailors, seamstresses, milliners, shirt makers, and makers of other clothing	907,466	
Less those who are on the finest articles of fancy and fashion	7,466	
		900,000
Engineers and firemen		23,495
Glove makers	12,271	
Less removed to Class III	2,271	
		10,000
Broom and brush makers		10,220
Photographers (with a few exceptions)		26,941
Tobacco and cigars (with a few exceptions)		131,452
Manufacturers and officials	243,082	
Less transferred to Class III	3,082	
		240,000
		2,708,411
Deducting for the few exceptions in fine and fancy cut and plate glass; Italian marble; fine and hand-decorated china; Stilton, Roquefort, and other fancy cheeses; Scotch marmalade and the like; worsted combers and other machinery in which there is much hand work; fancy cutlery; English saddles and harnesses of high cost; handmade trunks, boots, and shoes; foreign beer and ale of special brands; fine wines and liquors; hand work in brass, copper, gold, and silver; a few watches; finely bound and printed books, engravings, and photographs; fancy paper; handmade brushes; and a few other articles not specifically transferred to Class III, estimated in number at		312,116
There remains in Class II free of competition		2,396,295

CLASS III.

Subject to foreign competition—	
In agriculture	200,000
In deep-sea fisheries	8,000
Textile operatives	67,065
Clothing	7,466
Glove makers	2,271
Manufacturers and officials	3,082
	287,884
Add from tabulation of Classes I and II as per previous list of exportations	312,116
Probable number subject to foreign competition	600,000

That number comprises all who, in the judgment of the compiler, could be subject to foreign competition of an adverse or urgent kind if no duty, even for revenue, were maintained. A moderate duty for revenue purposes would incidentally protect them.

RECAPITULATION.

Class I.—Persons who can not be subjected to foreign competition, but who pay their proportion of duties on imports and of the enhancement of prices brought into effect by protection	26,077,822
Class II.—Persons not subject to foreign competition, whose industry in many branches would be promoted by the abatement of duties on materials of foreign origin used by them	2,396,295
Class III.—Persons occupied in arts which would require a readjustment if all duties were suddenly removed, which no one proposes	600,000
Total	29,074,117

In dealing with Classes I and II, I have used my own experience and judgment in putting into Class III such proportion of persons occupied (especially in the textile arts) as may make the finer and fancy or handmade fabrics which depend mainly on fashion and fancy for their sale.

I have also assumed the abatement of duties on wool, hides, drugs, dyestuffs, and chemicals, from which about $15,000,000 of revenue are now derived. So long as these taxes exist the manufactures of textile fabrics, boots, shoes, and leather goods, paper, and many other articles are restricted and their exports are much lessened.

Under Class II, subject only in small part to foreign competition, are also listed glass, pottery, chemicals, tools, brewers, clocks, watches, gold and silver ware, tailors, milliners, photographers, and machinery. I have made allowance by exceptions in these arts to the best of my judgment.

In all these arts there is, and probably always will be, an import of the fine and fancy fabrics or of articles chosen for style or fashion, all of which are suitable subjects for revenue duties. These imports rather set a standard for domestic manufacturers to emulate than subject them to competition in the great bulk of their products, which are for the use of the millions rather than the millionaires. Tobacco will always be subject to revenue duties. Under existing conditions there is no justification for duties on machinery, pig iron, copper, coal, ores, or other metals, which are the materials and tools of our domestic industry. We are exporting the highest types of metallurgy and machinery, while the tax on special machinery of other kinds which we import, and upon coal, ores, hay, potatoes, fish, beeves, and other necessities are burdens upon industry of the most obnoxious kind.

If anyone takes exception to this division, and now justifies the continuance of a tariff for "protection with incidental revenue," let him carry over as many as he honestly can from Classes I and II into Class III, giving reasons for such changes. I think it will prove impossible for any sincere student of the subject to designate 1,000,000 persons out of the 29,000,000 now occupied for gain whose industry would be seriously or adversely affected, even if all duties on foreign products of like kind were at once removed—an act which no one proposes. If all duties on materials were removed, the number would be lessened far below a million.

On the other hand, there are proportionately in agriculture from 1,500,000 to 2,000,000 out of 10,000,000 who rest upon exports for the disposal of their surplus products. There are about as many persons occupied even in manufacturing and in the mechanic arts only, whose products are exported, as there are in all the same arts which are now or can be protected by duties on imports. Out of 29,000,000 persons occupied for gain, not over 3,000,000 to 4,000,000 are or can be directly affected by tariff legislation, either by the obstruction of exports or imports in consequence of duties on imports. Twenty-five million are engaged in arts necessary to the existence of society and which can neither be promoted nor retarded by duties on imports, except so far as the cost of their living is increased by an ill-adjusted or injudicious system of taxation.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

EXHIBIT 3.

Distribution of employees for the year ending June 30, 1907, by groups.

[Statistics of railways in United States, 1907, Interstate Commerce Commission.]

Territory covered.	General administration.		Maintenance of way and structures.		Maintenance of equipment.		Conducting transportation.		Unclassified.	
	Number.	Per 100 miles of line.	Number.	Per 100 miles of line.	Number.	Per 100 miles of line.	Number.	Per 100 miles of line.	Number.	Per 100 miles of line.
Group I	2,728	33	22,517	276	13,282	163	47,069	577	73	1
Group II	12,905	54	101,183	424	89,965	377	197,476	827	196	(a)
Group III	7,458	29	73,698	283	56,484	217	106,362	409	57	(a)
Group IV	4,238	32	25,011	192	17,848	137	34,083	262	603	5
Group V	6,396	24	45,714	176	35,441	136	62,415	240	764	3
Group VI	12,606	25	99,734	195	57,470	112	124,588	244	270	1
Group VII	2,043	17	22,654	190	10,838	91	19,386	162	.....	.....
Group VIII	7,331	23	66,563	210	30,491	96	59,998	190	102	(a)
Group IX	3,587	22	29,800	181	16,293	99	25,574	156	697	4
Group X	5,516	29	51,129	267	24,069	126	36,514	191	855	4
United States, 1907	64,808	28	538,003	236	352,181	155	713,465	314	3,617	2
United States, 1906	57,054	26	495,879	223	315,952	142	649,820	292	2,650	1
United States, 1905	54,141	25	448,370	207	281,000	130	595,456	274	3,229	1
United States, 1904	48,746	23	415,721	196	261,819	123	566,798	267	3,037	2
United States, 1903	45,222	22	433,648	211	253,889	124	576,881	281	2,897	1
United States, 1902	41,071	20	399,592	200	228,280	114	518,390	259	1,982	1
United States, 1901	38,816	20	343,717	176	206,418	105	479,111	245	3,107	2
United States, 1900	36,451	19	324,946	169	197,799	103	450,063	234	8,394	4
United States, 1899	34,170	18	287,163	153	180,749	96	417,508	223	9,334	5
United States, 1898	32,431	18	261,866	142	171,600	93	398,907	216	9,754	5
United States, 1897	31,871	17	244,873	134	160,667	88	378,361	206	7,704	4

[a] Less than 1.

Comparative summary of average daily compensation of railway employees for the years ending June 30, 1907 to 1897.

[Average daily compensation in dollars.]

Class.	United States.										
	1907.	1906.	1905.	1904.	1903.	1902.	1901.	1900.	1899.	1898.	1897.
General officers	11.93	11.81	11.74	11.61	11.27	11.17	10.97	10.45	10.03	9.73	9.54
Other officers	5.99	5.82	6.02	6.07	5.76	5.60	5.56	5.22	5.18	5.21	5.12
General office clerks	2.30	2.24	2.24	2.22	2.21	2.18	2.19	2.19	2.20	2.25	2.18
Station agents	2.05	1.94	1.93	1.93	1.87	1.80	1.77	1.75	1.74	1.73	1.73
Other station men	1.78	1.69	1.71	1.69	1.64	1.61	1.59	1.60	1.60	1.61	1.62
Enginemen	4.30	4.12	4.12	4.10	4.01	3.84	3.78	3.75	3.72	3.72	3.65
Firemen	2.54	2.42	2.38	2.35	2.28	2.20	2.16	2.14	2.10	2.09	2.05
Conductors	3.69	3.51	3.50	3.50	3.38	3.21	3.17	3.17	3.13	3.13	3.07
Other trainmen	2.54	2.35	2.31	2.27	2.17	2.04	2.00	1.96	1.94	1.95	1.90
Machinists	2.87	2.69	2.65	2.61	2.50	2.36	2.32	2.30	2.29	2.28	2.23
Carpenters	2.40	2.28	2.25	2.26	2.19	2.08	2.06	2.04	2.03	2.02	2.01
Other shopmen	2.06	1.92	1.92	1.91	1.86	1.78	1.75	1.73	1.72	1.70	1.71
Section foremen	1.90	1.80	1.79	1.78	1.78	1.72	1.71	1.68	1.68	1.69	1.70
Other trackmen	1.46	1.36	1.32	1.33	1.31	1.25	1.23	1.22	1.18	1.16	1.16
Switch tenders, crossing tenders, and watchmen	1.87	1.80	1.79	1.77	1.76	1.77	1.74	1.80	1.77	1.74	1.72
Telegraph operators and dispatchers	2.26	2.13	2.19	2.15	2.08	2.01	1.98	1.96	1.93	1.92	1.90
Employees—account floating equipment	2.27	2.10	2.17	2.17	2.11	2.00	1.97	1.92	1.89	1.89	1.86
All other employees and laborers	1.92	1.83	1.83	1.82	1.77	1.71	1.69	1.71	1.68	1.67	1.64

Comparative summary of average daily compensation of railway employees for the years ending June 30, 1907 to 1897, by groups.

GROUP I.—NEW ENGLAND.

[Average daily compensation in dollars.]

Class.	1907.	1906.	1905.	1904.	1903.	1902.	1901.	1900.	1899.	1898.	1897.
General officers	13.34	12.76	12.58	11.92	11.32	10.91	10.92	10.70	10.53	9.75	9.42
Other officers	5.72	5.65	5.89	6.22	5.79	6.01	5.58	5.80	5.67	6.15	6.18
General office clerks	2.13	2.06	2.08	2.04	2.05	2.06	2.07	2.08	2.08	2.11	2.12
Station agents	2.03	1.99	1.96	1.93	1.88	1.84	1.82	1.80	1.81	1.79	1.79
Other station men	1.91	1.89	1.84	1.83	1.78	1.74	1.77	1.79	1.76	1.77	1.76
Enginemen	3.78	3.62	3.60	3.55	3.51	3.50	3.48	3.48	3.45	3.48	3.45
Firemen	2.20	2.08	2.07	2.02	2.00	1.98	1.98	1.97	1.96	1.97	1.95
Conductors	3.26	3.19	3.12	3.09	3.01	2.94	2.96	2.97	2.94	2.93	2.89
Other trainmen	2.32	2.17	2.12	2.09	2.02	1.96	1.94	1.94	1.91	1.92	1.88
Machinists	2.61	2.45	2.44	2.41	2.34	2.26	2.31	2.29	2.26	2.26	2.17
Carpenters	2.25	2.15	2.13	2.11	2.07	2.06	2.06	2.06	2.04	2.03	2.00
Other shopmen	2.02	1.95	1.93	1.88	1.86	1.85	1.85	1.86	1.87	1.89	1.82
Section foremen	2.24	2.17	2.14	2.13	2.10	2.07	2.04	2.03	1.96	2.00	2.00
Other trackmen	1.55	1.52	1.50	1.49	1.46	1.44	1.44	1.44	1.43	1.43	1.40
Switch tenders, crossing tenders, and watchmen	1.68	1.65	1.60	1.57	1.54	1.53	1.53	1.48	1.46	1.48	1.49
Telegraph operators and dispatchers	2.15	2.07	2.01	1.94	1.86	1.80	1.82	1.84	1.76	1.75	1.78
Employees—account floating equipment	2.22	2.17	2.13	2.10	1.85	1.70	1.70	1.71	1.65	1.64	1.63
All other employees and laborers	1.85	1.80	1.76	1.72	1.68	1.65	1.64	1.66	1.63	1.70	1.65

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Comparative summary of average daily compensation of railway employees for the years ending June 30, 1907 to 1897, by groups—Continued.

GROUP II.—NEW YORK, PENNSYLVANIA, NEW JERSEY, DELAWARE, MARYLAND.

Class.	1907.	1906.	1905.	1904.	1903.	1902.	1901.	1900.	1899.	1898.	1897.
General officers	14.12	13.43	13.81	13.50	12.91	12.00	11.59	11.25	11.11	10.36	9.91
Other officers	6.24	5.81	6.32	6.55	7.09	6.96	6.97	6.66	6.50	6.33	6.06
General office clerks	2.46	2.35	2.44	2.41	2.43	2.30	2.32	2.30	2.30	2.28	2.27
Station agents	2.03	1.91	1.88	1.89	1.84	1.76	1.72	1.68	1.69	1.69	1.66
Other station men	1.82	1.73	1.79	1.79	1.75	1.64	1.63	1.64	1.65	1.65	1.64
Enginemen	4.26	4.06	4.06	4.06	4.00	3.76	3.65	3.62	3.60	3.61	3.56
Firemen	2.55	2.46	2.38	2.33	2.26	2.14	2.08	2.05	2.02	2.03	1.97
Conductors	3.49	3.33	3.39	3.38	3.33	3.08	3.00	2.97	2.93	2.94	2.86
Other trainmen	2.56	2.40	2.28	2.21	2.14	1.98	1.93	1.90	1.87	1.87	1.84
Machinists	2.66	2.55	2.44	2.42	2.34	2.21	2.20	2.19	2.20	2.18	2.14
Carpenters	2.52	2.42	2.28	2.29	2.21	2.08	2.08	2.04	2.03	2.03	2.01
Other shopmen	2.06	1.95	1.89	1.89	1.86	1.74	1.75	1.64	1.59	1.57	1.58
Section foremen	1.96	1.89	1.87	1.87	1.82	1.71	1.69	1.66	1.68	1.69	1.69
Other trackmen	1.48	1.40	1.31	1.30	1.27	1.20	1.20	1.19	1.18	1.17	1.17
Switch tenders, crossing tenders, and watchmen	1.65	1.60	1.67	1.67	1.61	1.58	1.56	1.59	1.56	1.55	1.53
Telegraph operators and dispatchers	2.21	2.07	2.27	2.25	2.20	2.05	2.01	2.01	1.97	1.94	1.90
Employees—account floating equipment	2.31	2.20	2.25	2.27	2.23	2.11	2.12	2.01	1.96	2.02	2.00
All other employees and laborers	1.82	1.74	1.67	1.68	1.63	1.58	1.57	1.56	1.54	1.51	1.54

GROUP III.—OHIO, INDIANA, SOUTHERN MICHIGAN.

General officers	11.51	11.72	12.10	12.11	11.85	11.03	10.43	10.12	9.86	9.96	9.84
Other officers	6.48	6.25	6.48	6.45	6.79	6.14	5.91	5.93	5.83	6.02	5.85
General office clerks	2.24	2.34	2.32	2.27	2.28	2.25	2.21	2.19	2.17	2.21	2.24
Station agents	2.06	1.95	1.90	1.90	1.84	1.77	1.72	1.70	1.69	1.69	1.68
Other station men	1.77	1.72	1.71	1.70	1.65	1.58	1.55	1.55	1.55	1.55	1.55
Enginemen	4.14	3.98	3.98	3.99	3.94	3.73	3.65	3.67	3.57	3.57	3.52
Firemen	2.46	2.35	2.34	2.33	2.28	2.15	2.08	2.09	2.00	2.01	1.98
Conductors	3.56	3.37	3.36	3.39	3.35	3.21	3.12	3.14	3.07	3.10	3.03
Other trainmen	2.59	2.39	2.36	2.36	2.31	2.16	2.09	2.04	1.99	2.00	1.96
Machinists	2.77	2.60	2.56	2.58	2.47	2.35	2.23	2.22	2.17	2.13	2.09
Carpenters	2.30	2.19	2.21	2.17	2.11	2.02	1.96	1.95	1.93	1.91	1.86
Other shopmen	2.04	1.91	1.91	1.88	1.85	1.70	1.69	1.68	1.69	1.69	1.64
Section foremen	1.92	1.79	1.79	1.78	1.75	1.68	1.63	1.60	1.59	1.59	1.61
Other trackmen	1.52	1.43	1.39	1.42	1.37	1.28	1.25	1.22	1.18	1.17	1.16
Switch tenders, crossing tenders, and watchmen	1.75	1.65	1.66	1.60	1.56	1.68	1.61	1.75	1.71	1.70	1.71
Telegraph operators and dispatchers	2.11	2.00	1.99	1.94	1.87	1.82	1.78	1.78	1.78	1.78	1.79
Employees—account floating equipment	1.83	1.76	1.73	1.67	1.63	1.48	1.44	1.38	1.46	1.48	1.51
All other employees and laborers	1.86	1.78	1.81	1.83	1.73	1.64	1.57	1.58	1.55	1.54	1.59

GROUP IV.—WEST VIRGINIA, VIRGINIA, NORTH CAROLINA, SOUTH CAROLINA.

General officers	9.63	10.49	9.59	9.92	9.54	9.52	8.40	6.92	7.06	7.31	7.96
Other officers	4.89	4.66	4.60	4.39	3.76	3.69	3.92	3.25	3.01	2.87	2.93
General office clerks	2.08	1.98	1.92	1.87	1.88	1.87	1.75	1.64	1.68	1.94	1.95
Station agents	1.70	1.62	1.61	1.56	1.56	1.36	1.38	1.39	1.39	1.35	1.36
Other station men	1.33	1.26	1.21	1.06	.81	1.14	1.14	1.12	1.16	1.14	1.12
Enginemen	4.54	4.28	4.25	4.19	4.04	4.12	3.95	3.76	3.76	3.66	3.56
Firemen	2.18	2.04	1.94	1.95	1.85	1.90	1.85	1.75	1.76	1.67	1.61
Conductors	3.50	3.19	3.11	3.07	3.08	3.02	2.92	2.97	2.92	2.80	2.66
Other trainmen	1.82	1.66	1.65	1.54	1.52	1.55	1.52	1.51	1.45	1.54	1.39
Machinists	2.78	2.69	2.57	2.53	2.41	2.26	2.19	2.25	2.22	2.29	2.13
Carpenters	2.11	2.02	1.94	1.89	1.76	1.54	1.65	1.52	1.57	1.60	1.61
Other shopmen	1.76	1.69	1.68	1.59	1.55	1.48	1.44	1.45	1.45	1.45	1.37
Section foremen	1.69	1.64	1.56	1.51	1.48	1.42	1.40	1.35	1.37	1.35	1.39
Other trackmen	1.15	1.09	1.05	.97	.90	.93	.93	.90	.88	.87	.88
Switch tenders, crossing tenders, and watchmen	1.61	1.53	1.44	1.32	1.23	1.33	1.33	1.21	1.20	1.23	1.21
Telegraph operators and dispatchers	2.23	2.04	1.97	1.72	1.66	1.65	1.62	1.54	1.59	1.57	1.58
Employees—account floating equipment	1.56	1.58	1.62	1.60	1.50	1.50	1.57	1.55	1.38	1.55	1.31
All other employees and laborers	1.54	1.41	1.39	1.40	1.26	1.24	1.28	1.38	1.28	1.31	1.33

GROUP V.—KENTUCKY, TENNESSEE, GEORGIA, ALABAMA, MISSISSIPPI.

General officers	10.11	11.33	10.65	10.53	9.69	10.35	10.47	9.49	9.01	8.36	8.19
Other officers	5.00	5.05	4.81	4.90	4.07	3.94	4.05	3.66	3.67	3.63	3.40
General office clerks	2.17	2.12	2.13	2.09	1.92	1.96	2.20	2.13	2.19	2.26	1.61
Station agents	1.78	1.70	1.69	1.65	1.59	1.53	1.52	1.45	1.45	1.41	1.44
Other station men	1.54	1.46	1.45	1.37	1.33	1.38	1.37	1.39	1.40	1.38	1.46
Enginemen	4.59	4.35	4.28	4.25	4.22	4.01	3.90	3.88	3.96	3.83	3.69
Firemen	2.30	2.10	2.03	2.09	2.03	1.97	1.96	1.95	2.01	1.92	1.85
Conductors	3.78	3.41	3.29	3.31	3.31	3.12	3.14	3.12	3.13	3.04	3.07
Other trainmen	2.24	2.01	1.89	1.88	1.79	1.75	1.75	1.71	1.76	1.73	1.71
Machinists	2.91	2.77	2.71	2.62	2.59	2.27	2.29	2.34	2.34	2.26	2.20
Carpenters	2.18	2.04	2.02	2.01	1.94	1.83	1.80	1.81	1.83	1.74	1.78
Other shopmen	1.76	1.65	1.63	1.63	1.61	1.58	1.52	1.49	1.50	1.45	1.50
Section foremen	1.74	1.69	1.65	1.66	1.63	1.57	1.57	1.52	1.56	1.57	1.53
Other trackmen	1.15	1.07	1.03	1.02	.98	.96	.95	.95	.93	.88	.88
Switch tenders, crossing tenders, and watchmen	1.66	1.85	1.77	1.63	1.72	1.68	1.63	1.77	1.81	1.75	1.73
Telegraph operators and dispatchers	2.13	2.04	2.01	1.94	1.87	1.80	1.78	1.77	1.81	1.67	1.64
Employees—account floating equipment	1.11	1.18	1.15	1.20	1.36	1.45	1.41	1.40	1.37	1.14	1.21
All other employees and laborers	1.75	1.68	1.65	1.57	1.45	1.47	1.44	1.54	1.50	1.52	1.40

GROUP VI.—WISCONSIN, ILLINOIS, IOWA, MINNESOTA.

General officers	14.73	14.72	15.12	13.66	14.20	14.07	13.10	12.59	11.46	10.92	10.89
Other officers	7.50	7.33	7.71	7.59	7.42	6.89	6.64	6.71	6.57	7.16	7.01
General office clerks	2.22	2.20	2.12	2.15	2.11	2.14	2.10	2.16	2.16	2.22	2.14
Station agents	2.08	1.97	1.95	1.94	1.86	1.80	1.77	1.77	1.74	1.76	1.78
Other station men	1.77	1.69	1.69	1.66	1.61	1.55	1.55	1.57	1.55	1.56	1.63
Enginemen	4.18	4.08	4.05	3.98	3.88	3.71	3.68	3.68	3.67	3.70	3.68
Firemen	2.57	2.48	2.44	2.39	2.34	2.24	2.22	2.23	2.17	2.16	2.16
Conductors	3.82	3.71	3.69	3.65	3.36	3.29	3.27	3.29	3.25	3.31	3.24
Other trainmen	2.53	2.37	2.36	2.34	2.19	2.04	2.00	1.97	1.96	1.97	1.96

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Comparative summary of average daily compensation of railway employees for the years ending June 30, 1907 to 1897, by groups—Continued.

GROUP VI.—WISCONSIN, ILLINOIS, IOWA, MINNESOTA—continued.

Class.	1907.	1906.	1905.	1904.	1903.	1902.	1901.	1900.	1899.	1898.	1897.
Machinists	2.88	2.70	2.62	2.58	2.42	2.29	2.18	2.18	2.13	2.15	2.12
Carpenters	2.30	2.21	2.20	2.24	2.18	2.06	2.01	2.03	1.99	1.97	1.98
Other shopmen	2.02	1.94	1.96	1.95	1.88	1.79	1.74	1.73	1.73	1.71	1.77
Section foremen	1.80	1.70	1.68	1.70	1.69	1.64	1.63	1.63	1.63	1.64	1.66
Other trackmen	1.55	1.46	1.41	1.45	1.43	1.34	1.31	1.30	1.23	1.20	1.19
Switch tenders, crossing tenders, and watchmen	2.29	2.13	2.11	2.10	2.10	2.01	2.00	2.07	1.97	1.95	1.91
Telegraph operators and dispatchers	2.19	2.11	2.12	2.11	1.94	1.98	1.94	1.92	1.90	1.92	1.91
Employees—account floating equipment	1.81	1.71	1.68	2.05	2.07	1.83	1.66	1.63	1.81	1.62	1.68
All other employees and laborers	2.07	2.03	2.01	2.01	1.96	1.91	1.85	1.90	1.89	1.90	1.71

GROUP VII.—NORTH DAKOTA, SOUTH DAKOTA, MONTANA, WYOMING, NEBRASKA.

General officers	14.72	15.24	11.79	10.01	10.32	10.52	10.04	9.61	9.59	8.75	8.75
Other officers	8.19	8.26	8.38	8.42	7.74	7.63	7.81	7.01	7.52	7.29	8.16
General office clerks	2.31	2.26	2.23	2.12	2.26	2.22	2.31	2.22	2.18	2.24	2.29
Station agents	2.27	2.19	2.17	2.16	2.08	2.01	2.00	2.00	1.97	1.94	1.96
Other station men	1.91	1.84	1.85	1.81	1.82	1.77	1.83	1.81	1.81	1.82	1.85
Enginemen	4.31	4.27	4.27	4.17	4.08	3.89	4.00	3.90	3.87	3.94	3.82
Firemen	2.66	2.58	2.58	2.47	2.49	2.36	2.41	2.32	2.31	2.34	2.28
Conductors	3.86	3.82	3.82	3.74	3.45	3.31	3.36	3.38	3.35	3.38	3.26
Other trainmen	2.66	2.55	2.56	2.47	2.22	2.23	2.22	2.20	2.16	2.18	2.11
Machinists	3.43	3.35	3.29	3.16	2.98	2.84	3.00	2.96	2.87	2.86	2.86
Carpenters	2.62	2.55	2.49	2.40	2.25	2.27	2.41	2.38	2.31	2.37	2.36
Other shopmen	2.31	2.22	2.19	2.18	2.15	1.90	1.94	1.96	1.96	2.05	2.02
Section foremen	1.99	1.85	1.80	1.78	1.78	1.74	1.75	1.73	1.72	1.70	1.71
Other trackmen	1.56	1.46	1.42	1.47	1.44	1.41	1.49	1.44	1.37	1.33	1.35
Switch tenders, crossing tenders, and watchmen	2.37	2.22	2.07	2.06	2.21	2.04	2.12	2.28	2.38	2.36	2.32
Telegraph operators and dispatchers	2.60	2.44	2.39	2.34	2.26	2.11	2.11	2.14	2.12	2.13	2.15
Employees—account floating equipment	2.31	2.47	2.45	2.29	2.11	2.10	2.10	1.70	1.93	2.08	2.16
All other employees and laborers	2.19	2.11	2.03	2.10	2.10	2.07	2.10	2.07	2.00	1.95	2.04

GROUP VIII.—MISSOURI, ARKANSAS, OKLAHOMA, KANSAS, COLORADO.

General officers	10.40	9.52	9.94	10.90	10.88	11.29	11.25	10.85	10.42	10.55	10.35
Other officers	6.09	5.88	6.07	5.88	6.07	5.45	5.23	5.43	5.46	5.24	5.29
General office clerks	2.22	2.22	2.19	2.13	2.23	2.17	2.17	2.20	2.24	2.25	2.29
Station agents	2.05	2.01	1.97	2.07	1.97	1.94	1.89	1.87	1.84	1.83	1.75
Other station men	1.70	1.71	1.65	1.76	1.68	1.66	1.54	1.57	1.60	1.62	1.58
Enginemen	4.56	4.36	4.22	4.28	4.02	4.05	3.95	3.91	3.88	3.93	3.89
Firemen	2.86	2.74	2.62	2.62	2.44	2.46	2.42	2.38	2.34	2.35	2.34
Conductors	4.12	4.04	3.91	3.94	3.69	3.45	3.40	3.42	3.33	3.32	3.33
Other trainmen	2.78	2.65	2.63	2.50	2.37	2.22	2.20	2.12	2.12	2.13	2.12
Machinists	3.35	3.12	3.12	2.97	2.83	2.73	2.68	2.57	2.53	2.57	2.49
Carpenters	2.33	2.36	2.41	2.49	2.44	2.36	2.32	2.27	2.22	2.27	2.31
Other shopmen	2.06	1.99	1.96	1.99	1.95	1.90	1.86	1.89	1.88	1.87	1.90
Section foremen	1.74	1.71	1.68	1.68	1.71	1.69	1.67	1.68	1.68	1.68	1.67
Other trackmen	1.43	1.37	1.35	1.37	1.41	1.33	1.30	1.26	1.22	1.21	1.21
Switch tenders, crossing tenders, and watchmen	2.18	2.13	1.98	2.12	2.35	2.12	2.10	2.31	2.27	2.21	2.21
Telegraph operators and dispatchers	2.47	2.35	2.40	2.32	2.31	2.25	2.30	2.26	2.26	2.27	2.27
Employees—account floating equipment	2.42	2.47	2.35	2.28	2.26	2.15	2.04	2.04	2.05	2.06	2.12
All other employees and laborers	1.93	1.87	1.92	1.76	1.88	1.87	1.86	1.82	1.80	1.81	1.86

GROUP IX.—LOUISIANA, TEXAS, NEW MEXICO.

General officers	7.69	8.04	7.67	7.54	7.11	6.80	7.48	6.93	6.47	6.55	6.48
Other officers	4.60	4.82	4.74	4.77	4.95	4.92	4.94	4.87	4.70	4.76	4.88
General office clerks	2.41	2.32	2.29	2.23	2.26	2.09	2.25	2.30	2.16	2.39	2.44
Station agents	2.48	2.37	2.40	2.29	2.28	2.35	2.42	2.34	2.28	2.27	2.29
Other station men	1.87	1.73	1.76	1.74	1.73	1.63	1.63	1.58	1.71	1.86	1.78
Enginemen	4.68	4.35	4.45	4.32	4.29	4.09	4.07	4.10	4.06	4.08	3.99
Firemen	2.79	2.65	2.66	2.56	2.53	2.42	2.37	2.40	2.36	2.34	2.32
Conductors	4.13	3.88	3.83	3.89	3.81	3.48	3.58	3.62	3.65	3.62	3.54
Other trainmen	2.77	2.53	2.46	2.50	2.37	2.26	2.25	2.26	2.25	2.23	2.21
Machinists	3.37	3.09	3.03	3.05	3.01	2.87	2.80	2.63	2.86	2.85	2.77
Carpenters	2.46	2.38	2.46	2.51	2.38	2.31	2.35	2.32	2.31	2.34	2.32
Other shopmen	2.01	2.01	1.99	1.99	1.88	1.87	1.80	1.83	1.82	1.83	1.81
Section foremen	1.90	1.80	1.78	1.79	1.80	1.86	1.91	1.86	1.87	1.86	1.87
Other trackmen	1.34	1.26	1.22	1.21	1.22	1.18	1.16	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.71
Switch tenders, crossing tenders, and watchmen	2.07	1.98	2.02	2.07	2.44	2.37	2.21	2.27	2.22	2.22	2.24
Telegraph operators and dispatchers	2.61	2.54	2.52	2.55	2.41	2.39	2.41	2.42	2.23	2.22	2.23
Employees—account floating equipment	1.99	1.83	1.88	2.01	1.85	1.78	1.72	1.78	1.77	1.86	1.84
All other employees and laborers	1.88	1.79	1.76	1.77	1.74	1.67	1.75	1.65	1.70	1.70	1.75

GROUP X.—PACIFIC STATES, ARIZONA, NEVADA, UTAH.

General officers	11.88	9.27	10.00	10.66	9.97	10.24	11.30	11.05	11.05	10.98	9.94
Other officers	6.97	6.09	6.89	7.21	6.84	7.07	7.34	7.62	7.38	7.54	6.81
General office clerks	2.59	2.24	2.33	2.48	2.46	2.63	2.59	2.61	2.63	2.70	2.76
Station agents	2.55	2.41	2.57	2.60	2.55	2.47	2.45	2.46	2.43	2.42	2.42
Other station men	2.23	2.03	2.19	2.27	2.24	2.18	2.20	2.20	2.20	2.18	2.26
Enginemen	4.47	4.52	5.02	4.97	4.83	4.58	4.58	4.53	4.45	4.47	4.23
Firemen	2.83	2.80	2.96	2.97	2.80	2.67	2.67	2.68	2.53	2.51	2.39
Conductors	4.27	4.05	4.07	4.09	3.81	3.70	3.75	3.70	3.65	3.67	3.68
Other trainmen	3.15	2.74	2.92	2.93	2.73	2.61	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.65	2.61
Machinists	3.52	2.96	3.27	3.07	2.97	2.89	2.89	2.87	2.96	2.91	3.06
Carpenters	3.00	2.65	2.86	2.78	2.75	2.71	2.73	2.76	2.82	2.77	2.75
Other shopmen	2.80	2.26	2.36	2.45	2.35	2.23	2.12	2.35	2.33	2.34	2.38
Section foremen	2.41	2.19	2.34	2.30	2.31	2.28	2.26	2.24	2.22	2.22	2.28
Other trackmen	1.65	1.45	1.40	1.47	1.47	1.41	1.39	1.39	1.38	1.39	1.37
Switch tenders, crossing tenders, and watchmen	2.32	2.13	1.89	2.05	1.89	2.49	2.50	2.51	2.54	2.57	2.52
Telegraph operators and dispatchers	2.73	2.71	2.91	2.95	2.91	2.83	2.81	2.81	2.67	2.76	2.77
Employees—account floating equipment	3.13	2.64	2.54	2.58	2.41	2.35	2.32	2.24	2.22	2.21	2.21
All other employees and laborers	2.35	2.13	2.30	2.22	2.40	2.24	2.07	2.29	2.31	2.29	2.30

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

EXHIBIT 4.

Labor wages in building trades where not protected but duly organized.

[Prepared by Wm. T. Spencer, Secretary Building Trades Department, American Federation of Labor.]

Name of city.	Masons and bricklayers.	Structural iron setters.	Ornamental iron setters.	Plasterers.	Lathers.	Hoisting engineers.	Tile setters.	Plumbers.	Steam fitters.	Steam fitters' helpers.	Remarks.
	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	
Albany, N. Y.	60	45	.....	60	45	a $3.00	.....	50	43¾	.....	
Atlanta, Ga.	45	44½	44½	40	29⅓	29⅓	40	40	a $3.50	a $1.25–$2.00	Roofers work 10 hours; other trades, 9 hours.
Baltimore, Md.	b 56¼ c 62½	50	31¼–43¾	62½	50	62½	50	43¾	43¾	25	Slate and tile roofers, 50 cents.
Boston, Mass.	60	50	50	60	45	50	60	55	53	25	Rate of wages is the maximum.
Buffalo, N. Y.	b 50 c 55	50	30	50	d $2.25	a $3.00	56¼	43¾	43¾	a $1.50	
Burlington, Vt.	40–45	.....	.....	40–45	a $2.50	.....	.....	a $3.00	a $3.00	a $1.50	All trades work 9 hours.
Birmingham, Ala.	62½	62½	62½	56¼	37½	50	62½	62½	62½	31¼	Roofers and ornamental iron setters, 9 hours.
Chicago, Ill.	62½	60	56¼	68¾	62½	62½	62½	65	59⅜	30	Painters, 55 cents, January 1, 1909.
Cincinnati, Ohio.	62½	50	50	62½	52½	50	50	60	37½	23	Marble cutters and setters work 9 hours.
Cleveland, Ohio.	60	60	50–60	56¼	e 4	50	43¾–50	61¼	50	25	
Columbus, Ohio.	b 50 c 62½	60	40	56¼	d $2.00	a $3.00–3.60	40	50	45–50	a $1.50	
Denver, Colo.	b 62½ c 75	50	30–50	68¾	e 4½–6	50	50–56¼	62½	62½	31¼	
Detroit, Mich.	50–60	25–37½	a $2.50–$3.00	a $4.00–4.50	40	a $2.00–2.25	50	a $3.00–3.75	a $2.50–3.75	a $1.50–2.00	
Duluth, Minn.	b 60 c 65	45	45	62½	50	45	50	62½	60	31	
Erie, Pa.	b 45 c 60	45	.....	40	e 3	.....	.....	37½	37½	.....	
Grand Rapids, Mich.	b 40–55 c 55	50	50	50	45	a $2.00–2.50	50	38½	38½	a $2.00	Nearly all trades work 9 hours.
Galveston, Tex.	75	.....	.....	75	e 3½–4	.....	75	62½	62½	25	Rate of wages paid same as 1907.
Indianapolis, Ind.	65	50	50	50	45	50	50	50	50	25	Rate of wages paid same as 1907.
JerseyCity, N. J.	65	.....	.....	65	62½	62½	62½	56¼	56¼	37½	
Kansas City, Mo.	b 60 c 70	50	50	68¾	50	50	62½	62½	62½	25	
Louisville, Ky.	b 55 c 60	30–40	22–30	62½	50	f $19	50	50	43½–50	15⅝–17½	Marble and sheet-metal workers, 9 hours; cement finishers and iron setters; 10 hours.
Milwaukee, Wis.	60	50	50	60	45	50	56¼	56¼	50	2	
Minneapolis, Minn.	60	50	45	62½	e 4	40	35–50	50	50	25	Wages same as in 1907.
Montreal, Canada.	b 40 c 50	20–25	22½–27½	33½–40	30	25	25	35	35	a $1.25	All trades work 9 hours per day.
Memphis, Tenn.	70	50	.....	62½	e 3	50	56¼	50	50	.....	Rate of wages paid same as in 1907.
New Orleans, La.	62½	50	50	50–65	50	50	62½	56¼	56¼	17½	Plasterers' hodcarriers, 35 cents.
New York City, N. Y.	70	56¼	56¼	68¾	56¼	a $5.50	62½	62½	62½	37½	
Newark, N. J.	65	43¾–56¼	55–62½	65	55	60	50	50–55	50	25	
Omaha, Nebr.	62½	47½	47½	62½	43¾	37½	50	62½	56¼	25	Rate of wages paid same as in 1907.
Portland, Oreg.	b 56¼ c 81¼	37½–40	37½–40	68¾	d $1.75	.....	62½	56¼–62½	56¼–62½	.....	
Pittsburg, Pa.	60–65	50	50	52½	40	50	50–55	56¼	50	.....	
Providence, R. I.	b 45 c 55	35	40	55	40	37½	55	50	37½	21⅞	Rate of wages paid same as in 1907.
Philadelphia, Pa.	b 50 c 62½	50	30	59⅜	48¼	50	55	43¾	30–37½	18–25	Marble laborers, 25 cents. Frescopainters, 47½ cents.
Rochester, N. Y.	57	50	50	57	a $4.00	a $3.00	37½	40⅝	40⅝	a $1.50	Iron setters' helpers $2.50 per day.
Seattle, Wash.	75	55	50–55	75	62½	50–62½	62½	81¼	81¼	.....	
St. Paul, Minn.	b 50 c 60	50	50	56¼	e g 3½ e h 5	f 40 f 45	37½–50	42½–56¼	45	32½	Roofers work 9 hours per day; engineers and laborers, 10 hours.
San Francisco, Cal.	87½	62½	62½	87½	62½	75	75	75	75	37½	Cement laborers, 50 cents.
St. Louis, Mo.	b 56¼ c 65	60	65–70	75	62½	62½	56¼	66¼	68¾	37½	
Salt Lake City, Utah.	$6.00	$5.00	$5.00	$5.00	$4.00	$4.00	$5.00	$5.00	$5.00	$2.50	Rate scale is by the day.
Scranton, Pa.	b 45 c 55	50	50	50	50	30	50	47	40	25	
Syracuse, N. Y.	55	50	.....	55	d $2.25	40	.....	50	50	.....	
Toronto, Canada.	59	25–30	30–35	50	42	35	50	40	40	.....	Rate of wages paid same as in 1907.
Tacoma, Wash.	62½	55	55	75	d $2.25 k 5	43¾	70	70	70	31	
Toledo, Ohio.	60	40	25	50	45	30	.....	43¾	37½	50	
Wheeling, W. Va.	60	50	50	43¾	43¾	45	50	46⅝	46⅝	15	Rate of wages paid same as in 1907.
Washington, D. C.	62½	50	50	62½	a $2.25–2.50	50	50	50	50	a $2.20	
Wilmington, Del.	b 45 c 51	50	50	50	35	40	45	40	40	35	

a Per day. b Masons. c Bricklayers. d Per thousand. e Per yard. f Per week. g Pine; h Metal. i Hoisting. j Swing. k Cutters.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Labor wages in building trades where not protected but duly organized—Continued.

Name of city.	Gas fitters.	Carpenters.	Stone cutters.	Marble cutters and setters.	Painters.	Sheet-metal workers.	Electricians.	Roofers.	Cement finishers.	Laborers and hod carriers.	Remarks.
	Cents.	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	
Albany, N. Y.	.....	37½	45	.....	37½	50	37½	.....	50	31½	
Atlanta, Ga.	a $3.00	a $2.50-3.50	50	50	a $2.50-2.75	a $3.00	a $3.00	a $1.75	45	a $1.25	Roofers work 10 hours. Other trades 9 hours.
Baltimore, Md.	43¾	34⅜-43¾	b 45 c 50	37½-50	31½-37½	37½	43¾	25-35	50	a d $1.50 c 31½	Slate and tile roofers, 50 cents.
Boston, Mass.	45	43¾	50	45	39½	43¾	45	f 37½ g 43¾	50	d 25 c 30	Rate of wages is the maximum.
Buffalo, N. Y.	43¾	40	50	56¼	37½	37½	40	22½-30	40	18-22	
Burlington, Vt.	a $2.75	a $2.75	37½	.....	a $2.50	.....	a $2.50	.....	.....	a $1.50-1.75	All trades work 9 hours.
Birmingham, Ala.	62½	40	45	62½	47½	47½	43¼	25	56¼	a $1.25	Roofers and ornamental iron setters, 9 hours.
Chicago, Ill.	65	56¼	56¼	56¼	50	56¼	62½	52½	55	35	Painters 55 cents, Jan. 1, 1909.
Cincinnati, Ohio	37½	45	56¼	a $4.00	45-47½	25-40	40⅝	37½	40	c 40	Marble cutters and setters work 9 hours.
Cleveland, Ohio.	56¼	42½	50	f 31¼-43¾ g 50	37½	37½	43¾	25-40	50	25-28⅛	
Columbus, Ohio.	35	40-45	50	50	35	a $2.50-3.00	37½-40	31-40	35	d 20 c 34⅜	
Denver, Colo.	62½	55	56¼	f $3.00-3.50 g 55	50	56¼	50	40	37½-56¼	34⅜-37½	
Detroit, Mich.	c $2.50-3.50	30-40	50	a $2.00-3.00	25-40	25-35	a $2.50-3.00	f 30-35 g 20-30	a $.250-3.50	a $1.50-2.00	
Duluth, Minn.	62½	45	56¼	50	45	47½	46⅞	45	50	.....	
Erie, Pa.	.....	30	45	.....	35	25-30	30½	.....	40	20-25	
Grand Rapids, Mich.	38½	35	45	50	35	27-30	27-40	a $2.25-3.00	a $2.50-3.00	11½-22½	Nearly all trades work 9 hours.
Galveston, Tex.	62½	45	.....	.....	45	40	45	45	75	25	Rate of wages paid same as 1907.
Indianapolis, Ind.	40	40	50	40-75	30-37½	40	25-37½	.....	.....	d 25 c 25-31¼	Rate of wages paid same as 1907.
Jersey City, N. J.	56¼	50	62½	62½	45	50	50	50	62½	37½	
Kansas City, Mo.	62½	40	56¼	56¼	45	42½	40-50	35	50	d 25-30 c 35	
Louisville, Ky.	.....	37½-40	50	f 33½ g 44½	37½	30⅝	37½-43½	.....	30-40	a d $1.75 a c $2.50	Marble and sheet metal workers, 9 hours; cement finishers and iron setters 10 hours.
Milwaukee, Wis.	56¼	37½	50	56¼	37½	37½	40	40	50	30	
Minneapolis, Minn.	40	42½	56¼	30-50	42½	42½	31½-37½	25-30	30-35	20	Wages same as in 1907.
Montreal, Canada.	35	22½-30	36-40	25-30	25-30	30-35	22½-30	22½	30	15-20	All trades work 9 hours per day.
Memphis, Tenn.	50	45	62½	.....	40	41½	40	41½	30-50	30	Rate of wages paid same as in 1907.
New Orleans, La.	50	35-45	45-50	45-50	37½	35-45	45	30	40-50	20-27½	Plasterers' hodcarriers, 35 cents.
New York City, N. Y.	62½	62½	62½	62½	a $3.50	56¼	56¼	h $4.75 i $3.00	62½	a $2.80	
Newark, N. J.	50	50	60	56¼	47½	50	50	43¾-50	35-40	35	
Omaha, Nebr.	56¼	30-43	50	45	45	40-50	40	52	50	25-30	Rate of wages paid same as in 1907.
Portland, Oreg.	.....	37½-43¾	56¼	43¾	37½-43¾	50	37½-43¾	.....	28-44½	30-40	
Pittsburg, Pa.	56¼	43¾-50	50	50	42½	37½-42½	50	50	40-50	25-37½	
Providence, R. I.	40	41	50	50	35	40	37½	25	.....	21-28	Rate of wages paid same as in 1907.
Philadelphia, Pa.	30-37½	45	50	50	40	40	40	40	45	i 18¾ j 30-35	Marble laborers, 25 cents. Fresco painters, 47½ cents.
Rochester, N. Y.	.....	40⅜	57	37½	$3.00	37½	37½	37½	37½	21-23	Iron setters' helpers, $2.50 per day.
Seattle, Wash.	81¼	50-62½	62½	62½	50	50-62½	50	50	62½	25-31¼	
St. Paul, Minn.	40-56¼	35-45	56¼	f 30-40 g 37½-50	40	40	41¼	k 41½ h 50	32½	15-25	Roofers work 9 hours per day; engineers and laborers, 10 hours.
San Francisco, Cal.	75	62⅝	62½	62½	56¼	68¾	62½	l 68¾ h 75	75	i 37½ j 50	Cement laborers, 50 cents.
St. Louis, Mo.	66¼	60	56¼	56¼	50	56¼	65	62½	.....	42½-45	
Salt Lake City, Utah.	$5.00	$4.50	$4.00	$6.00	$4.50	$4.50	$3.50-4.00	$5.00	$5.00	$4.50	Rate scale is by the day.
Scranton, Pa.	47	37½	45	45	37½	45	37½	40	50	25	
Syracuse, N. Y.	.....	40	50	.....	43¾	37½	43¾	.....	50	20	
Toronto, Canada.	40	30-35	50	30-35	35	32½-35	30	25-30	30-40	25	Rate of wages paid same as in 1907.
Tacoma, Wash.	70	45	70	40	45	62½	50	62½	50	31-45	
Toledo, Ohio.	50	35	50	50	35	.....	37½	25	35	25	
Wheeling, W. Va.	46⅞	37½	50	50	42½	37½	40	37½	40	a $2.25-2.50	Rate of wages paid same as in 1907.
Washington, D. C.	50	50	50	56¼	43¾	50	50	50	50	a d $1.50 a c $2.50	
Wilmington, Del.	40	40	50	50	40	35	35	35	55	35	

a Per day. b Hard stone. c Soft stone. d Laborers. e Hod carriers. f Cutters. g Setters. h Composition. i Per week. j Hoisting. k Slate. l Metal.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

EXHIBIT 5.

[From Bulletin 77, United States Bureau of Labor, 1907.]

CARPETS.

Occupation and geographical division.	Average hours per week.		Average wages per hour.	
	1906.	1907.	1906.	1907.
Burlers, female:				
North Atlantic	59.02	58.87	$0.1434	$0.1467
Dyers, male:				
North Atlantic	58.56	58.49	.1586	.1623
Loom fixers, male:				
North Atlantic	58.98	59.11	.2777	.2817
Spoolers, female:				
North Atlantic	58.68	58.62	.1285	.1311
Twisters, female:				
North Atlantic	58.48	58.53	.1116	.1239
Weavers, brussels and wilton, male:				
North Atlantic	58.29	58.24	.3004	.3048
Weavers, ingrain, male:				
North Atlantic	59.75	59.88	.1593	.1575
Weavers, ingrain, female:				
North Atlantic	57.16	59.46	.1567	.1501
Winders, female:				
North Atlantic	58.47	58.59	.1250	.1378

Protected by a tariff of from 50 to 114 per cent. (Pars. 380 to 390.)
Work people in trade poorly organized in some localities; it is prohibited by employers.
Average labor percentage of all textiles is 19.5.

CLOTHING—FACTORY PRODUCT.

Occupation and geographical division.	Average hours per week.		Average wages. per hour.	
	1906.	1907.	1906.	1907.
Buttonhole makers, machine, male:				
North Atlantic	56.25	56.75	$0.2469	$0.2450
South Atlantic	55.54	55.70	.2641	.2487
United States	55.78	56.09	.2583	.2473
Buttonhole makers, machine, female:				
North Atlantic	53.50	53.38	.1282	.1428
South Atlantic	53.10	53.77	.1688	.1271
North Central	54.27	54.43	.1692	.1350
South Central	55.22	56.00	.1217	.1212
United States	54.21	54.46	.1487	.1317
Cutters, hand, male:				
North Atlantic	52.10	52.51	.3672	.3697
South Atlantic	53.77	53.62	.3192	.3203
North Central	48.61	48.63	.4131	.4326
South Central	57.14	57.14	.2255	.2380
United States	51.15	51.37	.3761	.3846
Cutters, machine, male:				
North Atlantic	50.00	50.54	.4267	.4300
South Atlantic	54.18	54.35	.3616	.3757
North Central	48.07	48.09	.4382	.4262
United States	49.27	49.14	.4244	.4198
Examiners, male:				
North Atlantic	52.08	52.84	.2858	.2904
South Atlantic	53.74	56.15	.2388	.2358
North Central	50.95	50.51	.3247	.3217
United States	51.95	52.56	.2921	.2921
Examiners, female:				
North Atlantic	53.57	52.93	.1447	.1468
South Atlantic	55.14	55.38	.1159	.1195
United States	54.36	54.07	.1303	.1341
Finishers, female:				
North Atlantic	55.13	54.88	.1161	.1301
South Atlantic	57.88	56.78	.1155	.1278
North Central	54.00	54.00	.1346	.1377
South Central	56.14	55.91	.1015	.1051
United States	55.63	55.16	.1201	.1286
Pressers, male:				
North Atlantic	53.87	54.06	.2152	.2285
South Atlantic	59.25	56.96	.2116	.2149
North Central	54.08	54.06	.2676	.2675
South Central	56.95	56.76	.2071	.1975
United States	55.04	54.70	.2280	.2369
Sewing machine operators, male:				
North Atlantic	54.94	55.12	.2188	.2243
South Atlantic	58.71	55.88	.2579	.2349
North Central	54.02	54.03	.3103	.3161
South Central	57.50	56.75	.2791	.2809
United States	55.50	55.16	.2320	.2351

CLOTHING—FACTORY PRODUCT—continued.

Occupation and geographical division.	Average hours per week.		Average wages per hour.	
	1906.	1907.	1906.	1907.
Sewing machine operators, female:				
North Atlantic	53.75	53.70	$0.1330	$0.1378
South Atlantic	56.26	56.63	.1373	.1407
North Central	54.10	54.09	.1939	.1885
South Central	54.59	54.95	.1302	.1317
United States	54.41	54.53	.1420	.1454

Protected by tariff of from 70 per cent to 118 per cent. Paragraphs 376 to 399.
Work people in trade making brave endeavors to organize.
Average percentage of labor in all textiles 19.5 per cent.

COTTON GOODS.

Occupation and geographical division.	Average hours per week.		Average wages per hour.	
	1906.	1907.	1906.	1907.
Carding machine tenders, male:				
North Atlantic	59.20	58.62	$0.1242	$0.1383
South Atlantic	65.38	63.51	.0875	.1046
South Central	63.35	63.17	.1053	.1115
United States	61.25	60.47	.1127	.1263
Dyers, male:				
North Atlantic	60.00	58.27	.1413	.1549
South Atlantic	64.73	62.79	.0966	.1124
United States	60.71	58.96	.1346	.1484
Loom fixers, male:				
North Atlantic	59.27	58.10	.2171	.2448
South Atlantic	65.27	63.39	.1434	.1560
South Central	64.32	64.51	.1642	.1683
United States	60.73	59.56	.1999	.2228
Spinners, frame, male:				
North Atlantic	58.82	58.29	.1199	.1333
South Atlantic	65.82	64.16	.0899	.0909
United States	61.18	59.99	.1098	.1210
Spinners, frame, female:				
North Atlantic	59.05	58.38	.1120	.1290
South Atlantic	65.59	63.50	.0761	.0904
South Central	64.27	64.31	.0668	.0710
United States	60.96	60.09	.0999	.1146
Spinners, mule, male:				
North Atlantic	59.37	59.07	.1978	.2328
Weavers, male:				
North Atlantic	58.48	58.55	.1698	.1940
South Atlantic	65.56	63.54	.1117	.1270
South Central	65.00	64.82	.1105	.1127
United States	60.89	60.21	.1498	.1719
Weavers, female:				
North Atlantic	58.85	58.67	.1483	.1668
South Atlantic	65.76	63.44	.0958	.1129
South Central	62.89	62.98	.0950	.0955
United States	60.17	59.73	.1366	.1531

DYEING, FINISHING, AND PRINTING TEXTILES.

Bleachers, male:				
North Atlantic	58.47	58.36	$0.1282	$0.1368
Calendrers, male:				
North Atlantic	59.02	58.85	.1435	.1472
Color mixers, male:				
North Atlantic	58.98	58.74	.1333	.1417
Dyers, male:				
North Atlantic	58.66	58.53	.1460	.1501
Engravers, male:				
North Atlantic	57.72	56.86	.4534	.4520
Printers, male:				
North Atlantic	58.20	58.27	.4476	.4477

Protected by tariff of from 17 per cent to 61 per cent (par. 313 to 314–315–317) and on cotton threads from 20 per cent to 78 per cent (par. 310).
Work people making brave endeavors to organize.
Average percentage in all textiles, 19.5.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

FOUNDRY AND MACHINE SHOP.

Occupation and geographical division.	Average hours per week.		Average wages per hour.	
	1906.	1907.	1906.	1907.
Blacksmiths, male:				
North Atlantic	57.70	57.30	$0.2962	$0.3068
South Atlantic	55.17	55.13	.2887	.3062
North Central	56.51	56.40	.3094	.3115
South Central	56.06	56.65	.3435	.3541
Western	54.39	54.11	.3873	.4207
United States	56.69	56.52	.3111	.3200
Boiler makers, male:				
North Atlantic	56.46	56.32	.2992	.3055
South Atlantic	54.28	54.09	.2976	.3163
North Central	55.58	55.42	.3198	.3121
South Central	58.42	58.34	.3146	.3076
Western	54.03	53.42	.3997	.4645
United States	56.00	55.73	.3162	.3290
Boiler riveters, male:				
North Atlantic	55.24	55.64	.2871	.2755
South Atlantic	54.00	54.00	.2639	.2533
North Central	57.11	57.95	.3087	.2647
South Central	58.50	57.18	.1509	.1679
United States	55.35	55.78	.2774	.2614
Brass finishers, male:				
North Atlantic	54.17	54.12	.2748	.2793
North Central	55.76	55.93	.2736	.2699
United States	54.73	54.73	.2744	.2762
Core makers, male:				
North Atlantic	56.51	55.64	.2706	.2816
South Atlantic	55.00	54.86	.2769	.2862
North Central	55.18	55.34	.2511	.2603
South Central	55.50	56.00	.2867	.2934
Western	53.53	53.21	.4131	.4239
United States	55.81	55.43	.2701	.2780
Core makers, female:				
North Atlantic	54.75	54.67	.1314	.1472
North Central	54.94	54.88	.1257	.1497
United States	54.93	54.88	.1259	.1496
Laborers, male:				
North Atlantic	56.90	56.19	.1623	.1681
South Atlantic	55.18	55.29	.1477	.1518
North Central	56.52	56.40	.1744	.1786
South Central	56.91	56.86	.1540	.1572
Western	54.39	55.04	.2412	.2508
United States	56.45	56.19	.1690	.1750
Machinists, male:				
North Atlantic	56.61	55.86	.2829	.2948
South Atlantic	54.55	54.47	.2960	.3096
North Central	55.17	55.12	.2926	.2999
South Central	56.07	56.25	.3248	.3367
Western	54.46	53.94	.3759	.3940
United States	55.83	55.40	.2949	.3051
Molders, brass, male:				
North Atlantic	54.70	54.39	.3105	.3126
North Central	56.56	56.74	.2912	.2960
South Central	54.00	54.00	.3222	.3500
Western	54.00	54.00	.4305	.4653
United States	55.27	55.13	.3077	.3107
Molders, iron, male:				
North Atlantic	56.20	55.76	.3180	.3290
South Atlantic	55.31	55.18	.3090	.3219
North Central	55.94	55.99	.3104	.3220
South Central	56.77	56.10	.3218	.3339
Western	54.21	54.54	.4227	.4277
United States	55.93	55.74	.3234	.3317
Pattern makers, metal, male:				
North Atlantic	56.30	56.56	.3282	.3422
North Central	54.53	54.70	.3093	.3064
United States	54.72	54.95	.3113	.3113
Pattern makers, wood, male:				
North Atlantic	55.89	55.62	.3458	.3542
South Atlantic	55.30	55.17	.3437	.3540
North Central	55.18	55.05	.3420	.3436
South Central	56.42	56.45	.3342	.3522
Western	54.71	54.83	.4534	.4590
United States	55.52	55.37	.3512	.3567

Protected by tariff up to 91 per cent on knives and variable on innumerable articles.

Various trades in this industry fairly organized. Average percentage of labor cost in iron and steel products, 21.10.

FURNITURE.

Occupation and geographical division.	Average hours per week.		Average wages per hour.	
	1906.	1907.	1906.	1907.
Cabinetmakers, male:				
North Atlantic	53.36	53.06	$0.3012	$0.3041
South Atlantic	59.37	59.42	.1721	.1720
North Central	55.80	56.13	.2514	.2503
South Central	59.75	59.74	.1904	.1927
United States	55.50	55.65	.2577	.2577
Carvers, hand, male:				
North Atlantic	48.64	49.17	.3691	.3630
North Central	55.97	56.01	.2850	.2956
United States	52.73	53.30	.3221	.3222
Machine woodworkers, male:				
North Atlantic	56.32	56.27	.2576	.2636
South Atlantic	59.37	59.38	.1706	.1741
North Central	57.97	58.04	.2106	.2155
South Central	59.84	59.82	.1778	.1745
United States	58.03	58.03	.2101	.2156
Sawyers, male:				
North Atlantic	54.26	54.20	.2772	.2860
South Atlantic	59.57	59.62	.1897	.1855
North Central	57.84	57.72	.2174	.2236
South Central	59.91	59.90	.1898	.1907
United States	57.36	57.28	.2256	.2313
Upholsterers, male:				
North Atlantic	48.89	49.01	.3969	.3981
North Central	55.77	55.48	.2675	.2748
United States	53.48	53.38	.3104	.3148
Varnishers, male:				
North Atlantic	55.93	55.53	.2378	.2441
South Atlantic	59.58	59.62	.1922	.1528
North Central	57.31	57.24	.1997	.2044
South Central	59.82	59.73	.1554	.1632
United States	57.25	57.11	.2072	.2080

Protected by tariff of 35 per cent. (Par. 211.)
Work people poorly organized.
Average percentage of labor in general manufacturing goods, 19.9.

GLASS.

Occupation and geographical division.	Average hours per week.		Average wages per hour.	
	1906.	1907.	1906.	1907.
Batch makers, male:				
North Atlantic	59.30	59.12	$0.1810	$0.1832
South Atlantic	57.78	57.40	.1969	.1994
North Central	61.11	61.16	.1984	.2076
United States	59.89	59.74	.1891	.1939
Blowers, flint glass, male:				
North Atlantic	49.60	49.65	.6413	.6570
South Atlantic	55.42	55.50	.5738	.5698
North Central	49.98	49.90	.6722	.6806
United States	50.21	50.24	.6510	.6616
Blowers, green glass, male:				
North Atlantic	47.91	47.77	.7616	.7963
South Atlantic	50.00	50.00	.7994	.8909
North Central	49.64	49.49	.7846	.7704
United States	48.65	48.42	.7718	.7894
Blowers, window glass, male:				
North Atlantic	41.91	41.95	.8892	.9443
North Central	40.00	40.00	.8571	.9213
United States	41.20	41.21	.8772	.9356
Cutters, window glass, male:				
North Atlantic	44.41	44.45	.7044	.7489
North Central	55.14	55.54	.6831	.7490
United States	49.02	49.07	.6953	.7490
Flatteners, window glass, male:				
North Atlantic	57.16	57.55	.7519	.8471
North Central	56.35	56.00	.6788	.7738
United States	56.81	56.87	.7208	.8151
Gaffers, flint glass, male:				
North Atlantic	51.17	51.28	.5376	.5306
North Central	49.50	49.50	.8014	.7989
United States	51.04	51.10	.5583	.5580

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

GLASS—continued.

Occupation and geographical division.	Average hours per week.		Average wages per hour.	
	1906.	1907.	1906.	1907.
Gatherers, flint glass, male:				
North Atlantic	50.41	50.48	$0.3032	$0.3090
South Atlantic	58.00	58.00	.2956	.3031
North Central	49.50	49.50	.3248	.3361
United States	50.62	50.51	.3115	.3231
Gatherers, window glass, male:				
North Atlantic	41.91	41.94	.6429	.6867
North Central	40.00	40.00	.6079	.6829
United States	41.19	41.20	.6298	.6852
Laborers, male:				
North Atlantic	59.07	59.07	.1511	.1527
South Atlantic	58.75	58.88	.1391	.1380
North Central	59.65	59.66	.1530	.1726
United States	59.39	59.41	.1518	.1641
Leersmen, male:				
North Atlantic	57.18	57.44	.1718	.1784
South Atlantic	59.54	59.54	.1702	.1702
North Central	57.41	56.36	.1829	.1994
United States	57.37	57.21	.1761	.1846
Packers, male:				
North Atlantic	56.01	56.40	.1997	.2022
South Atlantic	51.62	52.16	.2073	.2096
North Central	59.47	59.46	.1886	.1921
United States	57.49	57.53	.1947	.1981
Pressers, male:				
North Atlantic	52.51	52.44	.4074	.5002
South Atlantic	53.23	53.27	.7866	.8817
North Central	49.99	50.33	.6357	.6388
United States	51.70	51.73	.5084	.5751
Press gatherers, male:				
North Atlantic	52.51	52.44	.3109	.3833
South Atlantic	53.00	53.00	.6404	.7230
North Central	50.05	50.00	.4826	.4723
United States	51.71	51.65	.3815	.4257
Teasers, male:				
North Atlantic	76.49	76.42	.2022	.2035
South Atlantic	80.31	80.80	.1782	.1783
North Central	83.58	83.63	.1751	.1840
United States	79.43	79.68	.1903	.1936

Protected by tariff of from 40 per cent to 382 per cent (par. 97 to 102).
Work people in trade highly organized.
Average percentage of labor in glass, 37.1.

HATS, FUR.

Occupation and geographical division.	Average hours per week.		Average wages per hour.	
	1906.	1907.	1906.	1907.
Blockers, male:				
North Atlantic	53.85	53.88	$0.3534	$0.3647
Colorers, male:				
North Atlantic	55.43	54.67	.1960	.1971
Coners, male:				
North Atlantic	53.79	53.92	.2881	.2891
Curlers, male:				
North Atlantic	53.48	53.46	.5031	.4348
Feeders, female:				
North Atlantic	54.12	54.16	.1145	.1266
Finishers, male:				
North Atlantic	53.91	53.45	.3317	.3310
Flangers, male:				
North Atlantic	55.95	54.14	.3304	.3244
Fur blowers, male:				
North Atlantic	55.18	54.09	.1644	.1759
Hardeners, male:				
North Atlantic	54.00	54.11	.2925	.2959
Pouncers, male:				
North Atlantic	54.31	53.72	.2542	.2451
Sizers, male:				
North Atlantic	53.94	53.58	.3004	.3135
Stiffeners, male:				
North Atlantic	53.79	53.91	.3991	.3665
Trimmers, female:				
North Atlantic	54.33	53.65	.1460	.1507
Weighers, female:				
North Atlantic	53.29	53.32	.1260	.1386

Protected by a tariff of from 35 to 62 per cent. (Par. 442.)
Work people in trade fairly organized.
Average percentage of labor in miscellaneous, 19.9.

HOSIERY AND KNIT GOODS.

Occupation and geographical division.	Average hours per week.		Average wages per hour.	
	1906.	1907.	1906.	1907.
Boarders, male:				
North Atlantic	58.60	58.08	$0.2002	$0.2220
South Atlantic	63.80	63.70	.1148	.1444
North Central	58.12	57.75	.1403	.1415
United States	59.66	59.12	.1682	.1885
Finishers, female:				
North Atlantic	58.05	58.97	.1377	.1458
South Atlantic	64.16	64.20	.0865	.1052
North Central	58.20	57.18	.1108	.1165
United States	58.51	58.87	.1271	.1353
Knitters, male:				
North Atlantic	63.28	60.39	.2031	.2030
South Atlantic	64.33	64.41	.1103	.1241
North Central	57.48	57.23	.2741	.3023
United States	61.65	60.33	.2112	.2144
Knitters, female:				
North Atlantic	58.35	58.07	.1348	.1381
South Atlantic	59.38	59.25	.1001	.1059
North Central	56.33	56.12	.1073	.1164
United States	57.74	57.46	.1226	.1270
Loopers, female:				
North Atlantic	58.62	58.42	.1455	.1471
South Atlantic	63.98	63.68	.0885	.1017
North Central	58.48	57.89	.1219	.1252
United States	59.88	59.40	.1275	.1332
Menders, female:				
North Atlantic	59.16	58.87	.1272	.1310
South Atlantic	62.64	62.18	.0756	.0847
North Central	57.50	56.98	.1187	.1194
United States	59.45	59.06	.1151	.1199
Pressers, male:				
North Atlantic	59.26	59.35	.1697	.1757
South Atlantic	65.30	65.54	.0877	.1158
North Central	56.32	56.59	.1628	.1853
United States	60.19	60.33	.1470	.1629
Pressers, female:				
North Atlantic	58.63	58.75	.1032	.1014
North Central	56.00	55.00	.1203	.1216
United States	58.35	58.30	.1051	.1038
Ribbers, female:				
North Atlantic	59.78	59.62	.1495	.1704
North Central	59.09	58.96	.1226	.1224
United States	59.62	59.41	.1430	.1549

Protected by a tariff of from 30 to 64 per cent. (Pp. 325 to 327.)
Work people poorly organized.
Average per cent of labor in textiles, 19.5.

IRON AND STEEL, BAR.

Occupation and geographical division.	Average hours per week.		Average wages per hour.	
	1906.	1907.	1906.	1907.
Catchers, male:				
North Atlantic	64.04	63.89	$0.3338	$0.3484
South Atlantic	60.92	60.92	.2530	.2732
North Central	67.36	67.36	.5489	.5320
South Central	72.00	72.00	.2647	.3055
United States	65.44	65.29	.3978	.4034
Heaters, male:				
North Atlantic	64.70	64.63	.4948	.5656
South Atlantic	61.85	62.00	.4793	.5504
North Central	67.52	67.52	.6553	.6368
South Central	72.00	72.00	.4846	.4913
United States	66.49	66.50	.5719	.5926
Heaters' helpers, male:				
North Atlantic	67.64	67.50	.2456	.2587
South Atlantic	60.92	61.00	.2218	.2740
North Central	66.99	66.99	.3340	.3224
South Central	72.00	72.00	.1821	.1933
United States	67.10	67.10	.2797	.2844

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

IRON AND STEEL, BAR—continued.

Occupation and geographical division.	Average hours per week.		Average wages per hour.	
	1906.	1907.	1906.	1907.
Hot straighteners, male:				
North Atlantic	63.41	63.97	$0.2066	$0.2124
South Atlantic	61.16	61.06	.1535	.1701
North Central	69.66	69.75	.2600	.2543
South Central	72.00	72.00	.1366	.1418
United States	65.67	65.76	.2078	.2125
Rollers, male:				
North Atlantic	63.76	63.66	.7042	.7734
South Atlantic	61.33	61.33	.7002	.7739
North Central	70.25	70.30	1.0850	1.0397
South Central	72.00	72.00	.9401	1.0059
United States	66.69	66.61	.8674	.8931
Roughers, male:				
North Atlantic	65.36	65.33	.3854	.4040
South Atlantic	61.14	61.14	.3410	.3785
North Central	61.01	61.37	.5182	.5761
South Central	72.00	72.00	.3324	.3519
United States	63.43	63.54	.4407	.4804

IRON AND STEEL, BESSEMER CONVERTING.

Blowers, male:				
North Atlantic	60.33	61.26	$0.5440	$0.5329
South Atlantic	74.00	74.00	.4229	.4412
North Central	66.55	66.55	.6174	.6382
South Central	75.00	75.00	.3898	.4125
United States	65.69	66.00	.5302	.5360
Bottom makers, male:				
North Atlantic	69.00	69.39	.3142	.2982
South Atlantic	72.00	72.00	.2193	.2320
North Central	67.00	67.00	.3430	.3428
South Central	65.14	64.29	.1790	.1689
United States	68.38	68.45	.2879	.2812
Ladle liners, male:				
North Atlantic	64.74	65.40	.3807	.3710
South Atlantic	73.50	73.50	.3166	.3459
North Central	66.55	66.55	.4443	.4424
South Central	75.00	75.00	.2240	.2527
United States	67.86	68.09	.3702	.3736
Melters, male:				
North Atlantic	66.48	67.29	.4084	.3831
South Atlantic	72.00	72.00	.3846	.4212
North Central	50.55	50.55	.5765	.5440
South Central	66.00	66.00	.4229	.4695
United States	61.09	61.73	.4705	.4501
Steel pourers, male:				
North Atlantic	56.41	53.20	.5239	.5135
South Atlantic	74.00	74.00	.4592	.5071
North Central	51.53	51.53	.7088	.6690
South Central	66.00	66.00	.4229	.4636
United States	57.19	55.42	.5712	.5590
Vessel men, male:				
North Atlantic	65.00	57.00	.5512	.5734
South Atlantic	72.00	72.00	.4123	.4484
North Central	55.09	55.09	.7634	.7349
South Central	78.00	78.00	.3049	.3316
United States	63.97	60.55	.5777	.5863

Protected by a tariff of from 13 to 14 per cent. (Par. 124.)
Work people in trade fairly organized among independent producers; poorly organized where the trust controls.
NOTE.—Frightfully long hours these people work.
Average per cent of labor in iron and steel products, 22.10.

IRON AND STEEL, BLAST FURNACE.

Cinder snappers, male:				
North Atlantic	84.00	84.00	$0.1478	$0.1567
South Atlantic	84.00	84.00	.1375	.1404
North Central	84.00	84.00	.1743	.1794
South Central	84.00	84.00	.1287	.1264
United States	84.00	84.00	.1499	.1569
Hot-blast men, male:				
North Atlantic	84.00	84.00	.1813	.1907
South Atlantic	84.00	84.00	.1536	.1561
North Central	84.00	84.00	.1759	.1897
South Central	84.00	84.00	.1560	.1530
United States	84.00	84.00	.1738	.1822

IRON AND STEEL, BLAST FURNACE—continued.

Occupation and geographical division.	Average hours per week.		Average wages per hour.	
	1906.	1907.	1906.	1907.
Keepers, male:				
North Atlantic	84.00	84.00	$0.2023	$0.2137
South Atlantic	84.00	84.00	.1836	.1865
North Central	84.00	84.00	.2133	.2228
South Central	84.00	84.00	.1662	.1656
United States	84.00	84.00	.1981	.2070
Keepers' helpers, male:				
North Atlantic	84.00	84.00	.1637	.1718
South Atlantic	84.00	84.00	.1396	.1428
North Central	84.00	84.00	.1749	.1841
South Central	84.00	84.00	.1287	.1331
United States	84.00	84.00	.1573	.1644
Top fillers, male:				
North Atlantic	81.95	81.98	.1640	.1763
South Atlantic	84.00	84.00	.1330	.1537
North Central	79.46	79.46	.1995	.2095
South Central	84.00	84.00	.1583	.1591
United States	82.04	82.11	.1655	.1765

Tariff of from 19 to 41 per cent. (Par. 129.)
Average per cent of labor gross of product, 22.1.

LUMBER.

Occupation and geographical division.	Average hours per week.		Average wages per hour.	
	1906.	1907.	1906.	1907.
Cant setters, male:				
North Atlantic	60.00	60.00	$0.1950	$0.1950
North Central	60.83	60.83	.2089	.2179
South Central	60.00	60.00	.1875	.1875
Western	60.00	60.00	.2050	.2175
United States	60.63	60.63	.2053	.2129
Carriage men, male:				
North Atlantic	60.00	60.00	.2686	.2759
South Atlantic	61.98	60.76	.1589	.1638
North Central	60.25	60.26	.2330	.2432
South Central	60.82	60.42	.1967	.2152
Western	60.00	60.00	.2417	.2578
United States	60.55	60.31	.2183	.2300
Choppers and sawyers, in woods, male:				
South Atlantic	62.21	62.27	.1433	.1449
North Central	60.34	60.48	.1831	.1906
South Central	60.37	60.39	.1787	.1844
Western	61.56	61.50	.2940	.3138
United States	60.64	60.73	.1934	.2013
Edgermen, male:				
North Atlantic	60.00	60.00	.2765	.2773
South Atlantic	62.00	61.06	.1765	.1821
North Central	60.22	60.21	.2576	.2641
South Central	60.57	60.30	.2428	.2523
Western	60.00	60.00	.3268	.3420
United States	60.44	60.28	.2554	.2624
Filers, male:				
North Atlantic	60.00	60.00	.3500	.4421
South Atlantic	62.50	60.69	.4440	.4725
North Central	60.00	60.00	.4816	.4864
South Central	60.09	60.52	.5387	.5708
Western	60.00	60.00	.5113	.5402
United States	60.43	60.18	.4814	.5057
Laborers, male:				
North Atlantic	60.00	60.00	.1688	.1799
South Atlantic	60.71	59.96	.1332	.1367
North Central	60.32	60.16	.1744	.1804
South Central	61.00	60.74	.1507	.1604
Western	60.00	60.00	.2103	.2245
United States	60.44	60.22	.1729	.1805
Sawyers, band, male:				
North Atlantic	60.00	60.00	.5136	.4870
South Atlantic	62.45	61.36	.5191	.5304
North Central	60.29	60.30	.5063	.5230
South Central	61.14	60.60	.5697	.5970
Western	60.00	60.00	.4975	.5069
United States	60.54	60.37	.5170	.5303

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

LUMBER—continued.

Occupation and geographical division.	Average hours per week.		Average wages per hour.	
	1906.	1907.	1906.	1907.
Sawyers, circular, male:				
North Atlantic	60.00	60.00	$0.3500	$0.3500
South Atlantic	61.67	60.83	.3673	.3700
North Central	60.00	60.00	.3667	.3411
South Central	60.00	60.00	.5119	.5378
Western	60.00	60.00	.5456	.5699
United States	60.24	60.12	.4477	.4439
Sawyers, gang, male:				
North Atlantic	60.00	60.00	.2308	.2375
South Atlantic	59.33	56.00	.1667	.1833
North Central	60.38	60.38	.3072	.3210
South Central	60.00	60.00	.2815	.2877
Western	60.00	60.00	.3083	.3250
United States	60.13	59.81	.2766	.2886
Trimmers, male:				
North Atlantic	60.00	60.00	.2067	.2133
South Atlantic	62.74	62.19	.1494	.1496
North Central	60.27	60.31	.2274	.2285
South Central	60.43	60.43	.1799	.1836
Western	60.00	60.00	.2487	.2595
United States	60.46	60.46	.2150	.2160

Protected by a tariff of from 2.78 to 15.84 per cent. (Par. 197.)
Work people fairly organized in the West.

PAPER AND WOOD PULP.

Occupation and geographical division.	Average hours per week.		Average wages per hour.	
	1906.	1907.	1906.	1907.
Back tenders, male:				
North Atlantic	64.14	55.14	$0.1766	$0.2249
North Central	68.33	68.33	.1580	.1664
United States	65.02	57.57	.1727	.2142
Beaters, male:				
North Atlantic	61.23	53.34	.1783	.2054
North Central	68.79	68.74	.1628	.1665
United States	62.82	56.19	.1750	.1982
Bleachers, male:				
North Atlantic	53.25	53.47	.2036	.2113
North Central	62.57	62.57	.1640	.1668
United States	55.60	55.81	.1936	.1999
Calenderers, male:				
North Atlantic	54.56	56.20	.1980	.2047
North Central	64.88	64.88	.1752	.1777
United States	57.00	57.97	.1926	.1992
Calenderers, female:				
North Atlantic	55.00	55.00	.1382	.1595
Cutters, male:				
North Atlantic	52.24	58.01	.2123	.1722
North Central	59.14	59.12	.1758	.1796
United States	54.38	58.37	.2010	.1746
Cutters, female:				
North Atlantic	54.94	60.18	.1088	.1101
North Central	59.95	59.97	.0956	.1046
United States	56.13	60.13	.1056	.1086
Enamelers, male:				
North Atlantic	48.55	48.37	.2160	.2333
North Central	60.00	60.00	.1796	.1879
United States	51.64	50.18	.2062	.2263
Finishers, male:				
North Atlantic	60.05	56.96	.1776	.1959
North Central	59.93	61.40	.1791	.1835
United States	60.02	58.07	.1780	.1928
Finishers, female:				
North Atlantic	57.70	56.70	.1313	.1374
North Central	59.97	60.52	.1013	.1082
United States	58.97	58.60	.1144	.1229
Laborers, male:				
North Atlantic	59.31	58.65	.1573	.1606
North Central	60.62	60.59	.1499	.1550
United States	59.63	59.11	.1555	.1593

PAPER AND WOOD PULP—continued.

Occupation and geographical division.	Average hours per week.		Average wages per hour.	
	1906.	1907.	1906.	1907.
Machine tenders, male:				
North Atlantic	61.11	53.99	$0.2771	$0.3349
North Central	68.35	68.35	.2696	.2716
United States	62.41	56.27	.2757	.3249
Press tenders, male:				
North Atlantic	66.73	58.90	.1572	.1842
North Central	61.44	61.44	.1343	.1453
United States	65.79	59.33	.1531	.1777
Pulp grinders, male:				
North Atlantic	68.11	52.64	.1592	.1975
North Central	71.93	71.92	.1342	.1492
United States	68.51	54.07	.1566	.1939
Rag sorters, male:				
North Atlantic	57.85	59.86	.1675	.1628
Rag sorters, female:				
North Atlantic	52.10	52.85	.1043	.1150
North Central	59.56	59.64	.0979	.1168
United States	53.77	54.63	.1029	.1155
Wood cookers, male:				
North Atlantic	61.39	56.28	.2036	.2421
North Central	71.75	71.75	.1833	.1885
United States	62.22	57.72	.2019	.2371
Wood preparers, male:				
North Atlantic	62.32	56.76	.1637	.1990
North Central	59.90	59.89	.1505	.1618
United States	61.81	57.24	.1609	.1933

Protected by a tariff of wood pulp free to 10 per cent. (Par. 402.)
Paper from 5.58 to 49 per cent. (Pars. 403 to 409.)
Work people fairly organized.
Average percentage of labor miscellaneous, 19.9.

POTTERY.

Occupation and geographical division.	Average hours per week.		Average wages per hour.	
	1906.	1907.	1906.	1907.
Dippers, male:				
North Atlantic	46.50	46.50	$0.5206	$0.5654
North Central	44.43	44.54	.5382	.5268
United States	45.06	45.12	.5329	.5382
Jigger men, male:				
North Atlantic	51.39	51.28	.4354	.4356
North Central	53.00	53.00	.4772	.4496
United States	52.41	52.37	.4620	.4445
Kiln firemen, male:				
North Atlantic	62.44	62.44	.3684	.3684
North Central	82.15	82.15	.2500	.2500
United States	74.09	74.09	.2984	.2984
Kiln men, male:				
North Atlantic	46.43	46.70	.3800	.3707
North Central	45.73	45.71	.4038	.4362
United States	46.04	46.13	.3933	.4084
Mold makers, male:				
North Atlantic	53.15	53.15	.3868	.3833
North Central	52.40	52.40	.3452	.3461
United States	52.70	52.70	.3616	.3607
Pressers, male:				
North Atlantic	52.72	52.68	.4354	.4445
North Central	53.00	53.00	.3737	.3619
United States	52.81	52.77	.4140	.4207
Sagger makers, male:				
North Atlantic	50.81	51.07	.5046	.4822
North Central	47.44	47.44	.5223	.5420
United States	49.13	49.19	.5134	.5131
Setters out, male:				
North Atlantic	46.22	46.22	.4867	.4915
North Central	45.68	45.68	.5120	.5477
United States	45.93	45.93	.5006	.5224

Protected by a tariff of from 20 to 60 per cent. (Pars. 90 to 92.)
Work people highly organized. Note the reasonable working hours.
Average percentage of labor in clay products, 37.1.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

PRINTING AND BINDING, BOOK AND JOB.

Occupation and geographical division.	Average hours per week.		Average wages per hour.	
	1906.	1907.	1906.	1907.
Bookbinders, male:				
North Atlantic	53.34	52.82	$0.3440	$0.3514
South Atlantic	54.00	53.08	.3081	.3269
North Central	53.84	53.63	.3150	.3195
South Central	53.52	53.17	.3128	.3213
Western	49.56	49.64	.3946	.4165
United States	53.36	53.02	.3280	.3363
Compositors, male:				
North Atlantic	50.53	50.16	.3614	.3712
South Atlantic	51.82	50.85	.3271	.3336
North Central	51.29	51.19	.3421	.3433
South Central	52.60	52.91	.3337	.3409
Western	42.07	48.91	.4335	.4671
United States	51.01	50.75	.3537	.3620
Compositors, female:				
North Atlantic	51.87	51.59	.2887	.3077
North Central	52.96	52.29	.2758	.2671
United States	52.24	51.74	.2843	.2989
Electrotypers, male:				
North Atlantic	51.54	51.63	.4216	.4239
North Central	52.95	51.45	.3505	.3617
Western	49.83	49.04	.4800	.5022
United States	51.99	51.26	.3960	.4050
Linotype operators, male:				
North Atlantic	49.49	49.42	.4545	.4581
South Atlantic	50.34	50.03	.4213	.4263
North Central	49.63	49.61	.4608	.4743
South Central	48.80	49.16	.4731	.4572
Western	47.91	47.50	.5690	.5743
United States	49.46	49.38	.4625	.4675
Linotype operators, female:				
North Atlantic	52.11	52.42	.3062	.3085
North Central	53.11	53.00	.2037	.2716
Western	46.00	45.75	.5321	.4808
United States	51.74	51.78	.2812	.3118
Press feeders, male:				
North Atlantic	52.38	52.49	.2086	.2264
South Atlantic	53.83	52.75	.1609	.1622
North Central	53.90	53.49	.1896	.1949
South Central	53.23	52.86	.1649	.1712
Western	49.06	49.05	.2366	.2498
United States	52.91	52.62	.1949	.2053
Press feeders, female:				
North Atlantic	53.95	53.96	.1265	.1244
South Atlantic	54.00	53.70	.1136	.1208
North Central	53.90	53.43	.1450	.1407
South Central	53.75	53.69	.0989	.1168
United States	53.93	53.74	.1279	.1282
Pressmen, male:				
North Atlantic	52.81	52.62	.3550	.3691
South Atlantic	53.85	52.95	.3024	.3143
North Central	53.94	53.52	.3384	.3517
South Central	53.55	52.94	.3136	.3358
Western	49.00	48.94	.4357	.4553
United States	53.10	52.75	.3475	.3619
Proof readers, male:				
North Atlantic	50.15	49.81	.4101	.4197
South Atlantic	53.67	51.88	.3258	.3402
North Central	52.91	51.33	.3815	.4022
South Central	53.50	53.50	.3598	.3481
Western	48.86	48.86	.4096	.4275
United States	51.03	50.41	.3958	.4071
Proof readers, female:				
North Atlantic	52.44	51.72	.2928	.3195
South Atlantic	54.00	54.00	.1636	.1713
North Central	52.40	52.03	.2736	.2869
South Central	53.17	51.14	.2388	.2789
Western	50.40	49.50	.3099	.3930
United States	52.47	51.98	.2709	.2945
Sewers and stitchers, book, female:				
North Atlantic	53.34	52.98	.1269	.1306
South Atlantic	53.79	52.82	.0994	.1073
North Central	53.81	53.63	.1180	.1219
South Central	53.07	53.05	.1069	.1067
Western	49.79	49.58	.1525	.1663
United States	53.08	52.83	.1206	.1249

PRINTING, NEWSPAPER.

Occupation and geographical division.	Average hours per week.		Average wages per hour.	
	1906.	1907.	1906.	1907.
Compositors, male:				
North Atlantic	46.97	47.08	$0.5006	$0.5140
South Atlantic	47.21	44.88	.4711	.5069
North Central	47.19	47.11	.5148	.5281
South Central	48.46	48.52	.5037	.5060
Western	46.48	46.66	.6124	.6363
United States	47.17	46.92	.5135	.5296
Linotype operators, male:				
North Atlantic	46.56	46.46	.5557	.5641
South Atlantic	44.60	44.64	.5560	.5745
North Central	47.32	47.22	.5336	.5455
South Central	47.79	47.74	.6391	.6451
Western	46.35	46.73	.6237	.6653
United States	46.67	46.64	.5646	.5791
Pressmen, male:				
North Atlantic	46.66	46.47	.4645	.4871
South Atlantic	48.11	48.44	.3717	.3721
North Central	49.68	48.52	.4024	.4195
South Central	52.73	52.41	.4312	.4233
Western	48.75	47.56	.4754	.5344
United States	48.34	47.73	.4337	.4558
Stereotypers, male:				
North Atlantic	45.89	45.64	.5285	.5367
South Atlantic	46.80	46.56	.4067	.4466
North Central	48.93	48.73	.4296	.4380
South Central	51.42	51.36	.3973	.4200
Western	50.03	48.74	.5027	.5467
United States	47.68	47.39	.4752	.4905

Protected by a tariff of from 16 per cent to 49 per cent (par. 408).
Work people highly organized. Note the reasonable hours.
Laborers well organized, as a rule.
Average percentage of labor in printing products, 21.6.

SHIPBUILDING.

Blacksmiths, male:				
North Atlantic	54.92	55.13	$0.3093	$0.3066
South Atlantic	57.52	57.77	.2738	.2753
North Central	58.72	58.58	.2956	.3095
Western	53.87	53.83	.3833	.3995
United States	56.01	56.29	.3086	.3063
Boiler makers, male:				
North Atlantic	54.16	54.09	.2876	.2957
South Atlantic	58.36	58.67	.2589	.2622
North Central	59.46	59.11	.3048	.3125
Western	54.00	54.00	.4274	.4702
United States	56.29	56.41	.2892	.2965
Calkers, iron, male:				
North Atlantic	55.74	55.49	.2732	.2810
South Atlantic	54.28	54.23	.2332	.2305
North Central	57.53	57.66	.2995	.3532
Western	54.00	54.00	.3554	.4257
United States	55.70	55.52	.2849	.2990
Calkers, wood, male:				
North Atlantic	52.76	51.26	.3551	.3700
South Atlantic	54.15	54.32	.3005	.2997
North Central	54.00	54.00	.3100	.3300
Western	49.00	49.00	.5958	.7000
United States	52.94	51.85	.3506	.3656
Carpenters, male:				
North Atlantic	53.88	52.64	.3146	.3340
South Atlantic	57.25	57.13	.2746	.2815
North Central	58.55	58.41	.3000	.3087
Western	52.81	53.23	.4329	.4509
United States	54.99	54.21	.3146	.3296
Drillers, male:				
North Atlantic	55.92	55.73	.2368	.2536
South Atlantic	56.29	56.02	.1791	.1775
North Central	56.94	56.85	.2082	.2359
Western	54.00	54.00	.2823	.3016
United States	55.93	55.79	.2297	.2403
Fitters, male:				
North Atlantic	55.19	55.07	.2608	.2700
South Atlantic	58.39	58.05	.2437	.2526
North Central	56.98	57.73	.2736	.2960
Western	54.00	54.00	.4036	.4123
United States	56.74	56.65	.2692	.2814

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

SHIPBUILDING—continued.

Occupation and geographical division.	Average hours per week.		Average wages per hour.	
	1906.	1907.	1906.	1907.
Joiners, male:				
North Atlantic	55.53	55.15	$0.2988	$0.3063
South Atlantic	57.01	57.02	.2759	.2765
North Central	59.00	58.30	.2995	.3172
Western	53.72	53.66	.4305	.4458
United States	55.92	55.87	.3181	.3148
Laborers, male:				
North Atlantic	55.54	55.58	.1677	.1756
South Atlantic	56.81	56.68	.1356	.1418
North Central	58.02	59.00	.1605	.1755
Western	53.90	53.60	.2204	.2309
United States	56.56	57.02	.1622	.1677
Machinists, male:				
North Atlantic	55.16	55.05	.2707	.2787
South Atlantic	58.36	57.88	.2683	.2794
North Central	59.32	59.04	.2869	.3032
Western	54.00	54.00	.3769	.3928
United States	56.41	56.28	.2915	.2958
Molders, iron, male:				
North Atlantic	56.07	55.28	.2870	.2907
South Atlantic	57.38	57.43	.2876	.2971
North Central	55.37	55.14	.3266	.3466
Western	54.00	54.00	.4358	.4397
United States	56.07	56.14	.3218	.3225
Painters, male:				
North Atlantic	54.85	54.72	.2687	.2814
South Atlantic	55.95	56.36	.2425	.2471
North Central	59.18	57.30	.2410	.2246
Western	54.00	54.00	.3025	.3279
United States	55.34	55.51	.2598	.2664
Pattern makers, male:				
North Atlantic	55.92	55.79	.3226	.3235
South Atlantic	57.69	58.11	.3162	.3346
North Central	59.16	59.00	.3384	.3487
Western	54.00	54.00	.4747	.5073
United States	56.56	56.80	.3440	.3454
Riggers, male:				
North Atlantic	55.57	55.19	.2064	.2163
South Atlantic	56.15	55.86	.2366	.2361
North Central	56.69	56.10	.2183	.2281
Western	50.57	52.29	.4892	.4039
United States	55.00	54.92	.2499	.2458
Riveters, male:				
North Atlantic	55.19	54.85	.3345	.3375
South Atlantic	58.56	58.15	.2280	.2294
North Central	57.10	56.94	.2722	.3498
Western	54.00	54.00	.3097	.3689
United States	56.58	56.28	.2784	.3072

Work people well organized in the West.

SILK GOODS.

Occupation and geographical division.	Average hours per week.		Average wages per hour.	
	1906.	1907.	1906.	1907.
Beamers, male:				
North Atlantic	56.97	56.89	$0.1887	$0.1938
Doublers, female:				
North Atlantic	57.69	57.17	.1055	.1163
Dyers, male:				
North Atlantic	55.64	55.66	.1954	.1902
Loom fixers, male:				
North Atlantic	58.15	58.03	.2656	.2768
Pickers, female:				
North Atlantic	58.18	57.76	.1185	.1274
Quillers, female:				
North Atlantic	57.74	57.75	.0918	.0984
Spinners, male:				
North Atlantic	58.02	56.74	.1017	.1035
Spinners, female:				
North Atlantic	58.91	58.44	.1035	.1136
Twisters-in, male:				
North Atlantic	57.91	57.92	.2391	.2564
Warpers, male:				
North Atlantic	56.27	56.37	.2403	.2505
Warpers, female:				
North Atlantic	58.12	57.70	.1563	.1663
Weavers, male:				
North Atlantic	57.66	57.68	.2086	.2177
Weavers, female:				
North Atlantic	58.33	58.02	.1543	.1700
Weavers, ribbon, male:				
North Atlantic	56.14	56.16	.2543	.2813

Protected by a tariff of from 46 per cent to 130 per cent. (Par. 392 to 395.)
Work people poorly organized.
Average percentage of labor in textile products, 19.5.

WOOLEN AND WORSTED GOODS.

Occupation and geographical division.	Average hours per week.		Average wages per hour.	
	1906.	1907.	1906.	1907.
Burlers, female:				
North Atlantic	58.31	57.89	$0.1092	$0.1153
Carders, male:				
North Atlantic	58.73	58.49	.1213	.1290
Card strippers, male:				
North Atlantic	58.08	57.95	.1324	.1355
Combers, male:				
North Atlantic	59.20	58.57	.1219	.1239
Combers, female:				
North Atlantic	56.62	56.21	.0948	.0958
Dyers, male:				
North Atlantic	59.43	58.91	.1408	.1500
Loom fixers, male:				
North Atlantic	58.38	57.99	.2546	.2674
Spinners, frame, male:				
North Atlantic	58.32	57.70	.0951	.1159
Spinners, frame, female:				
North Atlantic	58.68	58.00	.1065	.1185
Spinners, mule, male:				
North Atlantic	58.57	58.45	.2027	.2066
Weavers, male:				
North Atlantic	58.73	58.51	.2025	.2116
Weavers, female:				
North Atlantic	58.18	58.07	.1697	.1841

Protected by a tariff on—
Wool, from 35 to 149 per cent. (Pars. 365 to 372.)
Yarns, from 55 to 141 per cent. (Par. 374.)
Knit fabrics, from 55 to 141 per cent. (Par. 374.)
Blankets, from 71 to 143 per cent. (Par. 375.)
Work people poorly organized.
Average percentage of labor in textile products, 19.5.

EXHIBIT 11.

A comparison between the platforms of the two great political parties from 1856 to 1908 on the tariff, monopoly, reciprocity, and income tax:

Republican platforms.

1856.

Tariff, silent.
Monopoly, silent.
Reciprocity, silent.
Income tax, silent.

1860.

TARIFF.

12. That while providing revenue for the support of the General Government by duties upon imports, sound policy requires such an *adjustment of these imposts as to encourage the development of the industrial interests of the whole country;* and we commend that policy of national exchanges which secures to the workingmen liberal wages, to agriculture remunerative prices, to mechanics and manufacturers an adequate reward for their skill, labor, and enterprise, and to the Nation commercial prosperity and independence.

Monopoly, silent.
Reciprocity, silent.
Income tax, silent.

1864.

Tariff, silent.
Monopoly, silent.
Reciprocity, silent.
Income tax, silent.

1868.

Tariff, silent.
Monopoly, silent.
Reciprocity, silent.
Income tax, silent.

1872.

TARIFF.

7. The annual revenue, after paying current expenditures, pensions, and the interest on the public debt, should furnish a moderate balance for the reduction of the principal, and that revenue, except so much as may be derived from a tax on tobacco and liquors, should be raised by duties upon importations, the details of which should be so adjusted as to aid in securing remunerative wages to labor, and promote the industries, prosperity, and growth of the whole country.

11. Among the questions which press for attention is that which concerns the relations of capital and labor, and the Republican party recognizes the duty of so shaping legislation as to secure

Democratic platforms.

1856.

Tariff, silent.
Monopoly, silent.
Reciprocity, silent.
Income tax, silent.

1860.

Tariff, silent.

Monopoly, silent.
Reciprocity, silent.
Income tax, silent.

1864.

Tariff, silent.
Monopoly, silent.
Reciprocity, silent.
Income tax, silent.

1868.

Tariff, silent.
Monopoly, silent.
Reciprocity, silent.
Income tax, silent.

1872.

TARIFF.

6. We demand a system of Federal taxation which shall not unnecessarily interfere with the industry of the people, and which shall provide the means necessary to pay the expenses of the Government, economically administered, the pensions, the interest on the public debt, and a moderate reduction annually of the principal thereof; and recognizing that there are in our midst honest but irreconcilable differences of opinion with regard to the respective systems of protection and free trade, we remit the discussion of the subject to the people in their congressional districts, and to the decision of the Congress thereon, wholly free from executive interference or dictation.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

full protection and the amplest field for capital, and for labor, the creator of capital, the largest opportunities and a just share of the mutual profits of these two great servants of civilization.

Monopoly, silent.
Reciprocity, silent.
Income tax, silent.

1876.

TARIFF.

8. The revenue necessary for current expenditures and the obligations of the public debt must be largely derived from duties upon importations, which, so far as possible, should be adjusted to promote the interests of American labor and advance the prosperity of the whole country.

Monopoly, silent.
Reciprocity, silent.
Income tax, silent.

1880.

TARIFF.

5. We reaffirm the belief avowed in 1876, that the duties levied for the purpose of revenue should so discriminate as to favor American labor.

Monopoly, silent.
Reciprocity, silent.
Income tax, silent.

1884.

TARIFF.

The largest diversity of industry is most productive of general prosperity, and of the comfort and independence of the people.

We therefore demand that the imposition of duties on foreign imports shall be made, not "for revenue only," but that in raising the requisite revenues for the Government such duties shall be so levied as to afford security to our diversified industries and protection to the rights and wages of the laborer, to the end that active and intelligent labor, as well as capital, may have its just reward, and the laboring man his full share in the national prosperity.

Against the so-called "economic system of the Democratic party," which would degrade our labor to the foreign standard, we enter our earnest protest.

The Democratic party has failed completely to relieve the people of the burden of unnecessary taxation by a wise reduction of the surplus.

The Republican party pledges itself to correct the inequalities of the tariff and to reduce the surplus, not by the vicious and indiscriminate process of horizontal reduction, but by such methods as will relieve the taxpayer without injuring the laborer or the great productive interests of the country.

We recognize the importance of sheep husbandry in the United States, the serious depression which it is now experiencing, and the danger threatening its future prosperity; and we therefore respect the demands of the representatives of this important agricultural interest for a readjustment of duties upon foreign wool, in order that such industry shall have full and adequate protection.

Monopoly, silent.
Reciprocity, silent.
Income tax, silent.

1876.

TARIFF.

Reform is necessary in the sum and modes of federal taxation, to the end that capital may be set free from distrust and labor lightly burdened.

We denounce the present tariff, levied upon nearly 4,000 articles, as a masterpiece of injustice, inequality, and false pretense. It yields a dwindling, not a yearly rising revenue. It has impoverished many industries to subsidize a few. It prohibits imports that might purchase the products of American labor. It has degraded American commerce from the first to an inferior rank on the high seas. It has cut down the sales of American manufactures at home and abroad, and depleted the returns of American agriculture—an industry followed by half our people. It costs the people five times more than it produces to the Treasury, obstructs the processes of production, and wastes the fruits of labor. It promotes fraud, fosters smuggling, enriches dishonest officials, and bankrupts honest merchants. We demand that all custom-house taxation shall be only for revenue.

Reciprocity, silent.
Income tax, silent.

1880.

TARIFF.

13. The Democratic party is the friend of labor and the laboring man, and pledges itself to protect him alike against the cormorant and the commune.

Monopoly, silent.
Reciprocity, silent.
Income tax, silent.

1884.

TARIFF.

Commenting on the Republican party, the platform says: "It professes a desire to elevate labor; it has subjected American workingmen to the competition of convict and imported contract labor."

* * *

"It proffers a pledge to correct the irregularities of our tariff; it created and has continued them. Its own tariff commission confessed the needs of more than 20 per cent reduction; its Congress gave a reduction of less than 4 per cent. It professes the protection of American manufactures; it has subjected them to an increasing flood of manufactured goods and a hopeless competition with manufacturing nations, not one of which taxes raw materials. It professes to protect all American industries; it has impoverished many to subsidize a few. It professes the protection of American labor; it has depleted the returns of American agriculture and industry, followed by half of our people."

"The Democracy pledges itself to purify the administration from corruption, to restore economy, to revive respect for law, and to reduce taxation to the lowest limit consistent with due regard to the preservation of the faith of the nation to its creditors and pensioners. Knowing full well, however, that legislation affecting the operations of the people should be cautious and conservative in method, not in advance of public opinion, but responsive to its demands, the Democratic party is pledged to revise the tariff in a spirit of fairness to all interests. But, in making reduction in taxes, it is not proposed to injure any domestic industries, but rather to promote their healthy growth. From the foundation of this Government, taxes collected at the custom-house have been the chief source of federal revenue. Such they must continue to be. Moreover, many industries have come to rely upon legislation for successful continuance, so that any change of law must be at every step regardful of the labor and capital thus involved. The process of reform must be subject in the execution to this plain dictate of justice; all taxation shall be limited to the requirements of economical government. The necessary reduction and taxation can and must be effected without depriving American labor of the ability to compete successfully with foreign labor, and without imposing lower rates of duty than will be ample to cover any increased cost of production which may exist in consequence of the higher rate of wages prevailing in this country. Sufficient revenue to pay all the expenses of the Federal Government, economically administered, including pensions, interest and principal of the public debt, can be got under our present system of taxation from the custom-house taxes on fewer imported articles, bearing heaviest on articles of luxury and bearing lightest on articles of necessity. We therefore denounce the abuses of the existing tariff, and, subject to the preceding limitations, we demand that federal taxation shall be exclusively for public purposes and shall not exceed the needs of the Government, economically administered."

Monopoly, silent.
Reciprocity, silent.
Income tax, silent.

1888.

PROTECTION TO AMERICAN INDUSTRIES.

We are uncompromisingly in favor of the American system of protection; we protest against its destruction as proposed by the President and his party. They serve the interests of Europe; we will support the interests of America. We accept the issue and confidently appeal to the people for their judgment. The protective system must be maintained. Its abandonment has always been followed by general disaster to all interests except those of the usurer and the sheriff. We denounce the Mills bill as destructive to the general business, the labor, and the farming interests of the country, and we heartily indorse the consistent and patriotic action of the Republican Representatives in Congress in opposing its passage.

DUTIES ON WOOL.

We condemn the proposition of the Democratic party to place wool on the free list, and we insist that the duties thereon shall be adjusted and maintained so as to furnish full and adequate protection to that industry throughout the United States.

MONOPOLY.

We declare our opposition to all combinations of capital, organized in trusts or otherwise, to control arbitrarily the condition of trade among our citizens; and we recommend to Congress and the state legislatures, in their respective jurisdictions, such legislation as will prevent the execution of all

Monopoly, silent.
Reciprocity, silent.
Income tax, silent.

1888.

TARIFF REFORM.

Our established domestic industries and enterprises should not and need not be endangered by the reduction and correction of the burdens of taxation. On the contrary, a fair and careful revision of our tax laws, with due allowance for the difference between the wages of American and foreign labor, most promote and encourage every branch of such industries and enterprises by giving them assurance of an extended market and steady and continuous operations. In the interests of American labor, which should in no event be neglected, the revision of our tax laws contemplated by the Democratic party should promote the advantage of such labor by cheapening the cost of necessaries of life in the home of every workingman and at the same time securing to him steady and remunerative employment. Upon this question of tariff reform, so closely concerning every phase of our national life, and upon every question involved in the problem of good government, the Democratic party submits its principles and professions to the intelligent suffrages of the American people.

TAXATION.

The Republican party, controlling the Senate and resisting in both Houses of Congress a reformation of unjust and unequal tax laws which have outlasted the necessities of war and are now undermining the abundance of a long peace, denies to the people

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

schemes to oppress the people by undue charges on their supplies, or by unjust rates for the transportation of their products to market. We approve the legislation by Congress to prevent alike unjust burdens and unfair discriminations between the States.

Reciprocity, silent.
Income tax, silent.

1892.

THE PRINCIPLE OF PROTECTION.

We reaffirm the American doctrine of protection. We call attention to its growth abroad. We maintain that the prosperous condition of our country is largely due to the wise revenue legislation of the last Republican Congress. We believe that all articles which can not be produced in the United States, except luxuries, should be admitted free of duty, and that on all imports coming into competition with the products of American labor there should be levied duties equal to the difference between wages abroad and at home.

We assert that the prices of manufactured articles of general consumption have been reduced under the operations of the tariff act of 1890.

We denounce the efforts of the Democratic majority of the House of Representatives to destroy our tariff laws piecemeal, as manifested by their attacks upon wool, lead, and lead ores, the chief products of a number of States, and we ask the people for their judgment thereon.

equality before the law and the fairness and the justice which are their right. Thus the cry of American labor for a better share in the rewards of industry is stifled with false pretenses, enterprise is fettered and bound down to home markets, capital is discouraged with doubt, and unequal, unjust laws can neither be properly amended nor repealed. The Democratic party will continue, with all the power confided to it, the struggle to reform these laws in accordance with the pledges of its last platform, indorsed at the ballot box by the suffrages of the people.

Of all the industrious freemen of our land the immense majority, including every tiller of the soil, gain no advantage from excessive tax laws, but the price of nearly everything they buy is increased by the favoritism of an unequal system of tax legislation. All unnecessary taxation is unjust taxation. It is repugnant to the creed of Democracy that by such taxation the cost of the necessaries of life should be unjustifiably increased to all our people. Judged by Democratic principles, the interests of the people are betrayed when, by unnecessary taxation, trusts and combinations are permitted to exist, which, while unduly enriching the few that combine, rob the body of our citizens by depriving them of the benefits of natural competition.

Reciprocity, silent.
Income tax, silent.

1892.

TARIFF LEGISLATION.

SEC. 3. We denounce Republican protection as a fraud—a robbery of the great majority of the American people for the benefit of the few. We declare it to be a fundamental principle of the Democratic party that the Federal Government has no constitutional power to impose and collect tariff duties except for the purposes of revenue only, and we demand that the collection of such taxes shall be limited to the necessities of the Government when honestly and economically administered.

We denounce the McKinley tariff law enacted by the Fifty-first Congress as the culminating atrocity of class legislation; we indorse the efforts made by the Democrats of the present Congress to modify its most oppressive features in the direction of free raw materials and cheaper manufactured goods that enter into general consumption, and we promise its repeal as one of the beneficent results that will follow the action of the people in intrusting power to the Democratic party. Since the McKinley tariff went into operation there have been ten reductions of the wages of the laboring men to one increase. We deny that there has been any increase of prosperity to the country since that tariff went into operation, and we point to the dullness and distress, to the wage reductions and strikes in the iron trade, as the best possible evidence that no such prosperity has resulted from the McKinley Act.

We call the attention of thoughtful Americans to the fact that, after thirty years of restrictive taxes against the importation of foreign wealth in exchange for our agricultural surplus, the homes and farms of the country have become burdened with a real-estate mortgage debt of over $2,500,000,000, exclusive of all other forms of indebtedness; that in one of the chief agricultural States of the West there appears a real-estate mortgage debt averaging $165 per capita of the total population, and that similar conditions and tendencies are shown to exist in the other agricultural exporting States. We denounce a policy which fosters no industry so much as it does that of the sheriff.

TRIUMPH OF RECIPROCITY.

We point to the success of the Republican policy of reciprocity, under which our export trade has vastly increased and new and enlarged markets have been opened for the products of our farms and workshops. We remind the people of the bitter opposition of the Democratic party to this practical business measure, and claim that, executed by a Republican administration, our present laws will eventually give us control of the trade of the world.

Monopoly, silent.

Income tax, silent.

1896.

TARIFF.

We renew and emphasize our allegiance to the policy of protection as the bulwark of American industrial independence and the foundation of American development and prosperity. This true American policy taxes foreign products and encourages home industry; it puts the burden of revenue on foreign goods; it secures the American market for the American producer; it upholds the American standard of wages for the American workingman; it puts the factory by the side of the farm, and makes the American farmer less dependent on foreign demand and price; it diffuses general thrift, and founds the strength of all on the strength of each. In its reasonable application it is just, fair, and impartial; equally opposed to foreign control and domestic monopoly, to sectional discrimination and individual favoritism.

We denounce the present Democratic tariff as sectional, injurious to the public credit, and destructive to business enterprise. We demand such an equitable tariff on foreign imports which have come into competition with American products as will not only furnish adequate revenue for the necessary expenses of the Government, but will protect American labor from degradation to the wage level of other lands. We are not pledged to any particular schedules. The question of rates is a practical question to be governed by the conditions of time and of production; the ruling and uncompromising principle is the protection and development of American labor and industry. The country demands a right settlement, and then it wants rest.

RECIPROCITY.

We believe the repeal of the reciprocity arrangements negotiated by the last Republican administration was a national calamity, and we demand their renewal and extension on such terms as will equalize our trade with other nations, remove the restrictions which now obstruct the sale of American products in the ports of other countries, and secure enRECIPROCITY.

SEC. 4. Trade interchange on the basis of reciprocal advantages to the countries participating is a time-honored doctrine of the Democratic faith, but we denounce the sham reciprocity which juggles with the people's desire for enlarged foreign markets and freer exchanges, by pretending to establish closer trade relations for a country whose articles of export are almost exclusively agricultural products, with other countries that are also agricultural, while erecting a custom-house barrier of prohibitive tariff taxes against the richest countries of the world, that stand ready to take our entire surplus of products, and to exchange therefor commodities which are necessaries and comforts of life among our own people.

MONOPOLY, TRUSTS, AND COMBINATIONS.

SEC. 5. We recognize in the trusts and combinations, which are designed to enable capital to secure more than its just share of the joint product of capital and labor, a natural consequence of the prohibitive taxes which prevent the free competition which is the life of honest trade; but we believe their worst evils can be abated by law, and we demand the rigid enforcement of the laws made to prevent and control them, together with such further legislation in restraint of their abuses as experience may show to be necessary.

Income tax, silent.

1896.

TARIFF RESOLUTION.

We hold that tariff duties should be levied for purposes of revenue, such duties to be so adjusted as to operate equally throughout the country, and not discriminate between class or section, and that taxation should be limited by the needs of the Government, honestly and economically administered. We denounce as disturbing to business the Republican threat to restore the McKinley law, which has twice been condemned by the people in national elections, and which, enacted under the false plea of protection to home industry, proved a prolific breeder of trusts and monopolies, enriched the few at the expense of the many, restricted trade, and deprived the producers of the great American staples of access to their natural markets.

Until the money question is settled we are opposed to any agitation for further changes in our tariff laws, except such as are necessary to meet the deficit in revenue caused by the adverse decision of the Supreme Court on the income tax. But for this decision by the Supreme Court there would be no deficit in the revenue under the law passed by a Democratic Congress in strict pursuance of the uniform decisions of that court for nearly one hundred years, that court having in that decision sustained constitutional objections to its enactment which had previously been overruled by the ablest judges who have ever sat on that bench. We declare that it is the duty of Congress to use all the constitutional power which remains after that decision, or which may come from its reversal by the court as it may hereafter be constituted, so that the burdens of taxation may be equally and impartially laid, to the end that wealth may bear its due proportion of the expense of the Government.

Reciprocity, silent.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

larged markets for the products of our farms, forests, and factories.

Protection and reciprocity are twin measures of Republican policy and go hand in hand. Democratic rule has recklessly struck down both, and both must be reestablished. Protection for what we produce; free admission for the necessaries of life which we do not produce; reciprocity agreements of mutual interests which gain open markets for us in return for our open market to others. Protection builds up domestic industry and trade, and secures our own market for ourselves; reciprocity builds up foreign trade, and finds an outlet for our surplus.

Monopoly, silent.

Income tax, silent.

1900.

TARIFF POLICY REAFFIRMED.

We renew our faith in the policy of protection to American labor. In that policy our industries have been established, diversified, and maintained. By protecting the home market, competition has been stimulated and production cheapened. Opportunity to the inventive genius of our people has been secured and wages in every department of labor maintained at high rates—higher now than ever before, and always distinguishing our working people in their better conditions of life from those of any competing country. Enjoying the blessings of the American common school, secure in the right of self-government, and protected in the occupancy of their own markets, their constantly increasing knowledge and skill have enabled them to finally enter the markets of the world.

TRUSTS.

We recognize the necessity and propriety of the honest cooperation of capital to meet new business conditions, and especially to extend our rapidly increasing foreign trade; but we condemn all conspiracies and combinations intended to restrict business, to create monopolies, to limit production, or to control prices, and favor such legislation as will effectively restrain and prevent all such abuses, protect and promote competition, and secure the rights of producers, laborers, and all who are engaged in industry and commerce.

MONOPOLY, TRUSTS, AND POOLS.

The absorption of wealth by the few, the consolidation of our leading railroad systems, and the formation of trusts and pools require a stricter control by the Federal Government of those arteries of commerce. We demand the enlargement of the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and such restriction and guarantees in the control of railroads as will protect the people from robbery and oppression.

Income tax, silent.

1900.

TARIFF RESOLUTION.

We hold that tariff duties should be levied for purposes of revenue, such duties to be so adjusted as to operate equally throughout the branches of the National Government, to enact any legislation designed to prevent or even curtail the absorbing power of trusts and illegal combinations, or to enforce the antitrust laws already on the statute books, proves the insincerity of the high-sounding phrases of the Republican platform.

CORPORATE INTERFERENCE IN GOVERNMENT.

Corporations should be protected in all their rights and their legitimate interests should be respected, but any attempt by corporations to interfere with the public affairs of the people, or to control the sovereignty which creates them should be forbidden under such penalties as will make such attempts impossible.

THE DINGLEY TARIFF LAW.

We condemn the Dingley tariff law as a trust-breeding measure, skillfully devised to give the few favors which they do not deserve and to place upon the many burdens which they should not bear.

TRUSTS.

Private monopolies are indefensible and intolerable. They destroy competition, control the price of all material and of the finished product, thus robbing both producer and consumer. They lessen the employment of labor and arbitrarily fix the terms and conditions thereof, and deprive individual energy and a small capital of their opportunity for betterment. They are the most efficient means yet devised for appropriating the fruits of industry to the benefit of the few at the expense of the many, and, unless their insatiate greed is checked, all wealth will be aggregated in a few hands and the Republic destroyed.

The dishonest paltering with the trust evil by the Republican party in state and national platforms is conclusive proof of the truth of the charge that trusts are the legitimate product of Republican policies; that they are fostered by Republican laws; and that they are protected by the Republican administration for campaign subscriptions and political support.

We pledge the Democratic party to an unceasing warfare in nation, State, and city against private monopoly in every form. Existing laws against trusts must be enforced and more stringent ones must be enacted, providing for publicity as to the affairs of corporations engaged in interstate commerce, requiring all corporations to show, before doing business outside the State of their origin, that they have no water in their stock and that they have not attempted, and are not attempting, to monopolize any branch of business or the production of any article of merchandise; and the whole constitutional power of Congress over interstate commerce, the mails, and all modes of interstate communication shall be exercised by the enactment of comprehensive laws upon the subject of trusts.

THE FREE LIST AS A REMEDY.

Tariff laws should be amended by putting the products of trusts upon the free list to prevent monopoly under the plea of protection.

TRUSTS CONDEMNED.

We reaffirm our opposition, declared in the Republican platform of 1888, to all combinations of capital, organized in trusts or otherwise, to control arbitrarily the condition of trade among our citizens. We heartily indorse the action already taken upon this subject, and ask for such further legislation as may be required to remedy any defects in existing laws and to render their enforcement more complete and effective.

Reciprocity, silent.

Income tax, silent.

1904.

TARIFF LEGISLATION.

The Democratic party has been, and will continue to be, the consistent opponent of that class of tariff legislation by which certain interests have been permitted, through congressional favor, to draw a heavy tribute from the American people. This monstrous prevention of those equal opportunities which our political institutions were established to secure has caused what may once have been infant industries to become the greatest combinations of capital that the world has ever known. These especial favorites of the Government have, through trust methods, been converted into monopolies, thus bringing to an end domestic competition, which was the only alleged check upon the extravagant profits made possible by the protective system. These industrial combinations, by the financial assistance they can give, now control the policy of the Republican party.

We denounce protection as a robbery of the many to enrich the few, and we favor a tariff limited to the needs of the Government economically administered, and so levied as not to discriminate against any industry, class, or section, to the end that the burdens of taxation shall be distributed as equally as possible.

We favor a revision and a gradual reduction of the tariff by the friends of the masses and for the common weal, and not by the friends of its abuses, its extortions, and its discriminations, keeping in view the ultimate ends of "equality of burdens and equality of opportunities," and the constitutional purpose of raising a revenue by taxation, to wit, the support of the Federal Government in all its integrity and virility, but in simplicity.

TRUSTS AND UNLAWFUL COMBINATIONS.

We recognize that the gigantic trusts and combinations designed to enable capital to secure more than its just share of the joint products of capital and labor, and which have been fostered and promoted under Republican rule, are a menace to beneficial competition and an obstacle to permanent business prosperity. A private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable.

Individual equality of opportunity and free competition are essential to a healthy and permanent commercial prosperity, and any trust, combination, or monopoly tending to destroy these by controlling production, restricting

RECIPROCITY FAVORED.

We favor the associated policy of reciprocity, so directed as to open our markets on favorable terms for what we do not ourselves produce in return for free foreign markets.

Income tax, silent.

1904.

THE PROTECTIVE TARIFF.

Protection which guards and develops our industries is a cardinal policy of the Republican party. The measure of protection should always at least equal the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad.

We insist upon the maintenance of the principles of protection, and therefore rates of duty should be readjusted only when conditions have so changed that the public interest demands their alteration; but this work can not safely be committed to any other hands than those of the Republican party. To intrust it to the Democratic party is to invite disaster. Whether, as in 1892, the Democratic party declares the protective tariff unconstitutional, or whether it demands tariff reform or tariff revision, its real object is always the destruction of the protective system.

However specious the name, the purpose is ever the same. A Democratic tariff has always been followed by business adversity; a Republican tariff by business prosperity.

To a Republican Congress and a Republican President this great question can be safely intrusted. When the only free-trade country among the great nations agitates a return to protection, the chief protective country should not falter in maintaining it.

We have extended widely our foreign markets, and we believe in the adoption of all practicable methods for their further extension, including commercial reciprocity wherever reciprocal arrangements can be effected consistent with the principles of protection and without injury to American agriculture, American labor, or any American industry.

COMBINATIONS OF LABOR AND CAPITAL.

Combinations of capital and of labor are the results of the economic movement of the age, but neither must be permitted to infringe upon the rights and interests of the people. Such combinations when lawfully formed for lawful purposes are alike entitled to the protection of the laws, but both are subject to the laws, and neither can be permitted to break them.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

competition, or fixing prices should be prohibited and punished by law. We especially denounce rebates and discrimination by transportation companies as the most potent agency in promoting and strengthening these unlawful conspiracies against trade.

CAPITAL AND LABOR.

We favor enactment and administration of laws giving labor and capital impartially their just rights. Capital and labor ought not to be enemies. Each is necessary to the other. Each has its rights, but the rights of labor are certainly no less "vested," no less "sacred," and no less "unalienable" than the rights of capital.

Reciprocity, silent.

RECIPROCITY.

We favor liberal trade arrangements with Canada and with peoples of other countries where they can be entered into with benefit to American agriculture, manufactures, mining, or commerce.

Income tax, silent.

Income tax, silent.

1908.

TARIFF REVISION PROMISED.

The Republican party declares unequivocally for a revision of the tariff by a special session of the Congress immediately following the inauguration of the next President, and commends the steps already taken to this end in the work assigned to the appropriate committees of Congress, which are now investigating the operation and effect of these schedules. In all tariff legislation the true principle of protection is best maintained by the imposition of such duties as will equal the difference between cost of production at home and abroad, together with a reasonable profit to American industries. We favor the establishment of a maximum and minimum rate to be administered by the President under limitations fixed by the law, the maximum to be available to meet the discrimination by foreign countries against American goods entering our markets, and the minimum representing the normal measure of protection at home, the aim and the purpose of Republican policy being not only to preserve without excessive duties the security against foreign competition to which American manufacturers, farmers, and producers are entitled, but also to maintain the high standard of living of the wage-workers of this country, who are the most direct beneficiaries of the protective system.

TRUSTS.

The Republican party passed the Sherman antitrust law over Democratic opposition, and enforced it after Democratic dereliction. It has been a wholesome instrument for good in the hands of a wise and fearless administration; but experience has shown that its effectiveness can be strengthened and its real objects better obtained by such amendment as will give the Federal Government greater supervision and control over and greater publicity in the management of that class of corporations engaged in interstate commerce having power and opportunity to effect monopolies.

1908.

TARIFF.

We welcome the belated promise of tariff reform, now offered by the Republican party, as a tardy recognition of the righteousness of the Democratic position on this question; but the people can not safely intrust the execution of this important work to a party which is so deeply obligated to the highly protected interests as is the Republican party. We call attention to the significant fact that the promised relief is postponed until after the coming election—an election to succeed in which the Republican party must have that same support from the beneficiaries of the high protective tariff as it has always heretofore received from them; and to the further fact that during years of uninterrupted power no action whatever has been taken by the Republican Congress as to correct the admittedly existing tariff iniquities.

We favor immediate revision of the tariff by the reduction of import duties. Articles entering into competition with trust-controlled products should be placed upon the free list; material reductions should be made in the tariff upon the necessaries of life, especially upon articles competing with such American manufactures as are sold abroad more cheaply than at home; and gradual reductions should be made in such other schedules as may be necessary to restore the tariff to a revenue basis.

Existing duties have given the manufacturers of paper a shelter behind which they have organized combinations to raise the price of pulp and of paper, thus imposing a tax upon the spread of knowledge. We demand the immediate repeal of the tariff on wood pulp, print paper, lumber, timber, and logs, and that those articles be placed upon the free list.

TRUSTS.

A private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable. We therefore favor the vigorous enforcement of the criminal law against guilty trust magnates and officials, and demand the enactment of such additional legislation as may be necessary to make it impossible for a private monopoly to exist in the United States. Among the additional remedies we specify three: First, a law preventing a duplication of directors among competing corporations; second, a license system which will, without abridging the right of each State to create corporations, or its right to regulate as it will foreign corporations doing business within its limits, make it necessary for a manufacturing or trading corporation engaged in interstate commerce to take out a federal license before it shall be permitted to control as much as 25 per cent of the product in which it deals, the license to protect the public from watered stock and to prohibit the control by such corporation of more than 50 per cent of the total amount of any product consumed in the United States; and, third, a law compelling such licensed corporations to sell to all purchasers in all parts of the country on the same terms, after making the allowance for the cost of transportation.

Income tax, silent.

INCOME TAX.

We favor an income tax as part of our revenue system, and we urge the submission of a constitutional amendment specifically authorizing Congress to levy and collect a tax upon individual and corporate incomes, to the end that wealth may bear its proportionate share of the burdens of the Federal Government.

Reciprocity, silent.

Reciprocity, silent.

EXHIBIT 12.

[Tables prepared by Byron W. Holt, October 15, 1906, 42 Broadway, New York.]

TABLE 1.—*Showing differences in discounts between export and home prices.*

Articles—Description.	Export discount from list.	Home discount from list.	Per cent difference.
	Per cent.	*Per cent.*	
Auger bits, Snells or Mathieson	70 and 10	60	48
Auger bits, Jennings pattern	70, 10, and 10	60	60
Auger bits, Kings or Star	60, 10, and 5	60	17
Auger bits, Bates	80 and 10	75	38
Auger bits, handled	33⅓	25	13
Auger bits, car, Jennings pattern	60, 10, and 10	60	23
	55 and 10	55	11
Alarms, electric	60 and 10	60	11
Axle pulleys	25, 10, and 2	25	17
Ash cans, galvanized	50	40	20
Bread or meat slicers	50	40	20
Box trucks	75 and 5	70	26
Barber's shears	60, 10, and 5	60	17
Bellhanger's gimlets	80 and 10	70 and 10	50
Boring machine augers	50 and 10	40	33⅓
Boring machine ship augers	50	40	25
Butts, door	55, 20, 5 and 5	60	23
Bolts, window	60 and 5	60	6
Bells, hand, nickel-plated	60 and 10	60	11
Bells, jingle	70 and 10	50 and 10	66
Bits, expansive, Clark Brown	60 and 10	50 and 10	25
Bits, expansive, Clark's genuine	70 and 10	50 and 10	66
Bits, expansive, cutters and screws	55, 5 and 10	55 and 5	11
Bootjacks	70, 10, 5 and 10	70, 10 and 5	11
Bench hooks	75, 10, 5 and 10	75, 10 and 5	11
Blacksmith's butterises	70, 10, 5 and 10	70, 10 and 5	11
Bridle rings	80, 10 and 10	80 and 10	11
Belt hooks	75, 10 and 10	75 and 10	11
Blind hinges	60 and 10	60	11
Brass pulleys	50	40	20
Bird-cage hooks	55 and 10	55	11
Bell pulls	70, 7½ and 10	70 and 7½	11
Bells, door	70, 5 and 10	70 and 5	11
Bell cranks	60, 10, 10 and 10	60, 10 and 10	11
Barn and cabin door catches	80 and 10	80	11
Box corners	10	Net.	11
Bench screws	60, 10, 10 and 10	60, 10 and 10	11
Cattle ties	90, 25 and 10	90 and 25	11
Cornice hooks	70, 5 and 10	70 and 5	11
Chandelier hooks	70 and 10	70	11
Chain bolts	50	40	20
Cake turners	75, 10 and 7½	75 and 5	13
Compasses and calipers	60	50	20
Chisels, box	75	60 and 10	44
Carpet stretchers, No. 5	50	40	20
Casters, stove leg	40	30	17
Casters, rubber tire	80	70 and 10	35
Casters, boss	50	40	25
Coat holders	80 and 5	70	53
Coat and hat hooks, crescent	20, 10 and 2	20	17
Carriage washers, perfection	25, 10 and 2	25	17
Chains, hitching	50 and 5	40	27
Carts, hand	60, 10 and 10	60 and 10	11
Coal tongs	60, 10, 10 and 10	60, 10 and 10	11
Coal shovels	70, 10, 5 and 10	70, 10 and 5	11
Cow bells	10	Net.	11
Can openers	60, 10, 10 and 10	60, 10 and 10	11
Clamps	60, 10 and 10	60 and 10	11
Cotton, box, and hay hooks	50 and 5 and 10	50 and 5	11
Curtain pins	60, 10 and 10	60 and 10	11
Chest handles	80, 10 and 10	80 and 10	11
Corner braces	70 and 10	70	11
Clothes line pulleys	60 and 10	60	11
Door bolts	75 and 10	75	11
Door springs	75 and 5 and 10	75 and 5	11
Door checks	60, 10, 10 and 10	60, 10 and 10	11
Door holders; pulls and knobs			

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

TABLE I.—*Showing differences in discounts between export and home prices*—Continued.

Articles—Description.	Export discount from list.	Home discount from list.	Per cent difference.
	Per cent.	*Per cent.*	
Barn door rollers, hangers, or stops	60, 10 and 10	60 and 10	11
Drills, blacksmith's	60, 10, 10 and 10	60, 10 and 10	11
Drill chucks, Reids	50 and 5	40	27
Door bells, rotary	60 and 10	50	36
Drip pans	65, 10 and 12½	65 and 10	14
Door keys	55 and 10	55	11
Door knockers	75, 5 and 10	70 and 5	11
Desk hooks	60, 10, 10 and 10	60 and 10 and 10	11
Escutcheons, door	55 and 10	55	11
Extension table fasteners	70, 5 and 10	70 and 5	11
Feed cars and measure holders	25, 10 and 2	25	17
Forges, machinist's portable	60, 10 and 7½	60	20
Fire iron sets	60, 10, 10 and 10	60, 10 and 10	11
Fluting scissors, Nos. 93, 94	33⅓	25	12½
Freezers, lightning	65 and 10	50	51
Freezers, blizzard	70 and 10	60	41
Floor scrubbers, No. 1	60 and 10	60	18
Faucets, metal key	60, 10 and 5	60	17
Foot scrapers	70, 5 and 10	70 and 5	11
Game traps	75, 10 and 10	75 and 10	11
Garden trowels and hooks	60, 10 and 10	60 and 10	11
Grindstone fixtures	70, 10, 10 and 10	70, 10 and 10	11
Grass hooks, Bardens	10 and 10	Net.	23
Gate hinges	60, 10, 10 and 10	60, 10 and 10	11
Gate latches	70, 5 and 10	70 and 5	11
Hoof nippers	10	Net.	11
Harness snaps	50 and 10	50	11
Hot-house pulleys	70 and 10	70	11
Harness hooks	60 and 10	60	11
Hacksaw frames, Sterling	50	30, 10 and 10	13
Hacksaw blades, Sterling	50	20, 10 and 5	19
Hacksaw power, Sterling	25 and 10	25	11
Hat and coat racks	50	40	20
Hammers, Spalling; masons	80, 10, 10 and 2½	80 and 10	17
Hammers, shoe	60, 10, 10 and 10	60, 10 and 10	11
Hammer saw-sets, No. 1	75	60 and 10	44
Horseshoe turning sledges	80, 10, 10 and 2½	80 and 10	17
Hinges, hook and strap	50	40	20
Hinges, refrigerator	60 and 10	60	11
Hasps and staples, No. 850	50 and 10	50	11
Hammock hooks and hitching rings	50	40	20
Hand rail stays	50 and 10	50	11
Handles, drop	55 and 10	55	11
Hatchets, shingling	70, 20 and 10	70 and 20	11
Handles, chisel	80, 10 and 10	80 and 10	11
Handles, screw-driver and file	60, 10, 10 and 10	60, 10 and 10	11
Handles, awl	60, 10 and 10	60 and 10	11
Harness brackets and chamois wringers	25, 10 and 2	25	17
Ice box fasts and ice axes	60, 10 and 10	60 and 10	11
Iron manger, hay racks and posts	25, 10 and 12	25	17
Jack chain, steel or brass	60, 7½ and 10	60 and 7½	11
Jackscrews	75, 10, 5 and 10	75, 10 and 5	11
Jacks, carriage	25, 10 and 2	25	17
Keys, padlock	90 and 10	90	11
Knife trays	50	40	20
Label plates	60, 10 and 10	60 and 10	11
Lamps, driving or police	50	40	25
Lamps or lanterns, tubular	50 and 10	45	22
Lamps, automobile	50, 10 and 10	45	35
Lemon squeezers	504	40	20
Ladles, melting	60 and 10	60	11
Linemen's pliers No. 4 and splicing	70	60	33⅓
Locks, ventilating	55, 20 and 5 and 5	60	23
Letter plates	55 and 10	55	11
Locks and latches—door and spring	55 and 10	55	11
Locker catches	60 and 10	60	11
Line cleats	70 and 10	70	11
Links, D	85 and 10	85	11
Lamp hooks	70 and 5 and 10	70 and 5	11
Measuring tapes, architects	50	40	20
Measuring tapes, leather case	40	25	25
Measuring tapes, steel, pocket	50	33⅓	33
Mattocks, adze eye	75, 10 and 5	75	17
Mauls, R. R., ship and wood choppers'	80, 10, 10 and 2½	80 and 10	14
Mop wringers	50	40	20
Mane combs	50 and 5 and 10	50 and 5	11
Match safes	60 and 10	60	11
Meat cutters, Hale	10	Net.	11
Molasses gates	80, 10, 5 and 10	80, 10 and 5	11
Nut cracks	70, 10, 5 and 10	70, 10 and 5	11
Nails, wagon	60 and 10	60	11
Oilstones, Washita, mounted	50 and 10	33⅓	48
Ornamental figures, bronze	70, 5 and 10	70 and 5	11
Oilers, steel, copper and nickel plated	75 and 5	60 and 10	57
Oilers, brass	50 and 10	50	11
Oilers, engineers' and railroads, copper	70	60 and 10	20
Ox-bow pins	80 and 10	80	11
Ox balls	60, 10 and 10	60 and 10	11
Padlocks	60, 7½ and 10	60 and 7½	11
Post augurs	70 and 10	60	48
Picks, railroad, Hunt eye	75 and 5	70	26
Picks, stone and contractors'	70, 10, 10 and 5	70	30
Picks, mattocks, coal and ore picks	75, 10 and 5	75	17

TABLE I.—*Showing differences in discounts between export and home prices*—Continued.

Articles—Description.	Export discount from list.	Home discount from list.	Per cent difference.
	Per cent.	*Per cent.*	
Pliers, farmers' and machinists'	80	70	50
Pruning shears	75	60 and 10	44
Planes, iron or wood bottom	70 and 10	60	48
Push buttons	70, 10, 5 and 10	70, 10 and 5	11
Push plates and picture nails	55 and 10	55	11
Picture knobs and hooks	60, 10 and 10	60 and 10	11
Paper weights and files	60, 10, 10 and 10	60, 10 and 10	11
Paste jaggers	55 and 5 and 10	55 and 5	11
Plumb bobs	70, 5 and 10	70 and 5	11
Plows, sulky and gang	40	25	25
Plows, hand and contractors'	40	25	25
Road scrapers	40	25	25
Rope binding clamps	60, 10 and 10	60 and 10	11
Rein chains	75, 5 and 10	75 and 5	11
Rim locks	60	50	25
Reamers, square	40, 10 and 10	40	23
Stair buttons	50	40	20
Shutter knobs, No. 30	80, 10 and 5	80	17
Spice cabinets	50	40	20
Slaw cutters	50	40	20
Sawbucks	50	40	20
Sash locks, cast	60, 20, 5, and 5	62½	30
Sash locks, Ives	55, 20, 5 and 5	50 and 10	40
Staples, wrought, No. 849	50 and 10	50	11
Screw-drivers, union	50	40	20
Screw-drivers, No. 40	60, 10 and 10	50	23
Screw-drivers, No. 30	60	60	60
Screw-driver countersinks	40, 10, 10 and 10	45	25
Sledges, 3 to 24 lbs. and railroad	80, 10, 10, 10 and 2½	80⅒	14
Shears, tailors', simplex	55	40 and 10	20
Scythe snaths	50, 12½, 7½ and 5	50	30
Stable gutters, drains, and gratings	25, 10 and 2	25	17
Scoops, potato	50, 10 and 5	40	40
Screws, saw	60 and 10	60	11
Steel rules	70, 7½ and 10	70 and 7½	11
Steel squares	75, 10 and 10	75 and 10	11
Soap boxes and racks, metal	25, 10 and 2	25	17
Stoves, crucible or scorcher	10 and 2	Net.	17
Scales, brass scoop, spring or platform	60 and 10	60	11
Sausage stuffers	55 and 10	55	11
Screen-door handles	50 and 5	40	11
Shutter screw rings	50, 10 and 10	50	23
Spring hinges	60, 10 and 10	60 and 10	11
Screen-door sets	60, 10, 10 and 10	60, 10 and 10	11
Shutter bolts	40, 10 and 10	40 and 10	11
Screen catches	60, 10 and 10	60 and 10	11
Store door handles	60, 10, 10 and 10	60, 10 and 10	11
Shutter knobs and sash pulls	60, 10 and 10	60 and 10	11
Sash rails and shutter sheaves	60 and 10	60	11
Sash rollers	60, 10, 10 and 10	60, 10 and 10	11
Shutter sheaves	60 and 10	60	11
Screw pulleys	70 and 10	70	11
Shelf brackets	80 and 10	80	11
Shutter rings, cord irons	60, 10 and 10	60 and 10	11
Screw and stair-rod eyes	90, 25 and 10	90 and 25	11
Safety chain, brass	66⅔ and 10	66⅔	11
Sheep bells	70, 10, 5 and 10	70, 10 and 5	11
Sad-iron stands	50, 5 and 10	50 and 5	11
Saw rods	80, 10 and 10	80 and 10	11
Twine boxes	70, 10 and 10	70 and 10	11
Telegraph hooks	66⅔ and 10	66⅔	11
Trucks, grocery	75 and 5	60	60
Trucks, baggage	65 and 5	50	50
Trucks, store	70	60 and 10	20
Tongs, blacksmiths'	75, 10, 5 and 10	75, 10 and 5	11
Tortilla mills	10	Net.	11
Tack hammers	60 and 10	60	11
Tacks, double pointed	{80, 10, 10, 10, 10 and 10}	80, 10, 10 and 10	23
Tree pruners, standard	80, 10, 10 and 5	80 and 10	17
Tree pruners, telephone	75	60 and 10	44
Trimmers, bent, japanned	75 and 5	70	26
Trimmers, bent, nickel	70	60	33⅓
Tinners' snips, forged steel	50 and 10	50	11
Trucks, barrel, No. 950	50	40	20
Tobacco cutters	40, 5 and 10	40	17
Tills, tool racks, and towel rollers	50	40	20
Towel bars	50 and 5	40	26
Transom butts and tub handles	60, 10 and 10	60 and 10	11
Transom catches and chains	60 and 10	60	11
Towel and toilet hooks	60 and 10	60	11
Tackle pulleys	70 and 10	70	11
Turn-buckles	60, 10 and 10	60 and 10	11
Umbrella stands, iron	60, 10 and 10	60 and 10	11
Vise boxes and screws	33⅓	25	13
Vises, solid box, 25 to 100 lbs	60, 10 and 5	60	17
Vises, solid box, 140 to 200 lbs	60	50	25
Veneer points	60, 10 and 10	60 and 10	11
Wrenches, Sargent's	75, 10, 5 and 10	75, 10 and 5	11
Wrenches, Coes, Star	40, 10, 7½, 7½, 5 and 5	40, 10, 5 and 5	10
Weather strips, flexible	75	60 and 10	44
Window cleaners and wagon stake irons	50 and 10	60	11
Well wheels	70, 5 and 10	70 and 5	11
Washers, bright	22½ and 10	22½	11
Washers, cutters	60, 10, 10 and 10	60, 10 and 10	11
Whip racks and wheel guards	25, 10 and 2	25	17
Watering troughs, iron	30, 10 and 2	30	17
Yoke hooks	25, 10 and 2	25	17

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

TABLE II.—*Showing difference between export and home prices of certain specified articles.*

Articles and description.	Export price.	Home price.	Difference.
			Per cent.
Boring machines, upright, each	$2.25	$2.50	11
Boring machines, angular, do	2.40	2.75	14
Crowbars, 10 to 40 lbs, per 100 pounds	2.35	3.25	38
Track wrenches, single, do	5.00	5.75	15
Lining bars, do	2.60	3.25	25
Tamping bars, do	3.15	3.50	11
Nail sets, No. 15, per gross	3.50	4.00	14
Saw sets, No. 1, per doz	3.00	3.50	16
Saw sets, Taintor, do	5.00	6.75	35
Box scrapers, No. 21, do	2.25	2.50	30
Revolving punches, No. 26, do	3.25	3.50	8
Saddler's punches, Nos. 1 to 6, do	.65	.75	10
Box hooks, 10-inch, do	2.25	2.50	11
Carpet stretchers, No. 66, do	1.75	1.90	9
Tack claws, No. 68, per gross	5.50	6.00	10
Gimlets, No. 18, do	4.25	4.60	8
Gimlets, German pattern, do	4.85	5.75	19
Can openers, No. 98, do	9.00	10.00	11
Sardine scissors, per doz	2.50	3.00	20
Cold chisels, ½ inch, per lb	.17	.19	12
Spoke shaves, No. 0, per doz	1.12	1.25	12
Plows, disc No. 1, each	32.50	40.00	25
Harrows, 25-tooth, do	18.25	22.00	25
Harrows, wood-frame, 18-tooth, do	7.50	9.00	20
Cultivators, wheel, No. 61, do	4.00	5.00	25
Plows, shovel, No. 20, do	2.15	2.50	16
Hoes, berry and grape, do	7.00	8.00	15
Hoes, potato, No. 1, do	4.75	5.50	16
Wheelbarrows, wood, bolted, per doz	14.50	16.00	11
Wheelbarrows, mortar, do	18.00	20.00	11
Wheelbarrows, stone, do	17.50	19.00	11
Wheelbarrows, garden, wood-wheel, each	2.50	3.00	20
Road scrapers, No. 1, do	4.00	5.00	25
Shoes, horse, per 100 pounds	3.38	3.90	15
Shoes, mule, do	3.38	3.90	15
Calks, toe, do	3.00	3.90	30
Threshers, grain, horse or steam power, 32-in., each	300.00	400.00	33⅓
Straw stackers, 18-ft, do	25.00	30.00	20
Grain weigher and bagger, do	45.00	60.00	33⅓
Rubber belting, 6-in, per ft	.39	.30	33⅓
Clover hullers, 32-in, each	338.00	450.00	33⅓
Horsepowers, 10-horse, do	143.00	190.00	33⅓
Sawmills, 24-ft. carriage, do	244.00	325.00	33⅓
Pumps, jet, do	3.00	4.00	33⅓
Engines, traction, 8-horsepower, do	917.00	1,225.00	33⅓
Engines, Farm, 8-horsepower, do	563.00	750.00	33⅓
Clothes wringers, 10 by 1⅞, per doz	18.70	22.50	20
Scales, wagon and hay, 3 tons, each	67.50	75.00	11
Scales, depot, 4 tons, do	162.00	180.00	11
Scales, platform, with wheels, 800 lbs, do	17.10	19.00	11
Scales, grocer's, brass scoop, 244 lbs, do	8.10	9.00	11
Incubators, No. 1, do	15.00	20.00	33⅓
Brooders, 200 chicks, do	9.20	11.50	25
Potato planters, plain, do	45.00	50.00	11
Potato diggers, do	90.00	100.00	11
Forges, machinists, portable, do	14.50	16.80	20
Shovels, D handle, square point, No. 2, per doz	8.25	11.00	33⅓
Spades, D handle, No. 2, per doz	$9.00	$12.00	33⅓
Watches, 23 jewel Vanguard, nickel case, each	22.47	26.23	16
Watches, 21 jewel Vanguard, nickel case, do	19.07	24.11	26
Watches, 21 jewel Crescent st., nickel case, do	15.43	19.88	28
Watches, 17 jewel Premier, nickel case, do	14.12	16.50	16
Watches, 23 jewel Riverside Maximus case, do	31.77	43.15	35
Watches, 19 jewel Riverside, nickel case, do	14.69	18.19	23
Watches, 21 jewel Father Time, nickel case, do	14.42	19.89	38
Beds, brass, 1½ inch pillars, do	22.67	27.50	5
Beds, brass, cribs, 1-inch pillars, do	20.00	22.50	11
Beds, enameled, 1-inch pillars, do	8.00	9.00	12
Bed springs, woven wire, do	2.70	3.04	13
Bull rings, steel, 2½-in, per doz	.67	.75	12
Bull rings, copper, 2½-in, per gross	10.85	13.45	24
Cattle leaders, No. 2, do	6.00	7.20	20
Corn hooks, serrated blade, do	23.70	25.20	7
Knives, kitchen, do	12.00	16.00	33⅓
Auger bits, Snells, ⅜-in, per doz	1.62	2.40	48
Auger bits, Jennings, ½-in, do	1.21	2.00	60
Auger bits, Kings, ⅜-in, do	1.71	2.00	17
Auger bits, Star, ⅜-in, do	1.37	1.60	17
Auger bits, Mathieson, 1-in, do	3.08	3.60	48
Pulleys, axle, 2½-in, do	.72	.80	11
Pulleys, hothouse, 2½-in, do	.81	.90	11
Bits, expansive, Clark Brown, do	4.86	8.10	66
Bits, expansive, cutters, ½ to ⅞-in, do	.81	1.35	66
Locks, rim, 5-in, do	3.60	4.01	11
Locks, mortise, No. 4607, do	3.24	3.60	11
Locks, padlocks, assorted, No. 5, per gross	3.89	4.32	11
Springs, coil, steel, ½-in, per doz	.48	.54	11
Springs, coil, brass, 2-in, do	.40	.45	11
Keys, door, No. 105, per gross	.80	.90	11
Keys, padlock, No. 20, do	1.77	1.97	11
Wagon stake irons, 2-in, per doz	.77	.86	11
Staples, in kegs, 1-in, per keg	4.80	5.30	11
Shears, barbers, 8-in. Japanned, per doz	3.80	4.80	26
Shears, tailors, 13-in, per pair	3.60	4.32	20
Shears, tinner's snipps, 13-in, do	.90	1.00	11
Shears, pruning, 9-in, per doz	13.50	16.20	20
Soap, toilet, Violet, per gross	32.00	40.80	25
Soap, toilet, Jockey Club, do	23.87	28.05	25
Soap, toilet, Lettuce, do	19.50	22.44	15
Soap, toilet, Vioris, large, do	16.62	19.12	15
Soap, toilet, Sweet Lavender, do	14.04	19.12	35
Soap, toilet, Shaving stick, large, do	13.00	16.74	20
Soap, toilet, Honey, do	11.11	12.75	15
Soap, toilet, Cashmere Bouquet, do	20.48	30.24	48
Soap, toilet white Castile, do	9.94	12.11	25
Soap, toilets Glycerine, do	8.34	12.75	52
Flavoring extract, vanilla ¼ pints, per doz	7.58	8.43	11
Flavoring extract, lemon pints, do	9.65	10.88	12
Florida water, per case	2.75	5.00	81
Perumery Edition de Luxe, 2 oz, per doz	15.60	17.85	15
Perfumery, violet, 2 oz, do	11.70	13.38	15
Talcum powder, violet, large, do	1.39	1.60	16
Vaseline No. 2, do	.58	.70	20

TABLE II.—*Showing difference between export and home prices of certain specified articles*—Continued.

EXHIBIT 13.

Dingley prohibitive duties.

[See H. R. Doc. 1504, 60th Cong., 2d sess., for reduction in these revenues.]

Payne-Aldrich bill.	Article.	Duty.	Ad valorem.	Revenue, 1907.	Evans's Imports and Duties, 1894–1907.
Par.			*Per cent.*		*Table No.*
423	Barley	30 cents per bushel	53.64	$3,544	148
	Buttons:				
	Bone	¼ cent per line plus 15 per cent	66.45	631	184
	Horn and vegetable ivory	¾ cent per line plus 15 per cent	71.88	49,270	182
	Nickel bar	1/16 cent per line plus 15 per cent	73.79	601	185
	Pearl shell	1½ cents per line plus 15 per cent	57.40	94,219	189
	Shoe buttons	1 cent per gross	44.92	84	100
1	Acid, salicylic	10 cents per pound	38.30	918	234
	Acids, n. s. p. f	25 per cent	25.00	12,435	242
59	Potash, chlorate of	2½ cents per pound	34.61	514	459
58	Potash, chromate and bichromate	3 cents per pound	41.14	283	460
68	Soda-bicarbonate, etc	¾ cent per pound	23.87	1,020	484
73	Soda ash	¾ cent per pound	34.63	25,295	500
81	Vanillin	80 cents per ounce	320.00	80	537
287	Chicory root	1 cent per pound	64.25	26,778	549
91	Clock cases, with or without movements, composed of china, porcelain, bisque, etc.	60 per cent	60.00	156	589
290	Dandelion root and other articles used as substitutes for coffee, n. s. p. f	2½ cents per pound	37.00	8,306	614
425	Corks three-fourths inch or less in diameter	25 cents per pound	42.08	22,898	642
323	Plushes, velvets, and other pile fabrics of cotton, etc., dyed, colored, etc	12 cents per yard plus 25 per cent	58.42	257,088	1174
323	Corduroys of cloth, dyed, colored, etc	12 cents per yard plus 25 per cent	58.10	1,704	1178
344	Collars and cuffs of cotton	45 cents per dozen plus 15 per cent	58.68	650	1220
	Corsets, n. s. p. f	50 per cent	50.00	37,244	1221
344	Collars and cuffs, part linen	40 cents per dozen plus 20 per cent	49.60	25,787	1637
353	Manufactures of flax, n. s. p. f	45 per cent	45.00	302,528	1700
273	Oranges	1 cent per pound	59.69	207,828	1792
	Lemons				
	Oilcloth				

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Dingley prohibitive duties—Continued.

Payne-Aldrich bill.	Article.	Duty.	Ad valorem.	Revenue, 1907.	Evans's Imports and Duties, 1894–1907.
Par.					
97	Glass:		*Per cent.*		*Table No.*
	Cylinder, crowned, common window glass, unpolished—				
	Above 16 by 24 inches, not exceeding 24 by 30 inches	2⅜ cents per pound	74.32	$82,569	1921
	Above 24 by 30 inches, not exceeding 24 by 36 inches	2⅞ cents per pound	78.69	26,970	1922
98, 99, 100, 101	Plate, cast, polished, silvered, etc.—				
	Not exceeding 16 by 24 inches	11 cents per square foot	43.80	78	1973
	Above 16 by 24 inches and not above 24 by 30 inches	13 cents per square foot	39.44	469	[a] 1974
441	Haircloth, crinoline cloth	10 cents per square yard	65.68	228	2029
254	Hay	$4 per ton	50.18	251,280	2037
151	Table, carving, cooks, kitchen, etc., knives, forks, and steels, with handles, n. s. p. f.	1½ cents each plus 15 per cent	69.43	17,554	2397
150	Tubes and tubing for cycles	35 per cent	35.00	9,324	2472
450, 451	Gloves, ladies' and children's:				
	Schmaschen, glace finish, not over 14 inches in length, unlined	$1.75 per dozen	41.63	182,722	2527
	Lamb or sheep, glace finish, not over 14 inches in length, unlined	$2.50 per dozen	49.48	548,268	2542
	Of sheep origin, with exterior grain surface, not over 17 inches in length, unlined.	$2.50 per dozen	41.64	9,040	2560
	Goat, kid, or other leather than sheep, glace finish, not over 14 inches in length, unlined.	$3 per dozen	43.34	126,570	2573
	Goat, etc., with exterior surface removed, not over 14 inches in length, unlined.	$3 per dozen	41.41	5,684	2591
306	Malt extract in casks (fluid)	20 cents per gallon	33.37	265	2652
418	Manufactures of palm leaf, n. e. p. f.	30 per cent	30.00	3,608	2881
457	Masks of paper or pulp	35 per cent	35.00	282	2911
464	Slate pencils, all other	3 cents per 100	59.77	6,471	2956
302, 304	Bay rum or bay water	$1.50 per proof gallon	331.84	2,021	2961
236	Rice, cleaned	2 cents per pound	62.66	539,081	3022
215	Saccharine	$1.50 per pound plus 10 per cent	216.71	847	3034
397	Silk goods, ornamented with beads or spangles	60 per cent	60.00	3,293	3155
395	All other manufactures of silk, n. s. p. f.	50 per cent	50.00	637,337	3162
	Spar, manufactures of	50 per cent	50.00	699	3171
455	Straw and grass manufactures, n. s. p. f.	36 per cent	30.00	200,820	3226
213	Sugar, refined	1.95 cents per pound	72.57	81,220	3295
198	Sticks for umbrellas, parasols, and sunshades	40 per cent	40.00	2,977	3351
250	Cabbage	3 cents per head	44.58	174	3355
	Spirits				
356, 357, 365	Wool, Class I:				
362	Washed	22 cents per pound	61.32	369	3498
362	Scoured	33 cents per pound	37.50	2,679	3499
	Wool, Class II:				
362, 365	Scoured	36 cents per pound		[b]	3511
	Wool, Class III:				
362, 366	Scoured	12 and 21 cents per pound		[b]	3530, 3535
373	Yarns, valued not more than 30 cents per pound	27½ cents per pound plus 40 per cent	143.02	31	3562
375	Blankets—				
	Valued more than 30 cents and not more than 40 cents per pound	22 cents per pound plus 30 per cent	107.60	340	3565
375	Valued more than 40 cents and not more than 50 cents per pound	33 cents per pound plus 35 per cent	103.12	232	3567
375	Over 3 yards long, valued not more than 40 cents per pound	33 cents per pound plus 50 per cent	165.42	67	3571
375	Valued more than 40 cents, not more than 70 cents per pound	44 cents per pound plus 50 per cent	120.98	4,438	3572
	Valued more than 70 cents per pound	44 cents per pound plus 55 per cent	104.55	8,591	3573
382	Carpets—				
	Brussels	44 cents per square yard plus 40 per cent	75.81	8,645	3577
384	Wool, Dutch and 2-ply ingrain	18 cents per square yard plus 40 per cent	58.63	993	3584
	Tapestry, Brussels	28 cents per square yard plus 40 per cent	60.73	1	3581
375	Flannels for underwear—				
	Valued over 30 cents, not over 40 cents per pound	22 cents per pound plus 50 per cent	143.67	34	3623
	Valued over 40 cents, not over 50 cents per pound	33 cents per pound plus 35 per cent	101.25	130	3625
	Valued over 50 cents, not over 70 cents per pound	11 cents per square yard plus 50 per cent	105.49	117	3626
	Valued over 70 cents per pound	11 cents per square yard plus 55 per cent	80.39	5,217	3627
	Weighing over 4 ounces per square yard, valued more than 50 cents and not more than 70 cents per pound.	44 cents per pound plus 50 per cent	125.80	5,481	3630
378	Knit fabrics—				
	Valued not over 40 cents per pound	33 cents per pound plus 50 per cent	141.00	1	3635
	Valued over 40 cents, less than 70 cents per pound	44 cents per pound plus 50 per cent	119.06	642	3636
	Valued above 70 cents per pound	44 cents per pound plus 55 per cent	95.67	9,255	3673
378	Hats of wool, valued over 50 cents per pound	44 cents per pound plus 60 per cent	86.61	13,771	3648
378	Shawls, knitted or woven	44 cents per pound plus 60 per cent	92.70	57,813	3654

[a] See others.

[b] More imported.

EXHIBIT 14.

Estimate of reductions in duties of H. R. 1438 as reported from the Committee on Finance, United States Senate, compared with the present tariff law, showing percentages of decrease.

[Prepared under direction of the Senate Committee on Finance, Sixty-first Congress, first session.]

SCHEDULE A.—CHEMICALS, OILS, AND PAINTS.

Paragraph of Senate bill.	Article.	Rates of duty— Present law.	Rates of duty— Senate bill.	Percentage of reduction.	Total imports, by value, 1907.
1	Acids:				
	Boracic	5 cents per pound	2 cents per pound	60.00	$28,425.00
	Chromic	3 cents per pound	do	33.33	303.00
	Gallic	10 cents per pound	8 cents per pound	20.00	7,086.00
	Lactic, containing not over 40 per cent of actual lactic acid	3 cents per pound	2 cents per pound	33.33	
	Salicylic	10 cents per pound	5 cents per pound	50.00	2,397.00
	Tannic, or tannin	50 cents per pound	35 cents per pound	30.00	2,797.00
	Tartaric	7 cents per pound	5 cents per pound	28.57	3,876.00

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Estimate of reductions in duties of H. R. 1438 as reported from the Committee on Finance, United States Senate, etc.—Continued.

SCHEDULE A—CHEMICALS, OILS, AND PAINTS—continued.

Paragraph of Senate bill.	Article.	Rates of duty— Present law.	Rates of duty— Senate bill.	Percentage of reduction.	Total imports by value, 1907.
2	Alcoholic compounds	60 cents per pound and 45 per cent.	60 cents per pound and 25 per cent.	20.09	$1,365.30
4	Alumina, hydrate of, containing not more than 64 per cent of alumina	$\frac{6}{10}$ cent per pound	$\frac{4}{10}$ cent per pound[a]	33.33	1,296.00
	Alum, alum cake, etc.:				
	Containing less than 15 per cent of alumina and more than $\frac{3}{10}$ of 1 percent of iron oxide.	$\frac{1}{2}$ cent per pound	$\frac{1}{4}$ cent per pound	50.00	24,582.30
	Containing more than 15 per cent of alumina or less than $\frac{3}{10}$ of 1 per cent of iron oxide.	do	$\frac{3}{8}$ cent per pound	25.00	
5	Ammonia, sulphate of	$\frac{3}{10}$ cent per pound	$\frac{2}{10}$ cent per pound	33.33	1,770,222.00
6	Argols, crude:				
	Containing not more than 40 per cent of bitartrate of potash	1 cent per pound	5 per cent	85.26	114.00
	Containing more than 40 per cent of bitartrate of potash	1½ cents per pound	do	65.59	10,443.00
	Argols, partly refined:				
	Containing not more than 90 per cent of bitartrate of potash	4 cents per pound	3 cents per pound	25.00	2,634.00
	Containing more than 90 per cent of bitartrate of potash	5 cents per pound	4 cents per pound	20.00	1.00
	Tartrate of soda, or potassa, or Rochelle salts	4 cents per pound	3 cents per pound	25.00	76.00
	Cream of tartar, and patent tartar	6 cents per pound	5 cents per pound	16.67	614.00
9	Blue vitriol	½ cent per pound	½ cent per pound[a]	50.00	75,650.50
11	Borax	5 cents per pound	2 cents per pound	60.00	48,118.00
	Borates of lime or soda:				
	Containing not more than 36 per cent of anhydrous boracic acid	3 cents per pound	1¼ cents per pound	58.33	346.00
	Containing more than 36 per cent of anhydrous boracic acid	4 cents per pound	do	68.75	2,325.00
14	Chloroform	20 cents per pound	10 cents per pound	50.00	1,575.00
17	Collodion, etc.:				
	Collodion and all compounds of pyroxylin	50 cents per pound	40 cents per pound	20.00	2,195.00
	Rolled, or in sheets, unpolished and not made up into articles	60 cents per pound	45 cents per pound	25.00	205.00
538	Copperas, or sulphate of iron	¼ cent per pound	Free of duty	100.00	89.00
20	Ethers:				
	Sulphuric	40 cents per pound	8 cents per pound	80.00	372.00
	Nitrous, spirits of	25 cents per pound	20 cents per pound	20.00	
	Fruit ethers, oils, or essences	$2 per pound	$1 per pound	50.00	1,439.00
	Other, n. s. p. f.	$1 per pound	50 cents per pound	50.00	1,012.00
21	Extracts of mangrove bark	⅜ cent per pound	⅛ cent per pound	37.50	42.46
22	Gelatin, fish glue, or isinglass, prepared fish bladders and fish sounds, valued not above 10 cents.	2½ cents per pound	2 cents[a]	20.00	
27	Iodoform	$1 per pound	75 cents per pound	25.00	59.00
	Licorice, extracts of	4½ cents per pound	20 per cent	49.77	77,984.00
3	Croton oil	20 cents per pound	25 per cent	22.88	1.10
	Cotton-seed oil	4 cents per gallon	3 cents per gallon[a]	25.00	9,342.00
33	Flaxseed or linseed oil	20 cents per gallon	15 cents per gallon	25.00	5,712.00
	Poppy-seed oil	do	do	25.00	3,243.00
37	Peppermint oil	50 cents per pound	25 cents per pound	50.00	18,839.00
45	Ocher and ochery earths, ground in oil or water	1½ cents per pound	1 cent per pound	33.33	
	Sienna and sienna earths, ground in oil or water	do	do	33.33	
	Umber and umber earths, ground in oil or water	do	do	33.33	
48	Ultramarine, dry, in pulp, or mixed with water	3½ cents per pound	3 cents per pound	20.00	66,753.00
	Wash blue containing ultramarine	do	do	20.00	23,623.00
49	Varnishes, spirit	$1.32 per gallon and 35 per cent.	35 per cent	66.38	5,154.00
52	Whiting, ground in oil (putty)	1 cent per pound	¾ cent per pound	25.00	143.00
58	Potash:				
	Bichromate and chromate of	3 cents per pound	2¼ cents per pound	25.00	685.00
59	Chlorate of	2½ cents per pound	2 cents per pound	20.00	
61	Nitrate of, or saltpeter, refined	½ cent per pound	Free of duty	100.00	15,833.12
64	Plasters, healing or curative, and court-plaster	35 per cent	25 per cent	28.57	9,468.50
68	Soda:				
	Bicarbonate of, or supercarbonate of, or saleratus, etc.	¾ cent per pound	⅝ cent per pound	16.67	4,274.00
	Bichromate and chromate of	2 cents per pound	1¾ cents per pound	12.50	425.00
70	Crystal carbonate of, etc	$\frac{3}{10}$ cent per pound	¼ cent per pound	16.67	2,025.00
	Chlorate of	2 cents per pound	1½ cents per pound	25.00	
71	Hydrate of, or caustic	¾ cent per pound	½ cent per pound	33.33	39,336.00
	Nitrite of	2½ cents per pound	2 cents per pound	20.00	37,623.00
	Hyposulphite of	½ cent per pound	⅜ cent per pound	25.00	1,093.00
	Sulphide of	do	do	25.00	20,988.00
72	Sal, or soda crystals	$\frac{3}{10}$ cent per pound	¼ cent per pound	16.67	4,771.00
73	Soda ash	½ cent per pound	⅓ cent per pound	33.33	73,052.00
	Arseniate of	1½ cents per pound	1 cent per pound	20.00	9,306.00
74	Silicate of	½ cent per pound	⅜ cent per pound	25.00	11,461.00
75	Sulphate of—				
	Glauber salts	$1.25 per ton	$1 per ton	20.00	4,974.00
	Salt cake, or niter cake	do	do	20.00	37,679.00
76	Moss, sea	10 per cent	Free of duty	100.00	17,567.00
	Prepared	20 per cent	10 per cent	50.00	12,029.00
77	Sponges, manufactures of, n. s. p. f	40 per cent	30 per cent	25.00	45.00
78	Strychnia, or strychnine, and salts of	30 cents per ounce	15 cents per ounce	50.00	338.00
79	Sulphur:				
	Refined	$8 per ton	$6 per ton	25.00	18,080.00
	Sublimed	do	do	25.00	41,501.00
81	Vanillin	80 cents per ounce	25 cents per ounce	68.75	25.00

SCHEDULE B—EARTHS, EARTHENWARE, AND GLASSWARE.

82	Brick, fire, not more than 10 pounds each: Glazed, enameled, etc	45 per cent	35 per cent	22.22	$20.00
	Weighing more than 10 pounds each, not glazed	35 per cent	30 per cent	14.28	
	Weighing more than 10 pounds each, glazed	45 per cent	35 per cent	22.22	
	Brick, other than fire: Glazed, enameled, etc	do	do	22.22	7,665.00
86	Plaster rock or gypsum:				
	Crude	50 cents per ton	20 cents per ton	60.00	457,047.00
	Ground or calcined	$2.25 per ton	$1.75 per ton	22.22	21,807.00
88	Mica:				
	Unmanufactured or rough trimmed only	6 cents per pound and 20 per cent.	5 cents per pound and 20 per cent.	7.58	1,116,320.25
	Cut or trimmed	12 cents per pound and 20 per cent.	10 cents per pound and 20 per cent.	7.47	73,364.00
90	Rockingham ware, decorated	60 per cent	40 per cent	33.33	
94	Carbons for electric lighting	90 cents per 100	70 cents per 100 feet	[b]22.22	157,311.00
	Filter tubs	45 per cent	35 per cent	22.22	1,755.00

[a] Amendment to be submitted by committee.

[b] Estimated.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Estimate of reductions in duties of H. R. 1438 as reported from the Committee on Finance, United States Senate, etc.—Continued.

SCHEDULE B—EARTHS, EARTHENWARE, AND GLASSWARE—continued.

Paragraph of Senate bill.	Article.	Rates of duty— Present law.	Rates of duty— Senate bill.	Percentage of reduction.	Total imports, by value, 1907.
97	Cylinder, crown, and common window glass, unpolished:				
	Above 24 by 30 and not exceeding 24 by 36 inches	2½ cents per pound	2⅜ cents per pound	4.00	$34,273.37
	Above 24 by 36 and not exceeding 30 by 40 inches	3½ cents per pound	3⅜ cents per pound	3.70	26,346.45
	Above 30 by 40 and not exceeding 40 by 60 inches	4 cents per pound	3⅞ cents per pound	3.23	11,698.00
	Above 40 by 60 inches	4⅛ cents per pound	4⅛ cents per pound	2.86	93.00
98	Cylinder and crown glass, polished, unsilvered:				
	Above 24 by 30 and not exceeding 24 by 60 inches	15 cents per square foot.	12 cents per square foot.	20.00	
	Above 24 by 60 inches	20 cents per square foot.	15 cents per square foot.	25.00	
99	Plate glass, fluted, rolled, etc.: Above 24 by 60 inches	35 cents per square foot.	22½ cents per square foot.	35.71	1,613.00
100	Plate glass, cast, polished, unsilvered: Above 24 by 60 inches	do	do	35.71	40,687.00
101	Plate glass, cast, polished, silvered, and looking-glass plates: Above 24 by 60 inches.	38 cents per square foot.	25 cents per square foot.	34.21	1,944.00
	Cylinder and crown glass, polished, silvered, and looking-glass plates: Above 24 by 60 inches.	do	do	34.21	1,173.00
102	Plate glass, cast, polished, silvered, when bent, etc., above 24 by 60 inches	38 cents per square foot and 5 per cent.	25 cents per square foot and 5 per cent.	31.26	45.00
	Plate glass, cast, polished, unsilvered, when bent, etc., above 24 by 60 inches	35 cents per square foot and 5 per cent.	22½ cents per square foot and 5 per cent.	33.65	6,324.00
	Cylinder, crown, and common window glass, unpolished, when bent, etc.:				
	Above 24 by 30 and not exceeding 24 by 36 inches	2½ cents per pound and 5 per cent.	2⅜ cents per pound and 5 per cent.	4.04	1,731.00
	Above 24 by 36 and not exceeding 30 by 40 inches	3½ cents per pound and 5 per cent.	3⅜ cents per pound and 5 per cent.	3.38	1,668.00
	Above 30 by 40 and not exceeding 40 by 60 inches	3¾ cents per pound and 5 per cent.	3⅝ cents per pound and 5 per cent.	3.05	15,173.00
	Above 40 by 60 inches	4⅛ cents per pound and 5 per cent.	4⅛ cents per pound and 5 per cent.	a 3.00	
	Cylinder and crown glass, polished, silvered, when ground, bent, etc., above 24 by 60 inches.	38 cents per square foot and 5 per cent.	25 cents per square foot and 5 per cent.	30.64	18.00
	Cylinder and crown glass, polished, unsilvered, when ground, bent, etc., above 24 by 30 and not exceeding 24 by 60 inches.	15 cents per square foot and 5 per cent.	12 cents per square foot and 5 per cent.	18.18	208.00
109	Marble:				
	Sawed or dressed, over 2 inches in thickness	$1.10 per cubic foot	$1 per cubic foot	9.09	360.00
	Slabs or paving tiles—				
	Not more than 1 inch in thickness—				
	Unrubbed	12 cents per superficial foot.	8 cents per superficial foot.	33.30	48,593.00
	Rubbed	15 cents per superficial foot.	10 cents per superficial foot.	33.33	16,686.00
	More than 1 inch and not more than 1½ inches thick—				
	Unrubbed	do	do	20.00	8,212.00
	Rubbed	18 cents per superficial foot.	12 cents per superficial foot.	33.33	724.00
	More than 1½ inches and not more than 2 inches thick—				
	Unrubbed	do	12½ cents per superficial foot.	30.55	202.00
	Rubbed	21 cents per superficial foot.	14½ cents per superficial foot.	30.91	
	Onyx:				
	In block, rough or squared	$1.50 per cubic foot	65 cents per cubic foot.	56.67	71,437.00
	Sawed or dressed, over 2 inches in thickness	$1.10 per cubic foot	$1 per cubic foot	9.09	
	Mosaic cubes of marble, onyx, or stone, not exceeding 2 inches in size, loose	1 cent per pound and 20 per cent.	½ cent per pound and 20 per cent.	58.59	49,405.00
	Attached to paper or other material	20 cents per superficial foot and 35 per cent.	5 cents per superficial foot and 35 per cent.	a 7.08	

SCHEDULE C—METALS, AND MANUFACTURES OF.

115½	Iron ore	40 cents per ton	25 cents per ton	37.50	$1,212,607.00
576	Basic slag	$1 per ton	Free of duty	100.00	8,197.00
116	Iron in pigs:				
	Ferromanganese	$4 per ton	$2.50 per ton	37.50	6,027,240.00
	Spiegeleisen	do	do	37.50	2,486,086.00
	All other (except ferrosilicon)	do	do	37.50	5,862,930.00
	Scrap iron and steel:				
	Iron, wrought and cast	do	do	37.50	193,973.22
	Steel	do	do	37.50	100,996.00
117	Bar iron:				
	Rolled or hammered, comprising—				
	Flats not less than 1 inch wide nor less than ⅛ of 1 inch thick	1/10 cent per pound	1/10 cent per pound	50.00	5,647.00
	Round iron not less than 7/16 of 1 inch in diameter	do	do	50.00	163,050.00
	Square iron	do	do	50.00	3,115.10
118	Bars or shapes of rolled or hammered iron n. s. p. f., and round iron in coils or rods, less than 7/16 of 1 inch in diameter.	1/5 cent per pound	1/5 cent per pound	25.00	7,195.92
	Slabs, blooms, loops, or other forms less finished than iron in bars and more advanced than pig, except castings.	1/10 cent per pound	1/10 cent per pound	20.00	1,090.00
	Bars, blooms, billets, slabs, or loops in the manufacture of which charcoal is used as fuel.	$12 per ton	$8 per ton	33.33	1,495,326.00
119	Beams, girders, joists, etc., and all other structural shapes of iron or steel	1/5 cent per pound	1/10 cent per pound	20.00	467,466.00
120	Boiler or other plate iron or steel (except crucible plate steel and saw plates), etc.:				
	Valued 1 cent per pound or less	do	3/10 cent per pound	40.00	
	Valued above 1 cent and not above 2 cents per pound	1/10 cent per pound	1/15 cent per pound	33.33	7,667.00
	Valued above 2 cents and not above 4 cents per pound	1 cent per pound	7/10 cent per pound	30.00	1,307.00
	Valued above 4 cents per pound	25 per cent	20 per cent	20.00	
	Cold rolled, smoothed only, valued above 2 cents and not above 4 cents per pound.	1 3/10 cents per pound	1/10 cent per pound	25.00	2,198.00
121	Anchors, or parts of	1½ cents per pound	1 cent per pound	33.33	2,308.50
	Forgings of iron or steel or combined iron or steel	35 per cent	30 per pound	14.28	190,105.49
122	Hoop, band, or scroll iron or steel n. o. p. f., etc.:				
	Not thinner than No. 10 wire gauge	1/10 cent per pound	1/15 cent per pound	40.00	3,479.00
	Thinner than No. 10 and not thinner than No. 20 wire gauge	1/10 cent per pound	1/15 cent per pound	33.33	95.90
	Thinner than No. 20 wire gauge	1/10 cent per pound	1/10 cent per pound	25.00	3,769.00
	Hoop or band iron, or hoop or band steel, flared, splayed, or punched, etc.:				
	Not thinner than No. 10 wire gauge	1/10 cent per pound	1/15 cent per pound	33.33	390.00
	Thinner than No. 10 and not thinner than No. 20 wire gauge	1/10 cent per pound	1/10 cent per pound	28.57	
	Bands or strips of steel, suitable for making band saws: b				
	Untempered	3 cents per pound and 20 per cent.	1 7/10 cents per pound a.	63.06	3,602.00
	Tempered, or tempered and polished	6 cents per pound and 20 per cent.	3 7/10 cents per pound a.	64.77	* 11,589.00

a Estimated. b Not enumerated in Senate bill.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Estimate of reductions in duties of H. R. 1438 as reported from the Committee on Finance, United States Senate, etc.—Continued.

SCHEDULE C—METALS, AND MANUFACTURES OF—continued.

Paragraph of Senate bill.	Article.	Rates of duty— Present law.	Rates of duty— Senate bill.	Percentage of reduction.	Total imports, by value, 1907.
123	Hoop or band iron, or hoop or band steel, cut to lengths, wholly or partly manufactured into hoops or ties, etc.	$\frac{1}{10}$ cent per pound	$\frac{3}{10}$ cent per pound	40.00	$20,805.00
124	Bars or rails for railways:				
	Iron	$7.84 per ton	$3.92 per ton	50.00	824.00
	Steel	do	do	50.00	106,484.00
	Railway fish plates or splice bars of iron or steel	$\frac{1}{10}$ cent per pound	$\frac{1}{10}$ cent per pound	50.00	11,938.00
125	Sheets of iron or steel, common or black, and skelp iron or steel, etc.:				
	Thinner than No. 10 and not thinner than No. 20 wire gauge	$\frac{7}{10}$ cent per pound	$\frac{5}{10}$ cent per pound	28.57	22,643.00
	Thinner than No. 20 and not thinner than No. 25 wire gauge	$\frac{8}{10}$ cent per pound	$\frac{5}{10}$ cent per pound	25.00	7,890.00
	Thinner than No. 25 and not thinner than No. 32 wire gauge	$1\frac{1}{10}$ cents per pound m	$\frac{7}{10}$ cent per pound	27.27	
	Thinner than No. 32 wire gauge	$1\frac{3}{10}$ cents per pound	$\frac{7}{10}$ cent per pound	25.00	
	Sheet iron or sheet steel, corrugated or crimped	$1\frac{1}{10}$ cents per pound	$\frac{7}{10}$ cent per pound	27.27	205.00
126	Hoop, band, or scroll, iron or steel (excepting tin plates, etc.), galvanized or coated, etc.:				
	Not thinner than No. 10 wire gauge	$\frac{7}{10}$ cent per pound	$\frac{5}{10}$ cent per pound	28.57	1,429.00
	Thinner than No. 10 and not thinner than No. 20 wire gauge	$\frac{8}{10}$ cent per pound	$\frac{5}{10}$ cent per pound	25.00	1,477.00
	Thinner than No. 20 wire gauge	1 cent per pound	$\frac{8}{10}$ cent per pound	20.00	4,599.00
	Sheets or plates of iron or steel (except tin plates, etc.), galvanized or coated, etc.:				
	Thinner than No. 10 and not thinner than No. 20 wire gauge	$\frac{9}{10}$ cent per pound	$\frac{7}{10}$ cent per pound	22.22	342.00
	Thinner than No. 20 and not thinner than No. 25 wire gauge	1 cent per pound	$\frac{8}{10}$ cent per pound	20.00	917.10
	Thinner than No. 25 and not thinner than No. 32 wire gauge	$1\frac{3}{10}$ cents per pound	1 cent per pound	23.08	5,967.00
	Thinner than No. 32 wire gauge	$1\frac{4}{10}$ cents per pound	$1\frac{1}{10}$ cents per pound	21.43	1.00
	Sheet iron or sheet steel, corrugated or crimped, galvanized, etc	$1\frac{3}{10}$ cents per pound	1 cent per pound	23.08	
	Sheets or plates composed of iron, steel, copper, nickel, or other metal, with layers of other metal imposed by forging, etc.	45 per cent	40 per cent	11.11	4,801.00
127	Sheet iron or sheet steel, polished, planished, or glanced	2 cents per pound	$1\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound	25.00	8,834.00
	Sheets or plates, pickled or cleaned by acid, etc.:				
	Thinner than No. 10 and not thinner than No. 20 wire gauge	$\frac{9}{10}$ cent per pound	$\frac{7}{10}$ cent per pound	22.22	305.00
	Thinner than No. 20 and not thinner than No. 25 wire gauge	1 cent per pound	$\frac{8}{10}$ cent per pound	20.00	
	Thinner than No. 25 and not thinner than No. 32 wire gauge	$1\frac{3}{10}$ cents per pound	1 cent per pound	23.08	429.00
	Sheets of iron or steel, common or black, etc., cold rolled, smoothed only, not polished:				
	Thinner than No. 10 and not thinner than No. 20 wire gauge	$\frac{9}{10}$ cent per pound	$\frac{7}{10}$ cent per pound	22.22	3,117.00
	Thinner than No. 20 and not thinner than No. 25 wire gauge	1 cent per pound	$\frac{8}{10}$ cent per pound	20.00	611.00
	Thinner than No. 25 and not thinner than No. 32 wire gauge	$1\frac{3}{10}$ cents per pound	1 cent per pound	23.08	623.00
128	Tin plates, etc.:				
	Lighter than 63 pounds per 100 square feet	$1\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound	$1\frac{2}{10}$ cents per pound	20.00	4,009,312.00
	All other	do	do	20.00	623,409.00
129	Steel ingots, cogged ingots, blooms and slabs, etc.:				
	Valued above $\frac{3}{4}$ and not above $1\frac{3}{10}$ cents per pound	$\frac{4}{10}$ cent per pound	$\frac{3}{10}$ cent per pound	25.00	171,370.00
	Valued above $1\frac{3}{10}$ and not above $1\frac{6}{10}$ cents per pound	$\frac{6}{10}$ cent per pound	$\frac{4}{10}$ cent per pound	16.67	12,134.00
	Valued above $1\frac{6}{10}$ and not above $2\frac{3}{10}$ cents per pound	$\frac{7}{10}$ cent per pound	$\frac{6}{10}$ cent per pound	14.28	
	Valued above $2\frac{3}{10}$ and not above 3 cents per pound	$\frac{9}{10}$ cent per pound	$\frac{8}{10}$ cent per pound	11.11	
	Valued above 3 and not above 4 cents per pound	$1\frac{2}{10}$ cents per pound	$1\frac{1}{10}$ cents per pound	8.33	
	Valued above 4 and not above 7 cents per pound	$1\frac{3}{10}$ cents per pound	$1\frac{2}{10}$ cents per pound	7.69	
	Valued above 7 and not above 10 cents per pound	2 cents per pound	$1\frac{9}{10}$ cents per pound	5.00	
	Valued above 10 and not above 13 cents per pound	$2\frac{3}{10}$ cents per pound	$2\frac{2}{10}$ cents per pound	4.17	
	Valued above 13 and not above 16 cents per pound	$2\frac{6}{10}$ cents per pound	$2\frac{1}{10}$ cents per pound	3.57	
	Sheets and plates n. s. p. f., and saw plates of steel wholly or partially manufactured:				
	Valued $\frac{3}{4}$ cent per pound or less	$\frac{3}{10}$ cent per pound	$\frac{1}{10}$ cent per pound	41.66	
	Valued above $1\frac{3}{10}$ and not above $2\frac{6}{10}$ cents per pound	$\frac{7}{10}$ cent per pound	$\frac{6}{10}$ cent per pound	14.28	5,088.00
	Valued above $2\frac{3}{10}$ and not above 3 cents per pound	$\frac{9}{10}$ cent per pound	$\frac{8}{10}$ cent per pound	11.11	541.00
	Valued above 3 and not above 4 cents per pound	$1\frac{2}{10}$ cents per pound	$1\frac{1}{10}$ cents per pound	8.33	1,366.00
	Valued above 4 and not above 7 cents per pound	$1\frac{3}{10}$ cents per pound	$1\frac{2}{10}$ cents per pound	7.69	69,154.00
	Valued above 7 and not above 10 cents per pound	2 cents per pound	$1\frac{9}{10}$ cents per pound	5.00	43,488.00
	Valued above 10 and not above 13 cents per pound	$2\frac{4}{10}$ cents per pound	$2\frac{2}{10}$ cents per pound	4.17	3,995.00
	Valued above 13 and not above 16 cents per pound	$2\frac{6}{10}$ cents per pound	$2\frac{1}{10}$ cents per pound	3.57	30,905.00
	Sheets and plates n. s. p. f. and saw plates of steel, cold rolled, smoothed only, not polished:				
	Valued above $1\frac{3}{10}$ and not above $2\frac{3}{10}$ cents per pound	$\frac{9}{10}$ cent per pound	$\frac{8}{10}$ cent per pound	11.11	24.00
	Valued above 3 and not above 4 cents per pound	$1\frac{4}{10}$ cents per pound	$1\frac{3}{10}$ cents per pound	7.14	695.00
	Valued above 4 and not above 7 cents per pound	$1\frac{7}{10}$ cents per pound	$1\frac{6}{10}$ cents per pound	6.67	31.00
	Valued above 7 and not above 10 cents per pound	$2\frac{3}{10}$ cents per pound	$2\frac{1}{10}$ cents per pound	4.54	2,367.00
	Valued above 10 and not above 13 cents per pound	$2\frac{7}{10}$ cents per pound	$2\frac{5}{10}$ cents per pound	3.85	346.00
	Valued above 13 and not above 16 cents per pound	3 cents per pound	$2\frac{9}{10}$ cents per pound	3.33	744.00
	Valued above 16 and not above 24 cents per pound	$4\frac{3}{10}$ cents per pound	$4\frac{1}{10}$ cents per pound	2.04	2,074.00
133	Wire rods, etc.:				
	Untempered or untreated—				
	Valued 4 cents or less per pound	$\frac{7}{10}$ cent per pound	$\frac{5}{10}$ cent per pound	25.00	852,080.00
	Valued over 4 cents per pound	$\frac{8}{10}$ cent per pound	$\frac{6}{10}$ cent per pound	20.00	33,341.00
	Tempered or treated or partly manufactured—				
	Valued 4 cents or less per pound	$\frac{9}{10}$ cent per pound	$\frac{8}{10}$ cent per pound	11.11	6.00
	Manufactures of, valued over 4 cents per pound	$2\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound	$2\frac{2}{2\frac{5}{0}}$ cents per pound	6.00	297.00
134	Round iron or steel wire:				
	Valued 4 cents per pound or less—				
	Not smaller than No. 13 wire gauge	$1\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound	1 cent per pound	20.00	52,172.00
	Smaller than No. 13 and not smaller than No. 16 wire gauge	$1\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound	$1\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound	16.67	76,607.50
	Smaller than No. 16 wire gauge	2 cents per pound	$1\frac{3}{4}$ cents per pound	12.50	79,783.00
	Manufactures of—				
	Not smaller than No. 13 wire gauge	$2\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound	$2\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound	10.00	9,385.00
	Smaller than No. 13 and not smaller than No. 16 wire gauge	$2\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound	$2\frac{1}{4}$ cents per pound	9.09	16,571.46
	Smaller than No. 16 wire gauge	$3\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound	3 cents per pound	7.69	6,809.92
	Cold rolled, etc., blued, brightened, tempered, etc., manufactures of, smaller than No. 13 and not smaller than No. 16 wire gauge.	$3\frac{3}{4}$ cents per pound	$2\frac{9}{10}$ cents per pound	22.67	27.00
	Hat, bonnet, crinoline, etc., and all wire n. s. p. f., valued more than 4 cents per pound.	45 per cent	40 per cent	11.11	198,489.00
	Do. (manufactures of)	45 per cent plus $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound.	40 per cent plus $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound.	10.60	23,318.43
	Do. (coated with zinc or tin, etc.)	45 per cent plus $\frac{8}{10}$ cent per pound.	40 per cent plus $\frac{8}{10}$ cent per pound.	10.60	333.10
	Do. (coated with zinc, etc., manufactures of)	45 per cent and $1\frac{8}{10}$ cents per pound.	40 per cent plus $1\frac{2}{10}$ cents per pound.	9.34	372.00
	Brass wire, manufactures of	45 per cent plus $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound.	40 per cent plus $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound.	10.74	20,082.00
	Copper wire, manufactures of	45 per cent plus $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound.	40 per cent plus $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound.	10.34	53.00
	Corset clasps, corset steels, and sheet steel in strips, etc	45 per cent	40 per cent	11.11	48,470.00
	Do. (manufactures of)	45 per cent plus $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound.	40 per cent plus $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound.	10.63	6,880.00
	Do. (cold rolled, etc., blued, brightened, tempered, etc.)	45 per cent plus 1 cent per pound.	40 per cent plus $\frac{4}{10}$ cent per pound.	16.07	3,343.00

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Estimate of reductions in duties of H. R. 1438 as reported from the Committee on Finance, United States Senate, etc.—Continued.

SCHEDULE C—METALS, AND MANUFACTURES OF—continued.

Paragraph of Senate bill.	Article.	Rates of duty— Present law.	Rates of duty— Senate bill.	Percentage of reduction.	Total imports, by value, 1907.
	Wire of iron or steel, coated with zinc, etc.:				
	Not smaller than No. 13 wire gauge	1⅜ cents per pound	1⅜ cents per pound	17.24	$321.00
	Smaller than No. 16 wire gauge	2 1/10 cents per pound	1⅞ cents per pound	11.36	2,581.00
	Manufactures of—				
	Not smaller than No. 13 wire gauge	2 7/10 cents per pound	2⅞ cents per pound	9.26	79.00
	Smaller than No. 13 and not smaller than No. 16 wire gauge	2⅞ cents per pound	2⅞ cents per pound	8.47	9.00
	Smaller than No. 16 wire gauge	3 7/10 cents per pound	3 7/10 cents per pound	7.25	6,966.00
	Wire rope and wire strand:				
	Made of iron and steel wire—				
	Not smaller than No. 13 wire gauge	2½ cents per pound	1¾ cents per pound	22.22	738.00
	Smaller than No. 13 and not smaller than No. 16 wire gauge	2½ cents per pound	2 cents per pound	20.00	1,980.00
	Smaller than No. 16 wire gauge	3 cents per pound	2½ cents per pound	16.67	6,278.00
	All valued more than 4 cents per pound	40 per cent plus 1 cent per pound.	40 per cent plus ¾ cent per pound.	6.10	21,726.00
	All valued more than 4 cents per pound, n. s. p. f	45 per cent plus 1 cent per pound.	do	13.64	24,981.56
	Made of iron or steel wire, coated with zinc, etc.—				
	Not smaller than No. 13 wire gauge	2⅝ cents per pound	1⅝ cents per pound	20.41	1,654.00
	Smaller than No. 13 and not smaller than No. 16 wire gauge	2 7/10 cents per pound	2⅛ cents per pound	18.52	1,077.00
	Smaller than No. 16 wire gauge	3⅜ cents per pound	2 7/10 cents per pound	15.62	5,078.00
	All valued more than 4 cents per pound	40 per cent plus 1⅜ cents per pound.	40 per cent plus ⅛ cent per pound.	5.28	7,379.00
136	Steel ingots, cogged ingots, blooms and slabs, etc., cold rolled, etc., galvanized or coated with zinc, etc., valued above 7 and not above 10 cents per pound.	2⅜ cents per pound	2 7/10 cents per pound	4.54	674.00
	Sheets and plates, n. s. p. f., and saw plates of steel, etc., cold rolled, cold hammered, blued, brightened, tempered, etc.:				
	Valued above 2 7/10 and not above 3 cents per pound	1⅜ cents per pound	1⅜ cents per pound	36.84	112.36
	Valued above 3 and not above 4 cents per pound	2⅜ cents per pound	1⅝ cents per pound	31.81	3,072.43
	Valued above 4 and not above 7 cents per pound	2⅜ cents per pound	1⅞ cents per pound	30.43	58.00
	Valued above 7 and not above 10 cents per pound	3 cents per pound	2 7/10 cents per pound	23.33	2,359.00
	Valued above 10 and not above 13 cents per pound	3⅜ cents per pound	2 7/10 cents per pound	20.59	676.00
	Valued above 13 and not above 16 cents per pound	3⅜ cents per pound	3 1/10 cents per pound	18.42	745.00
	Steel circular saw plates:				
	Valued above 4 and not above 7 cents per pound	1⅜ cents per pound	1⅜ cents per pound	19.44	16,038.00
	Valued above 7 and not above 10 cents per pound	2½ cents per pound	2 2/10 cents per pound	14.00	51,199.00
	Valued above 10 and not above 13 cents per pound	2⅞ cents per pound	2 1/10 cents per pound	12.07	6,005.00
139	Anvils	1½ cents per pound	1⅓ cents per pound	13.33	43,629.00
141	Axles, or parts of, axle bars, etc	1 cent per pound	¾ cent per pound	25.00	36,825.00
142	Hammers and sledges, etc	1½ cents per pound	1⅓ cents per pound	8.33	4,286.05
143	Bolts, etc	do	1½ cents per pound	25.00	14,993.95
	Castings:				
145	Cast-iron pipe of every description	7/10 cent per pound	½ cent per pound	37.50	23,775.50
146	Cast-iron vessels, not above 2 cents per pound	7/10 cent per pound	7/16 cent per pound	37.50	
	Chiseled, drilled, machined, or otherwise advanced	do	7/10 cent per pound	12.50	
147	Malleable-iron castings, n. s. p. f	⅞ cent per pound	do	22.22	45,085.86
148	Hollow ware, coated, glazed, or tinned	2 cents per pound	1½ cents per pound	25.00	743.00
	Chain or chains, made of iron or steel:				
149	Not less than ¾ inch in diameter	1½ cents per pound	½ cent per pound	22.22	629.00
	Less than ¾ inch and not less than ⅜ inch in diameter	1½ cents per pound	1½ cents per pound	18.18	131.00
	Less than ⅜ inch and not less than 7/16 inch in diameter	1½ cents per pound	1⅜ cents per pound	6.67	26.00
150	Boiler tubes, pipes, flues, or stays, etc.:				
	Not less than ¾ inch in diameter	2 cents per pound	1 cent per pound	50.00	
	Less than ¾ inch and not less than ¼ inch in diameter	do	1¾ cents per pound	12.50	
	Cylindrical or tubular tanks, etc	45 per cent per pound.	30 per cent	33.33	
	Flexible metal tubing or hose, n. s. p. f	35 per cent per pound.	do	14.29	
	Welded cylindrical furnaces, made from plate metal	2½ cents per pound	2 cents per pound	20.00	4,274.00
	Tubes and tubing for cycles	35 per cent	30 per cent	14.29	26,640.00
	Tubes, finished, n. s. p. f	do	do	14.29	63,830.00
153	Table, carving, cooks', etc., knives, forks, and steels, etc.:				
	With handles of mother-of-pearl, shell, or ivory (silver, etc.)	16 cents per piece and 15 per cent.	14 cents each and 15 per cent.	9.30	4,740.00
	With handles of deerhorn	12 cents per piece and 15 per cent.	10 cents each and 15 per cent.	12.67	7,863.00
	With handles of hard rubber, solid bone, celluloid, or any pyroxylin material	5 cents per piece and 15 per cent.	4 cents each and 15 per cent.	14.31	5,537.00
	With handles of any other material	1½ cents per piece and 15 per cent.	1 cent each and 15 per cent.	26.14	25,283.94
	Butchers', hunting, plumbers', painters', etc., knives, etc.:				
	With handles of mother-of-pearl, shell, or ivory (silver, etc.)	16 cents per piece and 15 per cent.	14 cents each and 15 per cent.	8.91	69.00
	With handles of deerhorn	12 cents per piece and 15 per cent.	10 cents each and 15 per cent.	14.11	11.00
	With handles of hard rubber, solid bone, celluloid, or any pyroxylin material	5 cents per piece and 15 per cent.	4 cents each and 15 per cent.	15.41	72.50
	With handles of any other material	1½ cents per piece and 15 per cent.	1 cent each and 15 per cent.	25.25	322.85
154	Files, file blanks, rasps, and floats:				
	2½ inches in length and under	30 cents per dozen	40 per cent	50.79	4,951.61
	Over 2½ and not over 4½ inches in length	50 cents per dozen	do	52.32	26,484.00
	Over 4½ and under 7 inches in length	75 cents per dozen	do	54.27	36,919.32
	Nails, spikes, and tacks:				
158	Nails and spikes, cut, of iron and steel	5/10 cent per pound	4/10 cent per pound	33.33	1,792.00
159	Nails, horseshoe, hob, and all other wrought-iron or steel nails, n. s. p. f	2½ cents per pound	1⅔ cents per pound	33.33	83.00
160	Nails, wire, made of wrought iron or steel—				
	Not less than 1 inch in length and not lighter than No. 16 wire gauge	½ cent per pound	½ cent per pound	50.00	3,288.00
161	Spikes of wrought iron or steel	1 cent per pound	¾ cent per pound	25.00	738.30
	Nuts and washers, of wrought iron or steel	do	do	25.00	2,553.00
	Horse, mule, or ox shoes, of wrought iron or steel	do	do	25.00	34.00
162	Tacks, brads, or sprigs, cut—				
	Not exceeding 16 ounces to the thousand	1½ cents per pound	¾ cent per pound	50.00	140.00
	Exceeding 16 ounces to the thousand	1½ cents per pound	¾ cent per pound	50.00	2.00
165	Rivets, of iron or steel	2 cents per pound	1¼ cents per pound	37.50	5,430.00
166	Saws:				
	Circular saws	25 per cent	20 per cent	20.00	884.00
	Crosscut saws	6 cents per linear foot.	5 cents per linear foot.	16.67	2,384.00
	Hand, back, and other saws, n. s. p. f	30 per cent	25 per cent	16.67	32,564.50
	Mill saws	10 cents per linear foot	8 cents per linear foot.	20.00	
	Pit and drag saws	8 cents per linear foot.	6 cents per linear foot.	25.00	205.00
	Steel band saws, etc	10 cents per pound and 20 per cent.	5 cents per pound and 20 per cent.	23.22	1,706.00
					62.00

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Estimate of reductions in duties of H. R. 1438 as reported from the Committee on Finance, United States Senate, etc.—Continued.

SCHEDULE C—METALS, AND MANUFACTURES OF—continued.

Paragraph of Senate bill.	Article.	Rates of duty. Present law.	Rates of duty. Senate bill.	Percentage of reduction.	Total imports, by value, 1907.
167	Screws, wood:				
	Over ¼ inch and not more than 1 inch in length	8½ cents per pound	8 cents per pound	5.88	
	Over 1 inch and not more than 2 inches in length	6 cents per pound	5 cents per pound	16.67	$107.00
	More than 2 inches in length	4 cents per pound	3½ cents per pound	12.50	36.00
169	Wheels, or parts of, etc	1½ cents per pound	1½ cents per pound	16.67	153,550.00
	Ingots, etc., for railway wheels or tires, etc	1½ cents per pound	1 cent per pound	20.00	
170	Aluminum:				
	In crude form, etc	8 cents per pound	7 cents per pound	12.50	258,601.40
	Plates, sheets, etc	13 cents per pound	11 cents per pound	15.38	7,333.00
176	Silver leaf in packs of 500 leaves	75 cents per pack	50 cents per pack	33.33	804.00
178	Hooks and eyes, metallic, etc	5½ cents per pound and 15 per cent.	4 cents per pound and 15 per cent.	17.55	$4,702.00
181	Monazite sand and thorite	6 cents per pound	4 cents per pound	33.33	
186	Agraffes, barettes, bars, etc., not jewelry	45 per cent	40 per cent	11.11	
191	Zinc:				
	In blocks or pigs	1½ cents per pound	1 cent per pound	33.33	95,069.00
	In sheets	2 cents per pound	1½ cents per pound	37.50	5,286.00
194	Cash registers, linotype and all typesetting machines	45 per cent	30 per cent	33.33	
195	Aluminum rope (made from aluminum wire)	45 per cent plus 1 cent per pound.	40 per cent plus ¾ cent per pound.	11.98	1,913.00

SCHEDULE D—WOOD, AND MANUFACTURES OF.

196	Timber:				
	Round, used for spars, etc	1 cent per cubic foot	½ cent per cubic foot	50.00	$25,902.86
	Hewn, squared, or sided, etc	do	do	50.00	49,811.78
197	Lumber:				
	Boards, planks, etc., whitewood, etc.—				
	Not planed or finished	$1 per M feet	50 cents per M feet	50.00	211,967.74
	Planed or finished on two sides	$2 per M feet	$1.50 per M feet	25.00	12,302.00
	Planed on one side and tongued and grooved	do	do	25.00	
	Planed on two sides and tongued and grooved	$2.50 per M feet	$2 per M feet	20.00	
	Sawed lumber n. o. p. f.—				
	Not planed or finished	$2 per M feet	$1 per M feet	50.00	14,623,256.00
	Planed or finished on one side	$2.50 per M feet	$1.50 per M feet	40.00	239,649.28
	Planed or finished on two sides	$3 per M feet	$2 per M feet	33.33	48,348.91
	Planed or finished on three sides	$3.50 per M feet	$2.50 per M feet	28.57	34.00
	Planed or finished on four sides	$4 per M feet	$3 per M feet	25.00	1,224.00
	Planed on one side and tongued and grooved	$3 per M feet	$2 per M feet	33.33	83,415.75
	Planed on two sides and tongued and grooved	$3.50 per M feet	$2.50 per M feet	28.57	15,482.78
200	Paving posts, railroad ties, etc	20 per cent	10 per cent	50.00	570,323.41
201	Clapboards:				
	Pine	$1.50 per thousand	$1 per thousand	33.33	7,391.20
	Spruce	do	do	33.33	149,609.30
558	Fence posts	10 per cent	Free	100.00	16,620.34
203	Laths	25 cents per thousand.	20 cents per thousand.	20.00	1,736,525.17

SCHEDULE E—SUGAR, MOLASSES, AND MANUFACTURES OF.

213	Sugar, Dutch standard in color, above No. 16, etc	1.95 cents per pound	1.90 cents per pound	2.56	$116,060.70
215	Saccharine	1.50 per pound and 10 per cent.	75 cents per pound	52.32	391.00

SCHEDULE G—AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS AND PROVISIONS.

232	Corn meal	20 cents per bu. of 48 lbs	40 cents per 100 pounds	4.00	$87.50
258	Pease, green, in bulk, etc	40 cents per bushel	25 cents per bushel	37.50	2,910.03
262	Seeds: Celery	30 per cent	10 cents per pound	51.07	92.95
	Canary	do	Free of duty	100.00	96,145.00
266	Fish: Anchovies, etc., in other packages	40 per cent	30 per cent	25.00	105,452.50
286	Tallow	¼ cent per pound	¼ cent per pound	33.33	29,733.00
	Wool grease, etc., crude and not refined	⅛ cent per pound	¼ cent per pound	50.00	
292	Starch, all other than potato	1½ cents per pound	1 cent per pound	33.33	51,973.00
293	Dextrine, etc	2 cents per pound	1½ cents per pound	25.00	142,320.00

SCHEDULE H—SPIRITS, WINES, AND OTHER BEVERAGES.

300	Ginger wine or ginger cordial:				
	In casks or packages other than bottles or jugs—				
	Containing 14 per cent or less of absolute alcohol	40 cents per gallon	$2.60 per proof gallon	35.00	(a)
	Do. (reciprocity)	35 cents per gallon	do	25.71	$13,303.00
	In bottles or jugs, containing each more than 1 pint and not more than 1 quart.	$1.60 per dozen	do	2.38	6,983.00

SCHEDULE J—FLAX, HEMP, AND JUTE, AND MANUFACTURES OF.

334	Yarns, of jute, single, finer than 5 lea or number	35 per cent	30 per cent	14.28	$68,354.50
335	Cables and cordage composed of istle or tampico fiber, etc	1 cent per pound	¾ cent per pound	25.00	8,577.50
336	Threads, twines, etc.:				
	Made from yarn not finer than—				
	5 lea or number	13 cents per pound	10 cents per pound	23.08	8,159.00
	10 lea or number	16¾ cents per pound	13¾ cents per pound	17.91	1,017.00
	[Senate rate on these threads is 3 cents per pound less than present rate for each corresponding lea or number.]				
337	Yarns of flax, hemp, or ramie, etc., single in the gray, not finer than 8 lea or number	7 cents per pound	6 cents per pound	14.28	14,395.00
338	Gill netting, etc.:				
	Made of thread, twines, etc., not finer than—				
	5 lea or number	13 cents per pound and 25 per cent.	10 cents per pound and 20 per cent.	22.44	3,205.75

(a) None.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Estimate of reductions in duties of H. R. 1438 as reported from the Committee on Finance, United States Senate, etc.—Continued.

SCHEDULE J—FLAX, HEMP, AND JUTE, AND MANUFACTURES OF—continued.

Paragraph of Senate bill.	Article.	Rates of duty— Present law.	Rates of duty— Senate bill.	Percentage of reduction.	Total imports by value, 1907.
338	Gill netting, etc.—Continued.				
	Made of thread, twine, etc.—Continued.				
	6 lea or number	13¾ cents per pound and 25 per cent.	10¾ cents per pound and 20 per cent.	21.01	$4.00
	[Senate rate on this gill netting is 3 cents per pound and 5 per cent less than the present rate for each corresponding lea or number of the thread from which made.]				
340	Carpets, etc., of flax, etc.:				
	Value not exceeding 15 cents per square yard	5 cents per square yard and 35 per cent.	4 cents per square yard and 30 per cent.	17.42	359.00
	Valued over 15 cents per square yard	10 cents per square yard and 35 per cent.	8 cents per square yard and 30 per cent.	16.43	71,361.00
341	Hose, hydraulic, etc	20 cents per pound	15 cents per pound	25.00	1,758.00
343	Oilcloths, etc., 12 feet and over in width	20 cents per square yard and 20 per cent.	12 cents per square yard and 15 per cent.	34.65	89,396.00
	SCHEDULE L—SILKS AND SILK GOODS.				
392	Silk partly manufactured from cocoons, etc	40 cents per pound	35 cents per pound	12.50	$295.05
395	Plushes on which ordinary duty does not amount to 50 per cent	50 per cent	$1.85 per pound [a]	.90	11,481.00
	Other, on which ordinary duty does not amount to 50 per cent	do	$2.50 per pound [a]	40.64	453.06
	Fabrics weighing not over ½ ounce per square yard	$4.50 per pound	$4 per pound	11.11	459,925.00
396	Handkerchiefs:				
	Not hemmed or hemmed only—				
	Weighing ¾ ounce to 1½ ounces per square yard—				
	Boiled off	$3 per pound	50 per cent	15.25	8,520.00
	Dyed or printed in the piece	$3.25 per pound	do	18.41	4,282.00
	Weighing 1½ ounces to 8 ounces—				
	Dyed in the piece, etc., containing over 45 per cent in weight of silk	$3 per pound	do	32.83	3,151.00
	Dyed in the thread, etc., containing 30 per cent to 45 per cent in weight of silk.	$1.30 per pound	do	10.71	9.00
	Hemstitched, etc.—				
	Weighing ¾ ounce to 1½ ounces per square yard, boiled off	$3 per pound and 10 per cent.	60 per cent	5.50	20,304.00
	Weighing 1½ ounces to 8 ounces per square yard, dyed in the piece, etc., containing over 45 per cent in weight of silk	do	do	23.28	4,133.00
	SCHEDULE M—PULP, PAPERS, AND BOOKS.				
405	Printing paper, book paper, etc.:				
	Valued 2 to 2¾ cents per pound	$\frac{4}{10}$ cent per pound	$\frac{3}{10}$ cent per pound	25.00	$3,634.00
	Valued above 3 and not above 4 cents per pound	$\frac{4}{10}$ cent per pound	$\frac{3}{10}$ cent per pound [b]	16.67	.....
408	Lithographic prints, etc.:				
	On paper, etc.—				
	Exceeding $\frac{6}{1000}$ to $\frac{32}{1000}$ inch in thickness—				
	Exceeding 35 to 400 square inches	8 cents per pound	7 cents per pound	12.50	423,019.00
	Exceeding 400 square inches	35 per cent	do	52.17	9,764.62
	SCHEDULE N—SUNDRIES.				
431	Gunpowder, etc.:				
	Valued 20 cents or less per pound	4 cents per pound	2 cents per pound	50.00	$291.00
	Valued over 20 cents per pound	6 cents per pound	4 cents per pound	33.33	213,303.00
432	Matches:				
	In boxes	8 cents per gross	6 cents per gross	25.00	197,816.00
	Otherwise	1 cent per thousand	¾ cent per thousand	25.00	10,183.00
433	Blasting caps	$2.36 per thousand	$2 per thousand	15.25	15,982.00
	Cartridges	35 per cent	30 per cent	14.28	101,482.57
	Mining and blasting fuse	do	do	14.28	14,083.00
441	Haircloth, known as crinoline	10 cents per square yard.	8 cents per square yard.	20.00	347.00
442	Hats, bonnets, etc., of fur, etc.:				
	Valued not over $5 per dozen	$2 per dozen and 20 per cent.	$1.25 per dozen and 15 per cent.	34.92	4,907.25
	Valued $5 to $10 per dozen	$3 per dozen and 20 per cent.	$2.25 per dozen and 15 per cent.	25.00	77,155.41
	Valued $10 to $20 per dozen	$5 per dozen and 20 per cent.	$4 per dozen and 15 per cent.	21.76	69,032.24
	Valued over $20 per dozen	$7 per dozen and 20 per cent.	$5.50 per dozen and 15 per cent.	22.92	82,402.44
448	Leather band or belting	20 per cent	5 per cent	75.00	61,739.11
	Upper, dressed	do	15 per cent	25.00	2,167,945.75
	All other	do	do	25.00	1,231,369.25
	Calfskins, tanned, etc	do	do	25.00	266,854.00
	Skins dressed and finished other than chamois	do	do	25.00	806,589.75
	Skins for morocco—				
	Finished	do	do	25.00	41,697.58
	Tanned	10 per cent	5 per cent	50.00	3,112,821.75
	Patent leather, etc.—				
	Weighing not over 10 pounds per dozen skins	30 cents per pound and 20 per cent.	27 cents per pound and 15 per cent.	18.31	216,113.00
	Weighing 10 pounds to 25 pounds per dozen skins	30 cents per pound and 10 per cent.	27 cents per pound and 8 per cent.	13.07	92,185.00
	Pianoforte leather	35 per cent	20 per cent	42.86	.....
	Boots and shoes	25 per cent	15 per cent	40.00	164,509.30
	Shoe laces	50 cents per gross and 20 per cent.	50 cents per gross and 10 per cent.	25.20	343.00
458	Harnesses, etc	45 per cent	35 per cent	22.22	160,632.83
462	Paintings, etc	20 per cent	15 per cent	25.00	2,544,262.08
	Statuary	do	do	25.00	9,138.00
468	Agricultural implements, etc	do	do	25.00	23,643.70

[a] Estimated.

[b] Amendment to be submitted by committee.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

The SECRETARY. The Senator from Oklahoma moves that the Finance Committee be instructed to report on or before Friday, June 18 next, an income-tax amendment in accordance with the recommendations in the message of the President.

YEAS—51.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Frye	Nixon
Borah	Crane	Gallinger	Oliver
Brandegee	Crawford	Gamble	Page
Briggs	Cullom	Guggenheim	Perkins
Bristow	Cummins	Hale	Piles
Brown	Curtis	Heyburn	Root
Bulkeley	Dick	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Burkett	Dillingham	Jones	Smoot
Burnham	Dixon	Kean	Sutherland
Burrows	Dolliver	La Follette	Warner
Burton	du Pont	Lodge	Warren
Carter	Elkins	McCumber	Wetmore
Clapp	Flint	Nelson	

NAYS—25.

Bacon	Davis	Martin	Smith, S. C.
Bailey	Fletcher	Money	Stone
Bankhead	Foster	Newlands	Taliaferro
Chamberlain	Gore	Overman	Tillman
Clay	Hughes	Paynter	
Culberson	Johnston, Ala.	Rayner	
Daniel	McEnery	Simmons	

NOT VOTING—15.

Beveridge	Depew	Penrose	Smith, Mich.
Bourne	Frazier	Richardson	Stephenson
Bradley	McLaurin	Shively	Taylor
Clarke, Ark.	Owen	Smith, Md.	

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The message stands referred as upon the original declaration, and the Senator from Idaho is recognized.

Mr. BEVERIDGE subsequently said: Mr. President, I was necessarily absent when the vote was taken on the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE]. If I had been present, I should have voted "yea" upon the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island to lay that motion on the table.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President——

Mr. BROWN. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. HEYBURN. I will yield for a moment, but for nothing that will displace the pending business.

Mr. BROWN. Out of order I offer a joint resolution.

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

Mr. HEYBURN. I yield for the purpose of allowing the Senator to introduce a joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Out of order the Secretary will——

Mr. HEYBURN. Not for any comment.

Mr. BROWN. No.

Mr. BACON. Under the rule, the Senator can not yield for that purpose.

Mr. ALDRICH. That is true.

Mr. HEYBURN. I think that is true, but I did not care to suggest it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Except by unanimous consent——

Mr. BROWN. I ask unanimous consent.

Mr. BACON. The rule is that the Chair shall enforce it without any point of order being raised.

Mr. BROWN. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution——

Mr. HEYBURN. It can not be given.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is of the opinion that it can not be done until the Senator from Idaho has yielded the floor and the Senator from Nebraska proceeds in his own right.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I do not suppose there ever was an occasion in the history of the Senate where the conditions that confronted us and the questions to be determined changed so radically between the time that a Senator was recognized and the time that he came back five minutes later upon the floor. We were engaged in considering how we might raise revenue to conduct the affairs of this Government and, incidentally, protect the American people in the field of competition against foreigners.

Since I first addressed the Chair, about ten minutes ago, it would seem that one of these great questions was pretty nearly eliminated from consideration. When the Finance Committee first reported this bill, they reported correctly, in my judgment, that it would provide the revenue necessary to conduct the affairs of the Government. If that is true, and I believe it is true, where is the necessity of proposing these statutes providing for a tax upon the incomes of the people or a tax upon the gross earnings of corporations, or any other kind of a tax, in addition to those proposed in the bill, which already provides a sufficient fund for this Government?

I have never known such a revolution to occur in proposed legislation in the few minutes that have elapsed. I feel as though the Republican party were brought up in this moment face to face with the question whether or not they shall maintain the old protective tariff policy or whether they shall step aside and seek to carry out the vagaries of those whose idea of government is to get what the other man has and to keep all they themselves have. In other words, to make the statutes that are intended to affect the civil rights of the citizens penal statutes. In other words, to see whether or not you can not devise some means here to meet the demand not of those who think and who benefit by thinking, but of the great mass whose cry goes up at the dictate of a local leader. What occasion can there be, if the Government is provided with sufficient revenue under this law, of enacting some additional law that will provide a larger sum of money? What are we going to do with it? Has some one some covert idea of a new plan of government, by which we are going to branch out and spend more money than is required under the present system? If so, it should be disclosed.

What would you do with the revenue that was received from an income tax when you already have money enough in the Treasury to meet the Government's necessities? There is in my untamed bosom an idea. I would like to see an income tax levied upon certain things and for certain purposes and within certain limitations, but it does not emanate from the conscientious idea that I have of the duty which confronts me. We were not called together here for the purpose of getting even with somebody or punishing somebody. We were called together for the purpose of revising the revenue law that provides the money for the expenses of the Government, and in doing that the man who would allow the spirit of resentment or the spirit of opposition to interest to enter into it—well, in my judgment, he would have forgotten the duty that rested upon him.

I rose to discuss the zinc item in this bill, and in doing so it was my purpose to discuss it, first, from the standpoint of the revenue which we are here to provide, and, second, in its relation to those interested in that enterprise; and I will leave further consideration of the suggestions contained in the message for a future occasion. It may be that we will not succeed in passing any bill that will provide enough revenue through our custom-houses, and then we would be compelled to go out and resort to some other kind of taxation. But the founders of the Government never intended that that should be true. I was proposing to discuss this question along the lines of first intention on the part of the founders of the Government; and I will not enter upon a discussion of the principle of protection at this time, because we have already discussed that question.

Mr. President, it is my purpose to offer an amendment to the substitute offered by the Senator from Rhode Island, my amendment to provide in the beginning of the paragraph—

Zinc contents contained in zinc-bearing ores of all kinds, 1 cent per pound.

I intend, if I can, to have the attention of those who will vote upon this question. I will not spend one minute upon this floor in order to make a record of what I say. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Idaho suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Aldrich	Clay	Frye	Page
Bacon	Crane	Gallinger	Paynter
Bailey	Crawford	Gamble	Rayner
Bankhead	Culberson	Gore	Root
Borah	Cullom	Guggenheim	Scott
Brandegee	Cummins	Heyburn	Simmons
Briggs	Curtis	Johnson, N. Dak.	Smith, Md.
Brown	Daniel	Johnston, Ala.	Smith, S. C.
Bulkeley	Davis	Jones	Smoot
Burkett	Dick	Kean	Stone
Burnham	Dixon	La Follette	Sutherland
Burrows	Dolliver	McCumber	Taliaferro
Burton	du Pont	McEnery	Tillman
Carter	Elkins	McLaurin	Warner
Chamberlain	Fletcher	Money	Warren
Clapp	Flint	Oliver	
Clark, Wyo.	Foster	Overman	

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Sixty-six Senators have answered to the roll call. A quorum of the Senate is present. The Senator from Idaho will proceed.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, if I can have the attention of the Senate, the item of zinc in ore is as important as that of the cotton schedule, the wool schedule, the lumber schedule, or of any other schedule; and those who produce it and are interested in it are as large in numbers as those interested in other schedules.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

The committee reported a duty of 1 cent per pound on the zinc contents of ore. We had a right to believe that the committee would stand for that report, first, because it was the report of the committee, and as well because it was just.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, in justice to the committee, I will have to say that the committee have on several occasions stated that they had not arrived at any conclusion about the duty on zinc ore. They made no report upon the subject until this one.

Mr. HEYBURN. Paragraph 190 in the bill provides for a duty on zinc ore.

Mr. ALDRICH. That is the House provision.

Mr. HEYBURN. It was reported here by the Senate committee, and it is figured out with considerable detail and care in the book of imports that accompanies it.

Mr. ALDRICH. Technically, of course, the Senator from Idaho is correct to that extent; but I think there is no Member of this body who does not know that the Committee on Finance have been struggling with this question ever since the bill was reported.

Mr. HEYBURN. I know it.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is the most difficult problem in the whole bill, and if we have satisfied any one Senator outside of the committee I shall be more or less disappointed. The committee, nevertheless, have presented their report, and have done the best they could in this provision.

Mr. HEYBURN. I welcome the statement of the Senator from Rhode Island that this is one of the most important items in the bill.

Mr. ALDRICH. What I said was the most difficult.

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes; and important.

Mr. ALDRICH. I will agree that it is important.

Mr. HEYBURN. It is not a trifling item in the commercial world of this country. For that reason, I took the liberty of inviting Senators who I am quite sure did not know it was under consideration to come in, that they might have an opportunity, at least, of being present.

The danger always in enacting this class of legislation is that when the bill gets well along in consideration so many people have obtained the concessions they want and have such a comfortable feeling about it they can not realize that anybody else can possibly want anything, and they rather feel as though we were all ready to go home because they have what they want. Now, we have in the air the lumber item, which affects a vast number of people. It might have been disposed of——

Mr. BACON. If the Senator will permit me to interrupt him for just a moment, I desire to say that the Senator in the last sentences has given a more important illustration of the relation which all these various interests bear to a protective tariff than any I have heretofore heard in the Senate.

Mr. HEYBURN. Yet I am not inclined at all——

Mr. BACON. A general graft game.

Mr. HEYBURN. I will indorse the first statement made by the Senator and which was doubtless made in sober thought, but the last one I will not indorse. There is a great deal of objection being made by a good many people who have very little interest and take very little interest in it to the time that is being consumed in considering this bill.

The joke sifters in the gallery, I will not say whose daily bread, but whose popularity at least is with the newspapers that they represent, are not interested in the zinc schedule. If you can get up some diverting controversy here that would verge upon a disregard of the rules of the body, then they are happy. I saw an item in the editorial column of a paper this morning—I think I threw it in my desk—which illustrates what I mean very well. I will find it. It suggested an ad valorem duty upon speeches made in the United States Senate. It came in the editorial columns of one of the daily morning papers published in this city, whose representative, by the courtesy of the Senate, occupies palatial and luxurious quarters here, and who is only here by the courtesy of the Senate, and whose other representatives, through some idea that I am not able to understand, walk on the floor of the Senate. They put themselves in the position of the guest who ridicules his host. When you see that in the fugitive columns of a paper away from editorial responsibility you do not pay any attention to it, because, as I say, we know that it merely comes from where it comes from; but when a newspaper editorially undertakes to criticise this body in the responsible performance of its duty, then it places itself in the position of a guest who misbehaves himself at his host's table.

Mr. President, zinc is produced under such a variety of circumstances that you can not possibly determine this question by the consideration of any one condition. I do not believe with those who say that a tariff must be regulated upon the basis of the most prosperous of those who are affected by it, but I believe that just the contrary is the rule. Idaho is a zinc-producing State. Some may possibly say, with some reason, that I bring Idaho into these debates pretty often, but I bring it in when it is a good illustration of the principle. We had not been importing zinc into the United States from Mexico; until within the last five years we never imported any at all. At the time the last tariff bill was enacted there was no occasion for mentioning it, because it was not an item in existence. You have been told here a dozen times within twenty-four hours that zinc in ore had always been on the free list, but no one has before suggested or seemed to understand that the reason why it was on the free list was because there was no zinc ore imported at the time of the enactment of the existing tariff law, or for many years afterwards.

The necessity had not arisen. It has arisen now. There have been developed in Mexico bodies of zinc ore that can be scooped up and put on the cars in vast quantities, and brought into this country, either in the shape of zinc or spelter. They can either bring it here as ore, or they can reduce it to spelter on that side of the line and bring in the spelter. In either event it comes into our market. When it comes into our market it comes in to undersell our product.

What if they can produce ore in certain zinc mines in the United States for practically a little more than it is produced in Mexico? Is the line of protection only to extend to that class of mines? There are zinc bodies in the United States where zinc can be produced nearly as cheaply as in those in Mexico. There is very little money invested in them. They require very little expense. But we have also in this country, and particularly in the State I represent, zinc ores that have to be mined, where, before you take out a pound of zinc, you must expend some hundreds of thousands of dollars. I speak of the Success mines, where the depth already reached is something over 700 feet, and they propose 400 more immediately. It is a mine equipped with a modern, up-to-date plant, for the purpose of concentrating and reducing the zinc, at an expense of some hundreds of thousands of dollars. Would you put those people on a plane with the Mexican zinc industry that can scoop it up and put it on the car for $2 a ton or $2.50? The Mexican zinc ore is nearly all produced in connection with lead ores. The lead is a by-product of value, which more than compensates them for the production of the zinc.

That is not true with our mines. I have here an accurate statement that I telegraphed for as to the character of those mines. I telegraphed to Mr. Samuels, who owns the Success mine, one of our foremost business men, a man who has been mining right in that camp for twenty years, and who is mining on a large scale and knows what he is talking about. He says:

The Success mine zinc ore averages 10 to 15 per cent.

That is the crude ore as it comes out of the ground.

A ton of ore would have from 100 to 150 pounds of zinc in it. Concentrates average 45 per cent.

It takes 4 tons of crude ore on that basis to make 1 ton of concentrates, 45 per cent zinc, and the balance waste. That is the kind of zinc mining we are compelled to do. He says:

Mill complete, ready to start at any time and ship 2,000 tons of concentrates per month—

That is the capacity of that mill and that mine—

when the price of zinc justifies—

That is when they can do it. They can not ship that zinc except the price justifies them in doing so—

150,000 tons of ore blocked out.

That means that it has been blocked out in mining, levels run under it and above it, and up and down through it, until they are able to measure up the cubic feet of ore of a given quality in that mine, and all they have to do is to take it out. Of course they will not take it out until they know they have a market for it. Otherwise it would be a dead product on their hands.

He refers me to the official report of the mining inspector of Idaho for 1907 to verify these facts.

The Sunset district, also Pine Creek, average 10 per cent zinc.

Now, the ores on Sunset Mountain and in Pine Creek are of immense value, but it is difficult, of course, to say how valuable a mine is until the ore has been explored and blocked out. He says:

They are lying idle because of the low price of zinc; 1 cent duty, and all these properties will commence working.

Mr. President, that is a live transaction. Here is the statement made by another about that mine:

The Success mine, on Nine-Mile, will not be operated until the tariff question is settled and the price of spelter not less than $5.25 per hundred at St. Louis, and $5.50 per hundred at New York, and a steady market assured.

That is the situation up there.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

is not a mill in New England that makes a pound of print paper out of poplar.

Mr. TILLMAN. There is very little poplar in New England.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is almost an unknown wood with us.

Mr. TILLMAN. But I wish to ask the Senator how long ago the discovery was made that spruce was the cheapest and almost the only product from which we could get print paper?

Mr. BROWN. Print paper was made prior to the discovery of the grinding process in 1844 out of the vegetable wastes of the country—straw, flax, hemp, jute, old ropes, canes, bamboo, and other cellulose fibers.

Mr. TILLMAN. I know what the old ordinary paper used to be made out of—rags.

Mr. BROWN. That is it exactly.

Mr. TILLMAN. But I wanted to know how long since they discovered that they could make print paper out of nothing but spruce.

Mr. BROWN. In 1844 they started to do it. It was always known that you could make print paper out of spruce, but to make it by the grinding or mechanical process was never known to the commercial and scientific world until 1844.

Mr. TILLMAN. Its general use has been much more recent.

Mr. BROWN. It has been used all the time.

Mr. TILLMAN. But its general use has been much more recent than 1844?

Mr. BROWN. I do not understand the Senator's question.

Mr. TILLMAN. What I mean is that we were not dependent on spruce even twenty-five years ago.

Mr. BROWN. No; because we used rags and waste.

Mr. TILLMAN. I will say to the Senator the nut of this proposition to me is this: The subscription rates on the New York Sun, for instance, are the same that they were when this discovery was first made. Are they going to reduce them any if they get paper free?

Mr. BROWN. You will have to write to the Sun to find out. I do not know.

Mr. TILLMAN. The Senator is here in the interests of free newspapers and is advocating free paper. Of course, I understand the political significance of that, and I wanted to know if it involves a terrible catastrophe to and an obliteration of these headlights of information—the newspapers. If they get free paper from Canada, will they sell their papers at half a cent apiece instead of a cent, or will they cut the price from 3 cents down to 1 cent? Tell us what will be the ultimate result of this. Who are the beneficiaries?

Mr. BROWN. I will ask the Senator from South Carolina if these improved processes reduced the price of paper?

Mr. TILLMAN. That has nothing to do with the case. I want to know where your interests lie.

Mr. BROWN. My interest is with the consumers of this country.

Mr. TILLMAN. The ultimate consumer is the man who buys the newspaper.

Mr. BROWN. He is the ultimate consumer.

Mr. TILLMAN. The question is whether he is going to get more newspapers for the money than he gets now.

Mr. FRYE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. BROWN. Certainly.

Mr. FRYE. In reply to the question asked by the Senator from South Carolina I will state that every newspaper man who was asked the question whether or not he would reduce the price of his paper with paper and pulp on the free list promptly replied, "No." He was then asked if he would reduce the price of advertisements, and he said, "No."

Mr. TILLMAN. I just wanted to know where the interest in this question comes.

Mr. BROWN. I have no such direct information from the publishers, and it is wholly immaterial whether they do or not, to my mind.

Mr. TILLMAN. It is the principle involved.

Mr. BROWN. The question is whether we are going to put a duty on it. If a duty is necessary it ought to be on, and if it is not it ought to be taken off.

Mr. OWEN and Mr. GALLINGER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield, and to whom?

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma first.

Mr. OWEN. I respectfully suggest to the Senator from Nebraska that because the newspapers do not consent to reduce the cost of the paper from 2 cents to 1 cent or from 1 cent to a half a cent, and do not consent to change their charge for advertising as a condition precedent to lowering or removing this duty, has nothing to do with the case. To change 2 cents to 1 cent or from 1 cent to a half cent in the cost of newspapers would be an amazing change in per cent and volume, and considering the corresponding benefit to them of the reduced cost of the paper it would be entirely unjustified. That they should enter into a contract in advance to change the charge for the use of their advertising columns because of this change in the cost of paper is ridiculous. They ought not to be expected to do so. The important fact that the newspapers of this country comprise one of the greatest agencies for the education of the American people, comprise the greatest agency for the publicity in public affairs, in business matters, and in promoting commerce; in creating activity of business, and the enormous benefit of cheap paper to the people of this country in promoting their welfare, can not be exaggerated.

In my judgment instead of reducing this rate it ought to be absolutely eliminated and paper be made as free as water, or air, or sunlight, or any other providence of God. Paper, newspaper, is the basis of all modern civilization. We should glory in our magnificent public press—and except the teachers of religion—it is the most powerful and valuable of all agencies in the advance of the human race and gives more in return for what it receives than any commercial agency on earth. They should have every advantage we can give them and should have cheap paper. They make a magnificent use of it. There can be no exaggeration of the value of cheap paper.

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator from Nebraska allow me a moment?

Mr. BROWN. Certainly.

Mr. TILLMAN. Agreeing to all that has been so eloquently said by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] the point with me is to find out how it is and why it is that the Senators on the other side who are so solicitous about the welfare of American industries in protecting them and looking after labor and all that kind of thing have found it in their hearts to interfere with the spread of light by newspapers; and, wonder on top of wonders, some of these very newspapers are the headlights of protection that are clamoring for free trade for the articles which they use, and deny me the opportunity to buy this coat without a protective tariff, these pants, these shoes, everything that I have. They are humbugs and whited sepulchers—that is what they are.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I do not care to be diverted to a discussion of whether the newspaper men are humbugs or not.

Mr. TILLMAN. I said the protective-tariff advocates among the newspapers were humbugs.

Mr. BROWN. If I went into the question of the humbug business I would have to read to my friend from South Caroline his platform and ask him why he is repudiating it from time to time.

Mr. TILLMAN. Go ahead and read it; I will answer.

Mr. BROWN. It is just the plan of the enemies of this proposition to put print paper on the free list to have the discussion sidetracked.

Now, I want to get back to the meat of this question. I started to read the statement of the chairman of the Mann committee with reference to the cost of wood. I beg the pardon of the Senator from New Hampshire; he wished to interrupt me a little while ago.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will not interrupt the Senator now.

Mr. BROWN. I read this statement as to the Booth mills at Ottawa, the very largest mills in Canada:

> The Booth mills at Ottawa, Canada, paid $8 per rough cord for pulp wood in log lengths at the mill during 1908. As shown by the returns to the special committee from the pulp and paper manufacturers using 1,677,000 cords of pulp wood for 1907, the average price per cord was $7.76—

Or 24 per cent more in Canada than on this side of the line.

> In Maine, seven establishments, using 125,000 cords, reported the average price as $6.81; in New Hampshire, eight establishments reported the average price at $7.89; while some of the large mills, like the Great Northern Company, W. H. Parsons & Co., and the Berlin Mills Company, refused to make out the schedules for the committee; yet the other companies reporting in Maine and New Hampshire show that the price paid for pulp wood in those States was not high. When the Wisconsin mills in 1907 purchased 50,000 cords of spruce pulp wood in Quebec they paid $6.50 per cord f. o. b. cars there. The Wisconsin mills paid $6.50 f. o. b. cars in Quebec early in the year 1907 before the scare about wood commenced, while the average price paid in Maine during that year was $6.81 at the mill.
>
> Certainly $6.50 per cord in Quebec on cars at the shipping point is not a lower price than $6.81 in Maine delivered at the mill.

So it seems to me the senior Senator from Maine was mistaken when he said the committee had not investigated the cost of wood and brought no information and no report back to Congress on that question, because the chairman has shown you it costs more in Canada than it does on this side of the line.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Mr. President, here is some other testimony that was taken before the committee. The American consul in the Province of Quebec was asked to investigate the cost of wood pulp and of print paper in that country. This is his report, and it is a letter addressed to the Secretary of State.

Mr. GALLINGER. Where was the letter written?

Mr. BROWN. It was written at the American consulate, Three Rivers, Province of Quebec, May 14, 1908.

No. 220.] AMERICAN CONSULATE,
THREE RIVERS, PROVINCE OF QUEBEC,
May 14, 1908.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your dispatch No. 109, dated May 6, 1908 (file No. 8712–34), and in reply beg to state:

(1) The price of pulp wood in the rough has within a year held at $5 per cord; at less, at very great distance from transportation facilities. Farmers who have no stumpage tax to pay have sold as low as $4.50 and in rare instances at $4 per cord.

(2) The rossing or peeling of the pulp wood costs from $2 to $3 per cord, making the price of such peeled pulp wood $7 to $8 per cord.

(3) The stumpage tax on wood for consumption in Canada is 40 cents per cord, but for export 65 cents per cord. For stumpage, the Canadian government estimates 600 feet to the cord, but in the trade 1,000 feet are taken as the measurement for 2 cords.

According to the local manager of the Union Bag and Paper Company, the cost of such pulp wood is $7.13 to $7.65 per cord, laid down at this port without any charges against the capital invested by purchase money in the limits, losses by fire, floods, etc.

That statement of our consul in Canada, together with the testimony and the reports from the mills of New Hampshire and Maine, show that the cost was about the same in the two countries.

In addition to that, we have the testimony of our Chief Forester, Mr. Pinchot, who said:

From the reports which the Forest Service received from manufacturers it is shown that the average price for pulp wood in 1905 was $5.56 per cord f. o. b. shipping point, and in 1906 $7.21 per cord at the mill.

That is, in this country it is less than the price fixed by our consul in Quebec.

The testimony further showed that on over a million and a half cords of wood actually bought by our mills and manufactured in 1907 they paid $7.76 a cord delivered.

Here is some further testimony that was taken. The treasurer of the Berlin Mills Company testified—you will find his testimony on page 1391—"that the spruce wood for that large paper mill cost $6.20 per cord delivered in 1907."

That is in Ontario.

Mr. GALLINGER. No; that is in New Hampshire.

Mr. BROWN—

The Minnesota and Ontario Power Company announces that it has contracted for a supply of 500,000 cords of spruce at prices ranging from $3.50 to $5 per cord delivered.

* * * * * * *

The American companies which shipped pulp wood from Canada to the United States and which had no incentive for undervaluation, because the wood was free of duty, reported to the Canadian government at Ottawa that the value of the wood shipped by them was—

And you will find this on page 1040 of the testimony—

1905, 593,642 cords, valued at $2,600,884=$4.38 per cord.
1906, 614,286 cords, valued at $2,649,106=$4.31 per cord.
1907, 628,844 cords, valued at $2,748,909=$4.37 per cord.

The figures are borne out by the invoices furnished to the United States authorities at 17 ports for seventeen months ending June 1, 1908 (p. 2359 of Paper Investigation), and show a sworn cost averaging $5.02 per cord, as follows:

	Quantity, in cords.	Value.	Average price per cord.
Alburg, Vt.	181,235	$762,706	$4.20
Bangor, Me.	14,562	56,232	3.84
Buffalo, N. Y.	10,650	58,122	5.45
Champlain, N. Y.	264,670	1,396,216	5.23
Chicago, Ill.	3,421	10,284	3.00
Detroit, Mich.	10,110	68,157	6.84
Erie, Pa.	20,768	112,480	5.41
Marquette, Mich.	31,333	146,089	4.65
Newport, Vt.	404,910	2,117,401	5.20
Milwaukee, Wis.	12,255	67,757	5.52
Niagara Falls, N. Y.	24,940	123,899	4.96
Ogdensburg, N. Y.	8,760	44,143	5.03
Oswego, N. Y.	10,942	62,411	5.70
Port Huron, Mich.	24,573	109,322	4.44
Richford, Vt.	5,021	25,577	5.09
St. Albans, Vt.	26,270	138,269	5.18
Total	1,073,113	5,397,322	5.02

Mr. GALLINGER. I will interrupt the Senator to ask him where it was that wood pulp was purchased at $3 a cord, as I understood him to say?

Mr. BROWN. "The Minnesota and Ontario Power Company announces that it has contracted for a supply of 500,000 cords of spruce at prices ranging from $3.50 to $5 per cord delivered."

Mr. GALLINGER. I confess I do not know, and I should like to know, who contracted for that wood. Was it in this country or Canada?

Mr. BROWN. I do not recall certainly, but I am reasonably certain it is a firm in the State of Minnesota. Your manufacturers ought to know. They buy almost a million cords of wood.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator ought to know; he is giving us information on the subject, or trying to do so.

Mr. BROWN. I am making the effort; that is true.

Mr. GALLINGER. I appreciate that.

Mr. BROWN. The exact location of that mill I do not remember, but, as I said, I think it is an American firm.

Mr. OWEN and Mr. GORE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To which Senator does the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the junior Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, those mills, I understand, are situated in International Falls, Minn. I should like to say while I am on my feet, if it will not interrupt the Senator too much, that the International Paper Company buys and imports many thousand cords of wood from Canada. It makes its purchases largely from the St. Lawrence Lumber Company of that country, one of its subsidiary concerns. Now, I am informed that the International Paper Company or its subsidiary company has certified to the Canadian government that the pulp wood which it has been importing into this country is worth less than $5 a cord. That is a matter of official report and the Finance Committee has doubtless given it thorough investigation.

Mr. GALLINGER. But, if the Senator will permit me, that does not accord with the argument the Senator has so repeatedly made, that the wood costs more in that country than it does in this country. He says it costs $7 or $8 a cord here.

Mr. BROWN. My attention was diverted.

Mr. GALLINGER. That ought to be worked out.

Mr. BROWN. I did not hear the statement of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE].

Mr. OWEN. I call the attention of the Senate to the report, Bulletin No. 80, Census of Manufactures, 1905, on paper and wood pulp. It shows the cost of material as reported by the factories themselves, and goes directly to the point of the costs. The material used in 1905 of Canadian pulp wood, spruce, for ground wood, was 245,087 cords, at a cost stated by the manufacturers themselves at $2,173,612, while the cost of ground wood, spruce, domestic, for 881,106 tons, was $6,355,563. Practically, therefore, the cost was almost the same, taking the general average of all the material referred to by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BROWN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FRYE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. BROWN. Certainly.

Mr. FRYE. It is fair to say that the wood which we purchase in Canada for our mills is transported by rail to our mills, and the average cost of transportation is $4 a cord. It takes a cord and a half to make a ton of paper. That would be $6 added to whatever price is paid in Canada as our cost for the raw material.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senator to the fact that that is the cost stated at the mills and not with the freight added.

Mr. FRYE. Oh, it is no use to talk about the cost to our mills importing wood from Canada as being $3 or $4 a cord.

Mr. OWEN. I will call the attention of the Senator to the tables as to the costs, not at the particular mill to which he has reference, but the cost of the Canadian pulp wood to the mills of the United States as a class.

Mr. FRYE. To-day that wood costs in the State of Maine $10.03 a cord delivered at the mills.

Mr. BROWN. If that is true, why would not the Maine mills make that statement to the committee that was investigating that subject when they were called upon for that very information?

Mr. FRYE. The sworn testimony taken by the committee shows that the cost of making paper in the United States was $7 or $8 more than it was in Canada. That is the sworn testimony taken before the House committee. The Booth mill was the only exception, and there was no sworn statement from the Booth mill at all. There was an investigation there just at the time the Booth mill was going through a state of reorganization. It was at a time when they were paying $7 or $8 to get wood from Nova Scotia on account of drought, and the Ottawa mill did not get its pulp wood down to its pool. That is the only reason they paid $8.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

on a level with our low duties, and run up to 62½ per cent. Mr. Campbell in his testimony said that these articles were purchased in this country.

Mr. HALE. Some of them.

Mr. BROWN. He said all of them.

Mr. HALE. He is wrong.

Mr. BROWN. And he discussed the advantages in favor of the American mills.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

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

Mr. BROWN. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will ask the Senator if Mr. Campbell, whoever he may be, gave an estimate as to how much it would increase the cost of a ton of paper even if all the articles to which the Senator has referred were imported?

Mr. BROWN. There was an estimate made. It runs to at least $2.

Mr. GALLINGER. In what?

Mr. BROWN. The advantage of the American mill in railroad freight of the finished product to the consumer, together with the coal freight to the mill, the coal duty in Canada, and the cheaper cost of labor in the United States is stated at a total of $2.71, and, in addition to that, for cost of sulphur, cost of lime, cost of wires, cost of felts, cost of oils, cost of alum, cost of repair materials, cost of renewing materials, cost of belting, cost of pulp stones, cost of clay, cost of size, cost of color, cost of screen plates, and cost of finishing materials, the advantage in favor of the American mill is estimated at $2 per ton of paper.

Mr. HALE. For all of those?

Mr. BROWN. All of those.

Mr. ALDRICH. How does the Senator explain the fact that the Mann committee that he is talking so much about decided to give the United States a duty of $2 per ton to offset the advantage the other way.

Mr. BROWN. Because they were persuaded——

Mr. ALDRICH. They must have made a mistake as to the side of the ledger on which these amounts were posted.

Mr. BROWN. They were persuaded, just as I am afraid the Senate will be persuaded by the appeals of men whom we all respect and love, that their home industries will be stricken down if we do not give them the duty proposed, when, as a matter of fact, the testimony does not justify us in voting that duty. That is the trouble.

Mr. CLAY. Will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. BROWN. Certainly.

Mr. CLAY. If I recollect correctly, in the last Congress a committee was appointed by the House of Representatives to thoroughly investigate this subject, and that committee was engaged in that work for about nine months. That committee unanimously reported to the House that the duty ought to be reduced from $6 to $2 per ton, and the House in framing the bill made that change, placing the duty at $2 per ton. I have read that report most carefully, and my recollection is that it was unanimous, every Republican and Democrat on the committee insisting that the duty ought to be reduced from $6 to $2 per ton. The Senator has moved, as I recollect, to put print paper on the free list. I understand him, however, to be willing to accept $2 per ton as passed by the House. My recollection is that that committee said distinctly that labor in the United States did not cost quite as much as it did in Canada.

Mr. GALLINGER. Oh, no.

Mr. CLAY. I think they did. I do not think I am mistaken.

Mr. BROWN. That is their statement.

Mr. CLAY. I have a synopsis of that report here. My recollection in regard to the scarcity of timber is that the committee stated that the International Paper Company owned enough lands now to supply that company for more than two hundred years.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me a moment?

Mr. CLAY. Yes.

Mr. OWEN. I would suggest that that one company has, according to the Manual of Statistics, 3,000,000 acres in Canada under their control and 1,000,000 acres of fee land which they have available for this purpose.

Mr. CLAY. With the Senator's permission, my recollection is that all this trouble in regard to paper came from the fact that the International Paper Company closed down more than half of its plants, brought about a scarcity of paper, and increased its price, and that that was the reason this investigation was made. With the permission of the Senate, I will read:

> Paper makers control 5,000,000 acres of spruce land in the United States and 10,000,000 in Canada, a total of 23,437 square miles.
>
> The International Paper Company has acquired 6,269 square miles of woodlands—1,426 in the United States and 4,843 in Canada (page 1029 of Paper Investigation). It figures that it has gained $10,000,000 by their appreciation in values. Applying Forester Pinchot's formula (page 1370 of Paper Investigation) for paper-cutting needs, the International Paper Company has acquired two and one-half times as much woodland as is necessary for a perpetual supply of wood to insure its present output of paper. Instead of cutting all that it needs from that land, it buys three-fourths of its wood supply from outsiders (page 1055 of Paper Investigation), thereby artificially inflating wood prices and promoting its gigantic speculation in timber tracts. It pays a high price to outsiders, while refusing to cut from its own cheap lands—lands that are inventoried at $1.70 per acre.

Mr. FRYE. By whom is that signed?

Mr. CLAY. It is signed by the chairman representing the American Newspaper Publishers Association, John Norris, who I understand to be a very honorable and upright man. It is true that he is representing the interests of the newspapers, but if we have reached the point in the Senate in the framing of this bill where we do not expect to consider the testimony of those who are interested, we have certainly changed front during the last two or three months.

Mr. BROWN. Recurring to the advantages which I undertook to detail which the American mill has over the Canadian mill, and in reply to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH], I want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that the manager of a Canadian paper mill company located in the Province of Quebec filed an affidavit with the Committee on Finance in which he states the advantages I have undertaken to enumerate. The original affidavit, I am informed, was delivered to the Senate. This affidavit was made by F. J. Campbell, who was the general manager, I understand, of the Windsor Mills at Quebec. In speaking of Mr. Mann's committee that went to Canada to find out what the cost of labor was in Canada, he states:

> Mr. Mann's committee obtained our labor cost, but I do not think he got our actual cost of production, and while I do not like exposing details too greatly, I nevertheless advise you that our actual cost of producing news throughout the year 1908 was $33.80 per ton at the mill. Of this I figure the labor cost from the rough wood was $8.62 per ton.

I do not care so much about that, but here is a list he gave of the advantages the American mill has:

> We buy our coal both here and in the United States, its cost running from $4.50 to over $5 per ton.
>
> In comparing cost of supplies, I might say that our lime costs us $5.60 per ton, but I do not know the price of this in the United States.
>
> For our fast news machines we import felts, making them cost us 35 per cent more than they cost manufacturers in the United States.
>
> Our wires cost us nearly 25 per cent more.
>
> Our screen plates nearly 30 per cent more.
>
> Our belting and repair materials 27½ per cent more; this being a very serious matter in the case of rubber-covered rolls, the work on them being largely done in Boston.
>
> Our stones cost us 15 per cent more, and, as you know, our capital outlay is about 25 per cent more than in the United States, nearly all our paper-making machinery being of United States manufacture.

Senators, those are natural advantages; those are advantages that protect our mills and protect our people. The freight advantage alone, which I have not mentioned at all, is almost as much as the duty proposed by the House of $2 per ton.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. BROWN. Certainly.

Mr. ALDRICH. To illustrate one of the peculiarities of this discussion and contention, we have two different affidavits in relation to the cost of making paper in the Canadian paper mills, and they vary about $6 a ton.

Mr. BROWN. The cost is different in different mills.

Mr. ALDRICH. No; in this same mill.

Mr. BROWN. You will find no difference. Does the Senator mean that he has testimony that disputes this statement I have just read? Have you not the testimony of Mr. Campbell?

Mr. ALDRICH. I think so.

Mr. BROWN. Have you not also the testimony of Mr. Pottle?

Mr. ALDRICH. We have a great deal of testimony on this subject, which we are——

Mr. BROWN. Does the Senator decline to tell me whether he has Mr. Pottle's testimony?

Mr. ALDRICH. I am not sure about the gentleman's name in this case.

Mr. BROWN. I think the Senator has some affidavits.

Mr. ALDRICH. We certainly have two affidavits from this same company, or from the same mill, showing a difference in cost of production of $6 a ton in the same year.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Mr. BROWN. It becomes very material who the witness is who makes the affidavit.

Mr. ALDRICH. I think very likely, as it seems to me in this case, it is very material who furnished the affidavit.

Mr. BROWN. The Senator has been furnished with both of them. Now, what is the fact about it? We have the information first, of the House committee that went there; of the experts that it sent there, and of our American consul, who lives there and reports.

In addition to that we have the testimony which I have read of a general manager of a mill. Summon in to testify anyone you please and show me that the witness has sources of information better than the man who owns the mill.

Mr. OWEN. Will the Senator from Nebraska permit me for a moment?

Mr. BROWN. Certainly.

Mr. OWEN. I should like to inquire whether this testimony under oath on one side and the other side continually contradicting itself through these schedules has ever been brought to book by the Finance Committee holding to account for perjury somebody who contradicts somebody else on a vital fact.

Mr. HALE. The Senator is a student and he investigates subjects carefully. But if he had had more experience in taking testimony as to labor and the cost of labor and the different kinds of labor in other countries, he would have learned what every committee that has investigated has learned—that all these statements are various. They proceed on different bases as to different kinds of labor, and no committee will ever investigate or attempt to investigate the cost of labor in a foreign country, whether it be Canada or Germany or England or France or any other country, that it will not find itself beset by the plainest contradictions at every step of the investigation. That has always been so and always will be so; and therefore, when general conditions are established and when we know what is the demonstration of the difference between the pay of labor abroad and here; the conditions of labor; that our labor lives better, is housed better, has better accommodations, and has better life, showing that its wages are higher—that fundamental fact is better than all the investigations.

The Senator himself may start a committee as to the cost of labor in Germany—and he has taken an interest in that—and he will find himself beset by these contradictions at every turn of the way. It is really a useless task for anybody to undertake.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, while of course human beings with inaccurate powers of observation, with minds which draw inaccurate conclusions from given observations, will arrive at varying results, and therefore testimony may be innocently offered which is at variance with other testimony, both of the witnesses intending to speak the truth, that does not at all reach the suggestion which I made—whether or not any witnesses have been held to book for a deliberate false statement made to these committees. If there has been, I should like to know it.

Mr. ALDRICH. In this particular case we have no jurisdiction, I suppose, over Canadian general managers.

Mr. OWEN. That is not an answer to my question.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is sufficient for my purpose. I want to ask the Senator from Nebraska a question.

Mr. OWEN. I understand, then, that there is no answer.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator can understand it that way; yes.

I should like to ask the Senator from Nebraska a question. Has he in his possession a statement of the Belgo-Canadian Company as to the cost of making paper at their mills?

Mr. BROWN. I think I have.

Mr. ALDRICH. That was the only statement submitted by these contending factions to the Committee on Finance that was agreed upon by both parties. It was for June, 1908, I think.

Mr. BROWN. I am not certain without going through my papers whether I have that one or not. I have three or four mills in that country. But I want——

Mr. ALDRICH. There was one statement of the Belgo-Canadian Company showing to the minutest detail the cost of producing paper in their mills, and that statement was furnished both by the newspaper people and by the paper people, and that shows the cost in Canada to be $27.57 a ton.

Mr. BROWN. I want to call the Senator's attention——

Mr. ALDRICH. That is based upon a cost of wood of $5 a cord. That statement is undisputed. I think it is the only statement made by either party that has not been discredited by the other.

Mr. BROWN. Who are the people who agreed on this statement?

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. Norris presented it to us for the American Publishers' Association and Mr. Chisholm presented it to us as representing the paper manufacturers of the United States.

Mr. BROWN. Is Mr. Chisholm an officer of the association? I am trying to locate him.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. Chisholm is an ex-president of the International Paper Company, and I presume the Senator from Nebraska will have no difficulty in locating him any more than I would have in locating Mr. Norris.

Mr. BROWN. I know Mr. Norris, and he has done a great work in letting in the light on these questions that have been mooted and disputed the last two years. He has come before this committee and the other committee indorsed by all the great newspapers of this country.

Mr. ALDRICH. I am not in any way mentioning Mr. Norris with a view of deprecating his position or disparaging his character or anything else. I simply say I presume the Senator from Nebraska knows both of these gentlemen and knows who they are.

Mr. BROWN. I knew Mr. Norris, but I did not know the latter gentleman. But here is the difficulty that the committee finds itself in now. This report is made, based, I suppose, upon this undisputed and consented stipulation.

Mr. ALDRICH. In part.

Mr. BROWN. Where are we? We have the testimony that covers 3,500 pages taken by the sworn officers of this Government, Members of Congress. We have it laid aside. We have all the other testimony that comes from our other sources, official sources also, laid aside.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President——

Mr. BROWN. And at the eleventh hour, just before the roll call, we are informed that two men have agreed as to what the cost was in one mill in Canada, and that fixes the cost of wood, and therefore we will write their agreement into the tariff law. The duty shall be based on that agreement.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President——

Mr. BROWN. I want something else than the agreement of two men on the cost of print paper in one mill to determine the cost of producing print paper in Canada.

Mr. ALDRICH. Before the House committee the only testimony of any kind taken, showing the cost of the production of paper in the Dominion of Canada, was in one instance. There was no other attempt made to show the cost of producing print paper in Canada, and in that particular instance the testimony of that particular concern has been absolutely discredited.

Mr. BROWN. But the committee itself was there.

Mr. ALDRICH. The committee themselves did not undertake to make any statement about the cost of production except one based upon this one mill in Canada, and the statement has been shown over and over again not to be accurate. There was no other testimony.

When the Finance Committee took up this matter I said to Mr. Norris, and I said to the representatives of the paper manufacturers of the United States, "so far as my action is concerned—and I think that is the position of the Committee on Finance—we must know what is the relative cost of producing print paper in Canada and the United States. We desire you to furnish us with testimony, not hearsay, not anything that the Mann committee has done, but new, original testimony showing the actual cost of production in the two countries." They have produced not one single particle of testimony, except this Belgo-Canada statement, that was not promptly disputed by the other side, and there has been no testimony submitted to the Committee on Finance, and there was none before the Mann committee that shows the relative cost of production, which both parties agree is correct, except this one statement of the Belgo-Canadian Company.

Mr. BROWN. Does the Senator inform the Senate that having gone through the Mann testimony on the basis of a personal examination of those volumes, he undertakes to say there is no testimony there about the cost of production?

Mr. ALDRICH. In Canada? I undertake to say exactly that. I have not read the three or four thousand pages of testimony, and I assume that the Senator from Nebraska has not.

Mr. BROWN. I may have missed a few pages, but I read hundreds of pages upon this subject.

Mr. ALDRICH. Not from any reliable source or from any source that pretended to be reliable.

Mr. BROWN. Why not reliable? The men who run the mills?

Mr. ALDRICH. Oh, no.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

By Mr. LENROOT: A bill (H. R. 10864) granting a pension to Henry C. Fisher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10865) granting an increase of pension to John Lees—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINDSAY: A bill (H. R. 10866) granting a pension to Celia Cornell—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10867) granting an increase of pension to John B. Liddle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10868) granting an increase of pension to John Soehnlein—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McHENRY: A bill (H. R. 10869) granting a pension to Charles W. Faux, alias Charles M. Ward—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10870) for the relief of J. K. Beltz—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McMORRAN: A bill (H. R. 10871) granting a pension to Emma R. Anderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 10872) granting an increase of pension to Lewis C. Grubb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 10873) granting an increase of pension to John M. Squires—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 10874) granting an increase of pension to Henry B. Combs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 10875) for the relief of Elijah A. Kilburn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10876) granting a pension to Lovina Montgomery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10877) granting an increase of pension to Nannie Layman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10878) granting an increase of pension to William Redus—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STERLING: A bill (H. R. 10879) granting an increase of pension to Absolom Wood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 10880) granting a pension to Susan Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 10881) granting an increase of pension to William W. Brubaker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM: A bill (H. R. 10882) granting an increase of pension to Edward G. Cannon—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WICKLIFFE: A bill (H. R. 10883) for the relief of Arthur B. Arbour, administrator of the estate of Frederick Arbour, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WOODYARD: A bill (H. R. 10884) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Ebert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BARCHFELD: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Henry Krug—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOK: Petition of Philadelphia Produce Exchange, against increase of duty on potatoes from 25 cents to 45 cents per bushel—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESCH: Paper to accompany bill for relief of George K. Redmond—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMLIN: Paper to accompany bill for relief of M. C. Bixby, Samuel Paxton, and Jonathan C. Crane—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAYES: Petition of Merchants' Association of San Francisco, Cal., favoring a bill entitled "An act concerning baggage and excess baggage carried by common carriers, and prescribing duties of same," etc.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HENRY of Texas: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Mrs. George A. Hodges—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Petition of Thoburn Post, No. 72, Grand Army of the Republic, Martins Ferry, Ohio, against engraving of Jefferson Davis's portrait on silver service of battle ship *Mississippi*—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KRONMILLER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Charles Jones—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LENROOT: Papers to accompany bills for relief of John Lees and Henry C. Fisher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Petition of Western South Dakota Stock Growers' Association, favoring retention of present duty on cattle, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Petitions of Franterna Independente and Society Maria S. S. del Parmône, favoring October 12 as a holiday in honor of Columbus—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, *June 18, 1909.*

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m.

Prayer by Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D., of the city of Washington.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

DEATH OF REV. EDWARD E. HALE.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a note which, while framed in personal terms, as it relates to the action of the Senate, the Chair thinks it appropriate the Senate should hear.

The Secretary read as follows:

39 HIGHLAND STREET,
Roxbury, June 15, 1909.

MY DEAR MR. VICE-PRESIDENT: The beautiful engrossed copy of the resolutions passed in the Senate last week has reached us, and I can not tell you what a treasure it will always be to us. I am sure the Senate knows how much my father cared for his relation to it, and this last mark of affection and appreciation would have moved him as it does my mother and all of us. Believe me,

Most truly, yours,

ELLEN DAY HALE.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented the petition of Charles A. Park, of Indianapolis, Ind., praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the general land laws, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also presented a petition of sundry members of the Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Brooklyn, Md., and a petition of sundry members of the Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Linglestown, Pa., praying for the termination and abrogation of the extradition treaty with Russia; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of New York, South Carolina, Arkansas, Michigan, Georgia, Alabama, California, Pennsylvania, North Dakota, Illinois, and of the Territory of Alaska, praying for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. OVERMAN presented resolutions adopted by the Tobacco Board of Trade of Winston-Salem, N. C.; which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolutions of the Tobacco Board of Trade of Winston-Salem, N. C.

At a meeting of the Tobacco Board of Trade of Winston-Salem, N. C., held June 10, 1909, at 10 o'clock a. m., the following resolutions were adopted:

Whereas a bill has been introduced in the Congress of the United States known as the "free-leaf bill," which has for its purpose the giving to tobacco growers the right to stem, twist, or otherwise manipulate their leaf tobacco and sell same free of the internal-revenue tax, we beg to earnestly protest against the passage of such a bill for the following reasons:

First. That the farmers now have the right under the law to sell their leaf tobacco in its natural state, and if they should be permitted to stem, twist, or otherwise manipulate the same without paying the internal-revenue tax it would open opportunities for others than those who are actually engaged in the production of tobacco to become directly or indirectly interested in farms, thereby defeating the object of this bill.

Second. It will induce the culture of tobacco in localities all over the country unsuited to its growth, and thereby place upon the market in these localities an inferior product at a low price, in competition with the product of the sections now engaged in the production of, and suitable to the growth of, tobacco, causing overproduction of the cheap grades and the lowering of prices, thereby materially injuring the present tobacco farmer.

Third. It will take away the safeguard of the Internal Revenue Department and offer temptations for thieving that would be disastrous to everyone in the tobacco business—farmers, dealers, and manufacturers—and would absolutely do away with the safeguard that now exists; and

Whereas a bill has been introduced to increase the tax on manufactured tobacco, therefore we hereby offer our earnest protest against this proposed increase, as it will further demoralize business, injuring everyone connected with the trade—farmers, dealers, and manufacturers—and we hereby request that you use your best efforts against the passage of this bill.

TOBACCO BOARD OF TRADE OF
WINSTON-SALEM, N. C.
F. A. COLEMAN.
C. I. OGBURN.
R. C. NORFLUT.

Mr. OVERMAN presented resolutions adopted by the Tobacco Board of Trade of Wilson, N. C., which were ordered to lie on the table and be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At a meeting of the Wilson Tobacco Board of Trade the following resolutions were offered and adopted:

Whereas a bill has been introduced to increase the tax on manufactured tobacco, therefore we hereby offer our earnest protest against

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

this proposed increase, as it will demoralize business to the extent of injuring everyone connected with the trade—farmers, dealers, and manufacturers—and we hereby request that you use your best efforts against the passage of this bill.

Whereas a bill has been introduced, known as the "free-leaf bill," which has for its purpose giving the right to the farmers to stem, twist, or otherwise manipulate their tobacco and sell same free of tax, we beg to submit our earnest protest against the passage of same, for the following reasons:

First. That the farmers have every right under the present law to sell; and if they are permitted to twist or otherwise manipulate it, it will open opportunities for others to become interested in farms, and the whole object and aim of this bill will be done away with.

Second. It will cause tobacco to be raised in new communities and supply their vicinities, much to the injury of the present growers; and if developed to any extent, overproduction, with lower prices, will follow.

Third. It will take away the safeguard of the Internal Revenue Department and offer temptations for thieving that would be disastrous to everyone in the tobacco business—farmers, dealers, and manufacturers—and would absolutely do away with the safeguards that now exist.

WILSON TOBACCO BOARD OF TRADE,
W. J. BOYKIN, *President*,
H. P. WATSON, *Secretary*.

Mr. PERKINS presented a petition of the Department of California and Nevada, Grand Army of the Republic, and a petition of Whipple Post, No. 49, Grand Army of the Republic, of Eureka, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to extend the provisions of the general pension laws to the officers and privates of the First Battalion Mountaineers, California Volunteers, and to their widows and minor children, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. LODGE presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Greenfield, Mass., praying for a removal of the duty on hides, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. DEPEW presented memorials of members of the Klebold Press composing room chapel, of New York City; of members of the New York Journal electrotype chapel, of New York City; of the stereotypers and electrotypers employed by the Troy Record Company, of Troy; and of members of the New York Herald stereotypers' chapel, of New York City, all in the State of New York, remonstrating against the inclusion in the new tariff bill of any duty on news print paper and wood pulp, which were ordered to lie on the table.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. WARREN:

A bill (S. 2626) granting to the Montana, Wyoming and Southern Railway Company additional lands for terminal purposes on the Fort Keogh Military Reservation, Mont.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRANDEGEE:

A bill (S. 2627) granting an increase of pension to George F. Keeling; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PERKINS:

A bill (S. 2628) to provide for the naturalization of aliens who have served or shall hereafter serve five years in the United States Navy or Marine Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. PILES:

A bill (S. 2629) granting increase of pensions to survivors of the Indian wars under the acts of July 27, 1892, and June 27, 1902; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OWEN:

A bill (S. 2630) for the erection of a statue of Sequoyah, a Cherokee Indian, the inventor of the Cherokee alphabet; to the Committee on the Library.

A bill (S. 2631) to establish a fish hatchery at or near Tahlequah, Okla.; to the Committee on Fisheries.

A bill (S. 2632) for the relief of the Miami Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs; and

A bill (S. 2633) for the establishment of a probation system in the United States courts, except in the District of Columbia (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CHAPLAIN OF THE SENATE.

Mr. HALE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 58) which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Senate resolution 58.

Resolved, That until otherwise ordered Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D., shall act as the Chaplain of the Senate.

THE TARIFF.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed, and the first bill on the calendar will be proceeded with.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The pending amendment is that offered by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] on behalf of the Committee on Finance.

Mr. ALDRICH. I beg the Chair's pardon. I think the pending amendment is the one offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BROWN] to the amendment of the committee.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The motion of the Senator from Nebraska is practically a motion to strike out. The Chair thinks that the text should be perfected before the motion to strike out is considered.

Mr. BURKETT. Very possibly my colleague [Mr. BROWN] will want to continue his remarks this morning. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BROWN] is on his way here now. I think that course is very advisable.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Aldrich	Clay	Gamble	Page
Beveridge	Crane	Guggenheim	Paynter
Borah	Crawford	Hale	Penrose
Brandegee	Culberson	Heyburn	Perkins
Briggs	Cullom	Hughes	Piles
Bristow	Cummins	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Brown	Davis	Johnston, Ala.	Scott
Bulkeley	Depew	Jones	Simmons
Burkett	Dillingham	Kean	Smoot
Burnham	Dixon	Lodge	Sutherland
Burrows	Dolliver	McLaurin	Tillman
Burton	Fletcher	Martin	Warner
Carter	Flint	Nelson	Warren
Chamberlain	Foster	Nixon	Wetmore
Clapp	Frye	Oliver	
Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Overman	

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Sixty-two Senators have answered to the roll call. A quorum of the Senate is present.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I desire to say that I have about concluded my remarks at this time.

The evidence conclusively shows a combination and conspiracy on the part of the print-paper manufacturers to control the production, fix the price of print paper, and to maintain it at excessive and extortionate rates, all at the expense of the newspaper publishers of the country and to the injury of the general public. I present the following evidence to sustain this charge, compiled from the testimony before the House committee:

THE PAPER SITUATION IN 1907.

"In September, 1907, newspaper publishers had notice from the president of the American Paper and Pulp Association that consumption had overtaken production and that a real scarcity was likely in the year 1908 (p. 182). The International Paper Company had told paper consumers that it had oversold 18,000 tons on its production and to that extent must cancel contracts with regular customers for 1908 (p. 92), and that it could not sell them paper, notably the Philadelphia Inquirer (p. 393), even at 5 cents per pound. The Springfield (Mass.) Union was notified by the International Paper Company that the allotment for New England had been curtailed, and its supply of paper to that publication must be stopped (p. 74); that the International Paper Company had given out generally it would make no contract for more than one year (p. 114). It had refused to sell to the Farm and Fireside (p. 82) or to the Newark Evening News (p. 91).

The publisher of the New York Journal of Commerce has been told to act promptly or get left (p. 82).

The Philadelphia Inquirer has been allowed twenty days in which to accept an advance of $12 per ton on 13,000 tons, a total increase of $156,000 per annum, or go without any prospect of a supply.

The Philadelphia Inquirer, as well as many other newspapers, had been informed that other paper makers were not in position to make quotations.

Many newspapers had been notified that the paper mill which they had then contracted with could no longer supply them because the mills were oversold; other newspapers had been told by paper companies that they had no paper for sale; that they were buying paper elsewhere to meet their contracts; and that the market was bare.

The Paper Trade Journal had announced $3.10 on July 1, 1907, as the maximum price for news print paper. The paper-trade publications printed a report in September of a meeting of paper makers which advanced prices $3 per ton and fixed rates for that period at $2.60 for less than 1,000 tons and $2.85 for sheets.

Mr. K. B. Fullerton, of the Manufacturers' Paper Company, announced that he had sold 300 tons at 3 cents per pound, that the entire surplus stock of 60,000 tons of news had disappeared, that the American mills were unable to supply the demand, that they were obliged to look to Canadian mills for all that they

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

vogue, and we rely upon your sense of fairness and good judgment to protect American labor; for if the proposed reduction goes into effect, it will be a terrible blow to the wage-earner of the paper industry, and, at the same time, will not benefit a single individual in the United States, with the possible exception of a few opulent newspaper publishers.

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF PAPER MAKERS,
J. T. CAREY, *President.*
J. J. O'CONNOR, *Secretary.*

Mr. GALLINGER. The other letter referred to is as follows:

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD
PULP, SULPHITE, AND PAPER MILL WORKERS, LOCAL NO. 23,
Berlin, N. H., March 22, 1909.

Hon. JACOB H. GALLINGER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are led to believe that Congress, now in extra session, is preparing to pass a new tariff bill. Accordingly, we, the workers in the pulp and paper mills, feel that our means of gaining a livelihood will be greatly impaired, if not totally destroyed, if the duty on pulp and paper is removed or reduced. There is considerable difference in the wages paid the pulp and paper mill employees in Canada and this country, and with a low tariff, or no tariff at all, it would enable the Canadian manufacturers to manufacture paper some cheaper, if only the difference in labor were taken into consideration. Many of the pulp and paper mill employees would be ruined by such an act; they have built homes in the paper and pulp mill towns in this section, under the assumption that they would be allowed to enjoy many years of happiness and prosperity in their chosen towns.

We all feel very nervous over the present situation, and beg to advise you that our members and the employees in general in paper and pulp mills in this section join in petitioning you to use your utmost influence in preventing the removal or a reduction in the present duty on paper. Some people in some parts of the country may be benefited by such a move, but we, your constituents, will be greatly harmed.

We sincerely trust that you will use your best endeavors to prevent any such action by Congress.

We beg to remain,
Very truly, yours,
[SEAL.] LEWIS W. STEUART, *President,*
HERBERT W. SULLIVAN, *Secretary.*

Mr. President, only a moment longer.

Surely the protest of these laboring men, pleading for their families and their homes, deserves consideration and ought to be heeded in preference to the demands of opulent and selfish newspaper publishers.

Berlin is a city of 12,000 inhabitants, situated near the Canadian border, its chief industries being lumber and the manufacture of pulp and paper. Naturally they are alarmed, foreseeing, as they do, the inevitable destruction of their industries if hostile legislation is enacted; and in their behalf I appeal for justice in this matter. In 1880 Berlin had a population of less than 1,000, and the place has grown to its present proportions largely as a result of the development of the paper and pulp business, and other towns in southern New Hampshire have also had a phenomenal growth from the same cause.

Mr. President, I am gratified that the Committee on Finance, after patient investigation, have reported an amendment increasing the duties on print paper to $4 per ton, but at the same time it is a matter of sincere regret to me that they did not see their way clear to recommend the continuance of the existing rate. Six dollars per ton does not measure the difference between the cost of production in Canada and the United States, and the reduction to $4 will be a severe blow to an industry that deserves better treatment. The committee's proposed reduction of 33⅓ per cent from the rates of the Dingley law is a far greater reduction than is made in any other schedule of the bill, and I confess that I can find no adequate excuse for it. If this industry is to be sacrificed at the behest of a portion of the newspaper press of the country, we may well inquire into the motives of the agitation.

For my part, I can find neither justice nor reason in the demand, and profoundly regret that this schedule has not been accorded as considerate treatment as was given to the other schedules of the bill. The best I can do is to register a protest against it, knowing that it is hopeless to attempt to secure a higher rate against the conclusions of the Finance Committee and the pronounced hostility of the House of Representatives. Events will justify the views I have expressed, for when Canada gets possession of the business and has imposed an export tax on the product, even the newspapers that have created such a clamor will be rewarded by increased prices of news print paper. There will be no escape from that, just as there seems to be no escape to-day from legislation that will inevitably work serious harm both to those who have invested their money in the enterprise and the many thousands of men who are employed in the industry. It is a blow to American capital and American labor that ought not to be inflicted by the American Congress. But as the proposed amendment of the Finance Committee is so much better than the provisions of the bill as it came from the House, I trust that it may be agreed to, notwithstanding it is my impression that it will not properly protect the great industry for which I plead, and I fear that it will stand as a monumental error on the part of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. MONEY. Mr. President, I wish to correct an error of my own making. Some days ago, by permission of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], I was allowed to lay before the Senate a table of comparative wages in this country and three or four countries abroad. Day before yesterday I received a letter from a very intelligent gentleman in this city, who informed me that I had made a very great mistake. Under the head of "Engineering" in this table, which is to be found in the RECORD of the 15th instant, fitters, turners, and smiths received $25.39 per week wages. I find that my correspondent was correct. Instead of $25 it should have been $15. I had the matter examined into and discovered that the original manuscript was $15.39, and the error was caused by the typewriter, who inserted "2" instead of "1." I desire that this table shall stand corrected—$15.39. I will send it up to the Clerk, that he may make the necessary correction.

I wish also to express my obligation to my correspondent for calling my attention to an unintentional mistake, and I desire to correct it.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] to the fact that in quoting the change of prices of agricultural products he took approximately the lowest price at which corn had been and compared it with the highest price.

Mr. GALLINGER. I so stated.

Mr. OWEN. I suggest that the comparative prices of agricultural products are shown by Table 194 of the Statistical Abstract of the United States for 1907, which shows that corn No. 2 in 1884 was 60 cents, in 1907 it was 64 cents; that wheat No. 2 was 97 cents in 1884 and 96 cents in 1907; that in 1891 wheat was $1.09 and in 1907 it was 96 cents; that in 1891 corn was 70 cents a bushel and in 1907, 64 cents a bushel.

I wish to call attention to the table, because it ought to be clearly understood that agricultural products in this country, where the agricultural area is limited and the population has been rapidly growing, ought to advance by virtue of the growing demand from our own number of people, who are consumers of agricultural products, and that, notwithstanding this fact, taking the averages in a reasonable way, there has been no great increase in agricultural products.

The reverse ought to be true with regard to manufactured products. While population increases, it can not increase in the same ratio as the output of manufactured products, due to wonderfully improved machinery and to the greatly increased use of water power and all other forms of power which are made available for turning out manufactured products. I simply wanted to call attention to that, so that it might not be lost sight of in the consideration of this matter.

Yesterday I called attention to the fact that no man had ever been held to account for perjury before any of these committees, and yet this debate has been full of contradictory statements. Each one takes a part of the testimony and proves what he likes, and while always there must be, and should be, an abundant latitude allowed for the inaccuracy of observation and inaccuracy of conclusion on the part of witnesses testifying, there is a point at which the inaccuracy of the human mind ceases and willful and deliberate perjury begins. It seems to me there ought to be some review of the testimony given, and where it is found that men have falsely sworn for the purpose of pecuniary profit from the shaping of the tariff law, they ought to be held to a strict criminal account. It is a crime to swear falsely for the purpose of influencing the legislation of Congress, and there ought to be some limitation to the effrontery with which that is done.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. OWEN. I do.

Mr. HEYBURN. I should like to inquire of the Senator if he desires us to understand that in all controversies where there is conflicting testimony in regard to the facts, it is proper and necessary that criminal suits should be commenced at the end of the trial? Has it been the Senator's practice in the trial of cases to prosecute the witnesses on the losing side who have testified to facts that were not sustained?

Mr. OWEN. The Senator has no ground so to interpret my remarks, because I have stated that, granting every privilege that could be reasonably accorded to the inaccuracy of observation and of the conclusion of witnesses, there was a limit where the inaccuracy of the human mind ceased and the deliberate crime began.

Mr. HEYBURN. I think it is always safest to leave the question of determining which side is right until after the final judgment has been entered in a case, and in this case the final judgment has not been entered.

Mr. OWEN. It will suffice my purpose to call attention to the fact that no man has ever been held to account for a false statement made before these committees.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Mr. GALLINGER. I should like to ask the Senator, as a lawyer—I ask him from the standpoint of a layman—inasmuch as the men who made these two conflicting affidavits are subjects of the Dominion of Canada, does he think we ought to pursue them into Canada and prosecute them for perjury?

Mr. HEYBURN. Or extradite them.

Mr. GALLINGER. Or should we ask for their extradition?

Mr. OWEN. I shall be content if the committees of Congress should hold to account those whom they are satisfied are guilty of deliberate crime in submitting testimony to the committees.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Will the Senator from New Hampshire permit me to ask my friend from Oklahoma a question?

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Does the making of a false affidavit constitute the crime of perjury?

Mr. OWEN. I am inclined to think it does constitute the crime of perjury under the statutes of the United States.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I ask as a legal proposition.

Mr. OWEN. I am answering as a legal proposition.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. It is novel to me. Of course, as a legal proposition, false affidavits do not constitute perjury. I think they ought to, myself; but, as a matter of fact, they do not.

Mr. OWEN. That is a matter of opinion, and in that I differ with the Senator from Indiana. I call his attention to the statutes of the United States with regard to perjury.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I shall be glad if the Senator is right about it.

Mr. OWEN. If the Senator will allow me, I will answer. Section 5392 states, in describing what perjury is, that—

> Every person who, having taken an oath before a competent tribunal, officer, or person, in any case in which a law of the United States authorizes an oath to be administered—

Then falsely swears to a material fact. An oath is authorized to be administered by section 101 of the Revised Statutes, which is in the following language:

> SEC. 101. The President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, or a Chairman of a Committee of the Whole, or of any committee of either House of Congress, is empowered to administer oaths to witnesses in any case under their examination.

In my opinion, therefore——

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Will the Senator permit me? I do not know that it is very material, but was this affidavit made before the chairman of the House committee, or was it made before a notary public?

Mr. OWEN. I am not referring to any particular affidavit. I am referring to 3,500 pages of evidence, a large part of which is declared to be unworthy of trust in this debate.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Then, I misapprehended what was in the mind of the Senator. I thought he referred to a false affidavit as being a crime of perjury, and I thought the Senator, as a lawyer, would not want to let that go.

SENATOR FROM ILLINOIS.

Mr. CULLOM presented the credentials of WILLIAM LORIMER, chosen by the legislature of the State of Illinois a Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1909, which were read and ordered to be filed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator-elect will present himself at the desk and take the oath of office.

Mr. LORIMER was escorted to the Vice-President's desk by Mr. CULLOM, and the oath prescribed by law having been administered to him, he took his seat in the Senate.

THE TARIFF.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the question will be first put on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. ALDRICH. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there a second to the request?

Mr. BROWN. Wait a moment.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. What is the question?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays have been called for. Is the demand seconded?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator from Nebraska was addressing the Chair at that time, and I merely wanted to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I was busy here at my desk and I did not understand what the question was on which the yeas and nays were demanded.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair is disposing of the question whether the yeas and nays are to be ordered.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I desire to know before the yeas and nays are ordered.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN. I want to be heard a moment on that.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there a second to the demand for the yeas and nays?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska will proceed.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senate for just a moment to the situation of this amendment and some of the arguments that have been made this morning.

I undertook, as best I could, to present to the consideration of the Senate three propositions. The first was the report of the select committee, which was made after an investigation of ten months by Members of the House of Representatives, charged with the duty of obtaining the truth about the conditions of this industry. I went beyond that to inquire upon what testimony that report was based, and undertook to present it to the Senate. I call the attention of the Senate this morning to the fact that not only have we the report of that select committee and the evidence upon which they acted before the Senate, but we have also the report of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House, consisting of entirely different Members of that body, who reached the same conclusion with regard to the facts as did the other committee.

So we have the testimony of this array of officers, charged with ascertaining the truth, presented to this body.

We are confronted this morning with what? With the testimony of a single witness before either one of those committees? No; not one. The only testimony presented was that of affidavits which our friend from New Hampshire said he filed with the Committee on Finance of the Senate, and when I asked him who the names of the men were who made the affidavits he declined to answer and referred me for information to the Finance Committee.

Mr. President, I want the Senate to understand when it votes upon this proposition it is voting, so far as we are concerned, upon information received from our committee in dead darkness. Not a word has come from one member of that committee as to a single fact or the name of a single witness who testified before it by affidavit or otherwise.

Now, Mr. President, I have just this suggestion to make: We have the choice of discarding the work of all the men charged with ascertaining the truth and reporting it, and discarding it upon the plea alone of Senators who claim that the industry is local and who assert their belief, unsupported by the testimony of a single witness, that it will be destroyed if we pass this law.

I want to say to the Senate, I want to say to the Finance Committee, that notwithstanding the fact we have shown by the reports and by the testimony that no duty at all is required, I am here to get results, if I can, upon this proposition approximately as near right as possible, and therefore, Mr. President, I am going to withdraw my motion to amend by putting print paper on the free list and ask the Senate to stand by the report and the bill of the House, that was based upon the testimony of sworn witnesses before that body.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays have been ordered. It will require unanimous consent. Is there objection to the Senator from Nebraska withdrawing his motion?

Mr. ALDRICH. What was the request?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. That the Senator from Nebraska withdraw his motion.

Mr. ALDRICH. I object to its withdrawal.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Objection is made.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, that is precisely the reason why, as soon as I heard the yeas and nays called for, I rose and insisted upon the matter being put before the yeas and nays were ordered. I was not certain when I rose what the question was, because my attention had been occupied at this desk. I had known that the Senator from Nebraska had intended to exercise his right to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. ALDRICH. He has no such right.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. He certainly had a right before the yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ALDRICH. Not at all, except by the unanimous consent of the Senate.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Very well; it does not make any difference. In any event, the Senator from Nebraska should have been heard before the yeas and nays were ordered.

It is of no avail at this particular moment to call attention to that. I do not think the rules have been in the least violated; but I do suggest this thought as growing out of this incident: That in the future it is necessary to careful legislation that when the yeas and nays are called for and a Senator rises before they have been ordered, it is not the right of the Senator calling

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

for them to demand a show of hands, because that very Senator himself may want to either make remarks or withdraw the motion or indulge in some other parliamentary device necessary to the interests of the legislation that he is pressing.

But if that can be done, if in a case as was cited by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] the other day, the yeas and nays having been ordered and a Senator rising in his place and not being heard by the Chair, and the clerk promptly beginning the roll call and the first name promptly answering it, not only is the debate cut off, which is not very important, but every possible parliamentary right which a Senator might have had if the Chair had heard him would also have been lost.

I do not suggest that in any way the rules have been violated, but I do suggest that in matters of legislation so grave as nearly every feature of this bill is the largest toleration should be exercised toward Senators who are on their feet concerning a motion or an amendment which they are presenting.

Before I had addressed the Chair the Senator from Nebraska was on his feet, and for that purpose. Of course it is perfectly clear what the Senator from Rhode Island has in mind by objecting to a withdrawal of the amendment. He is exercising the perfectly permissible strategy that is at his disposal under the rules. He is not at all to blame for that.

The Senator from Nebraska feels that testimony has been presented to the Senate, formally taken by committees, printed by the House, which has not been answered and which justifies his original motion. But he said what he wanted was results; and perhaps that motion could not get as many votes as would a motion for the proposition to stand by the House rate upon paper, which is $2, the Senate rate making it 100 per cent more. But after that vote is taken, I hope the Senator from Rhode Island does not think that because Senators may see fit to vote against the proposition to put paper on the free list, therefore, by that vote, he will be able to show them that they are committed to vote against the House rate, because they are two different propositions. I think it permissible to point that out at this juncture.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I unfortunately was called from the Chamber at the time the yeas and nays were called for. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. Do I understand the Chair correctly in ruling that the yeas and nays having been ordered, the Senator from Nebraska was cut off from a right to make a motion?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. No question of order was raised. Certainly the Chair would not hold anything of that kind.

Mr. BACON. I am asking for information.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. No question of order has been raised. The Chair has made no decision.

Mr. BACON. I understood the Chair to say—I may be mistaken in my understanding—that the yeas and nays having been ordered, the Senator from Nebraska could not withdraw his motion or his amendment without unanimous consent.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That is correct.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair did rule that.

Mr. BACON. That is what I thought, and that is the point to which I direct my inquiry. I simply desire to suggest that whatever right the Senator had prior to the order of the yeas and nays was not, in the absence of the beginning of the roll call, lost by the fact that the yeas and nays were ordered. I do not know of any parliamentary law which changes the situation by reason of the fact that the yeas and nays have been ordered, because if that were the case, debate would have been cut off and the last speech made by the Senator from Nebraska could not have been heard. It is true that after the first name is called all right to any action is debarred by our rules, but the simple fact that the yeas and nays have been ordered, I respectfully submit, does not cut off the right to debate or the right to make any motion.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Certainly not.

Mr. BACON. I am not discussing the question whether a Senator has a right to withdraw an amendment at any time unless there is unanimous consent. I am not addressing my remarks to that question at all.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. May the Chair inquire of the Senator from Georgia if he contends that the Senator from Nebraska could have withdrawn his amendment except by unanimous consent?

Mr. BACON. I am not addressing myself to that contention. I am simply contending that whatever right he had was a right which was not lost by the fact that the yeas and nays had been ordered, at a time when the roll call had not been begun. That is the only point.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Evidently the Senator from Georgia and the Chair do not differ.

Mr. BACON. I misunderstood the Chair when I understood him to say that the yeas and nays having been ordered, for that reason the Senator from Nebraska could not withdraw his amendment without unanimous consent. I may have misunderstood the Chair in that particular.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair used those words. The Chair said that the Senator from Nebraska could not withdraw his amendment except by the consent of the Senate.

Mr. BACON. Not on the ground that the yeas and nays had been ordered.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It was not necessary to have stated that ground.

Mr. BACON. That was the statement made by the Chair to which I directed the inquiry. Of course, if I misunderstood the Chair, I will not pursue it further.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I simply desire to detain the Senate long enough to emphasize that even a Republican will admit the tariff is a tax when he wants to take it off. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BROWN] has based his whole advocacy of this amendment transferring print paper to the free list upon the ground that he would thus reduce the price of paper to the publishers of newspapers throughout the country. I thoroughly subscribe to that opinion, and I only ask him then to agree with me that the same effect would occur with every other reduction of the tariff. While I agree with him that we can reduce the price of printing paper by removing or reducing the tariff, I want him to agree with me that we could also reduce the price of cotton or woolen clothes by removing or reducing the tariff.

Mr. President, I have been many times impressed by the inconsistencies of Senators on the other side and occasionally I have been impressed with the inconsistency of a Senator on this side. When a Republican Senator is defending the general tariff policy of his party he affirms that the tariff is no tax, or if it is a tax at all it is a tax which the foreigner pays for the privilege of selling his goods in the United States. If that is true, I have no objection myself to the Canadian manufacturer of paper paying this tax. But the Senator from Nebraska says that is not true, that the American publishers will pay the tax, and it is for their relief that he seeks to remove the duty.

I want to reenforce the argument of the Senator from Nebraska by reading the testimony of a Republican manager and part owner of a newspaper printed in the State of Massachusetts. This testimony was delivered before the committee of the House which had been appointed and charged with the duty of investigating this question. The publisher, or rather, he says, he was the business manager, and in connection with one other gentleman owned a controlling interest in the paper, was summing up the cost of his paper and he found it to be $2.30. Here is the way he made up the items—$1.80 at the mill, 20 cents for freight, and 30 cents for tariff. Mr. SIMS, a member of the committee and a Democratic Member of the House, inquired:

Mr. SIMS. What is the amount you are paying for it at Springfield?

Mr. PLUMMER. Two dollars and thirty cents. That would be 20 cents for freight and 30 cents a hundred for duty.

Mr. SIMS. That is the full duty, is it?

Mr. PLUMMER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is your paper a Republican paper?

Mr. PLUMMER. It is Republican.

The CHAIRMAN. Does it believe in the protective system?

Mr. PLUMMER. It believes in protection where it is necessary, but I think that if the experience of other people who deal in protected goods is the same as it is in this case, that I do not believe in it, because it is evident from our experience that the International Paper Company are taking advantage of the situation, and that they are lining up the thing so that they are getting all there is in it.

In other words, Mr. President, it makes a great difference whose ox is gored. Plummer's ox was gored in that case, and Plummer did not believe in protection. The people's ox is gored all the time by these excessive tariff rates; and yet, while these Republicans are trying to take the duty off of print paper, they vote to leave it on the clothing of the American people.

Do you doubt that the woolen manufacturer adds the duty to his clothes the same as the printing-paper manufacturer adds it to his paper? The only Republican who has delivered a speech that can be defended from a Republican standpoint, and yet admit this doctrine that the tariff does increase the price, is the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE]——

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President——

Mr. BAILEY. Let me finish the sentence. The Senator from Wisconsin admits that the tariff increases the price, and admits that he is willing to increase the price to the American consumer in order to insure protection for the American laborer. That is the admission of his speech, and upon that I can understand how a man can be a Republican. I can understand that a man can obtain his consent to tax everybody else to pay a higher wage to the American laborer; but I can not understand how a Republican in one breath can deny that the tariff increases the cost of the domestic article, and then in the next

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

mentary motion provided in the rule. I do not think it is a good practice. It never has been done under our unanimous-consent agreements, and I think every Senator should at least have reserved to him the right under the rule to make any regular parliamentary motion.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair understands the Senator objects to the request of the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. LODGE. I do.

Mr. ALDRICH. I think the Senator from Texas will agree with me. There will be no trouble here. We have been here together a long time. We on this side are not trying to get an agreement that will be different from what is expressed here. We will go on in the regular way. There is no trouble whatever about it. I have no intention at present to make a motion to refer; but I do not think it is desirable that we should be cut off from making proper motions with respect to the disposition of this subject.

Mr. BAILEY. Complying with the suggestion of the Senator from Massachusetts, who repeated the suggestion of the Senator from Rhode Island, that that kind of unanimous consent was unprecedented, or at least unusual, in the Senate, I agreed to waive that and to take the Senator's word that he would not make a motion to refer. But I do not deem it half so important now as it has been heretofore. Heretofore the plan of campaign mapped out by the Senator from Rhode Island was to move to refer this amendment to the Judiciary Committee, and that plan of campaign was based on the belief that they could cast more votes for a motion to refer than they could for a motion to defeat. That was the whole purpose. I was not altogether a novice at matters here, and I knew what the Senator intended to do and why he intended to do it, just as well as he did. Consequently I iterated and reiterated, with some degree of persistence, that that was what he intended to do, with the direct and specific object of preventing him from doing it. At least we have brought everybody in the United States Senate and everybody in the country to understand that a vote to refer is a vote to defeat, and he can now poll about as many votes against the amendment as he can on the motion to refer it.

The Senator from Rhode Island found that out, and so did the President of the United States find it out, and straightway, although the President, as has been recited here to-day, had declared that an amendment to the Constitution was unnecessary, and had made that declaration the basis of a criticism against the Democratic party, he now goes to the declaration of the Democratic platform; and I think if we could have a week or ten days longer, and we were blessed with the kind of progress that the last ten days has brought, the country would witness the unlooked-for spectacle of the Senator from Rhode Island even consenting to an income-tax amendment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. May the Chair interrupt to suggest that it is very near 7 o'clock?

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that the unanimous consent be granted.

Mr. BAILEY. The matter is now before the Senate. Let it go over, and it will be the pending question in the morning.

Mr. ALDRICH. It will not go over as the pending question.

Mr. BAILEY. Oh, yes.

Mr. LODGE. It will have no privilege in the morning.

Mr. ALDRICH. It will have no privilege to-morrow.

Mr. BAILEY. It will not?

Mr. ALDRICH. No.

Mr. BAILEY. When an amendment is pending——

Mr. ALDRICH. Oh, no.

Mr. BAILEY. Then I will ask unanimous consent to withdraw it, and I will offer it again when I can.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to that request?

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator does not need to withdraw it. It falls at 7 o'clock.

Mr. BAILEY. Will it not be pending to-morrow?

Mr. ALDRICH. No.

Mr. BAILEY. I will ask the Chair for a construction of the parliamentary rule. If we adjourn without any action on it, does the amendment lapse or will it be pending when we again meet?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The impression of the Chair is that the amendment would lapse.

Mr. BAILEY. The amendment would lapse? We ought to have a little more time——

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator allow me to ask unanimous consent that this amendment be taken up immediately after the disposition of the schedules and continued from day to day until disposed of? I ask unanimous consent for that.

Mr. BAILEY. The Chair wishes to say something.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair wants to correct a misapprehension. The Chair was under a misapprehension. The Chair understands now, from what the clerk tells him, that—the present occupant of the chair was not here when the original agreement was made—the amendment now having been brought up, it is regularly before the Senate. The Chair thinks——

Mr. ALDRICH. But it would have no privilege to-morrow unless——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It would be the pending proposition. That is the impression of the Chair.

Mr. HEYBURN. I do not understand the amendment has been brought up in that sense.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask the Chair to put the request for unanimous consent.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. What was the request of the Senator—that it go over until to-morrow?

Mr. ALDRICH. That the pending amendment be taken up immediately after the disposition of the schedules and be continued from day to day until disposed of.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to that request?

Mr. HEYBURN. I should like to understand the term "disposed of." The term "disposed of" does not imply a vote.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Certainly.

Mr. HEYBURN. Not upon the amendment.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That means subject to any rule of the Senate.

Mr. HEYBURN. I want that to appear in the RECORD.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I dislike to take myself off the floor, but I make the point of order that the hour of daily adjournment has arrived.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The point of order is well taken. The hour of 7 o'clock having arrived, the Senate stands adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, June 19, 1909, at 10 o'clock a. m.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, *June 19, 1909.*

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

FINDINGS OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate communications from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting certified copies of the findings of fact filed by the court in the following causes:

In the cause of Jacob M. Davis and sundry other claimants of the League Island Navy-Yard *v.* United States (S. Doc. No. 107);

In the cause of Otto Seiler, administrator of the estate of Carl Weiland, deceased, *v.* United States (S. Doc. No. 106); and

In the cause of Hans Anderson and sundry other claimants of the Brooklyn Navy-Yard *v.* United States (S. Doc. No. 108).

The foregoing findings were, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

ALASKA-YUKON-PACIFIC EXPOSITION.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a telegram in the nature of an invitation to the Members of the Senate, which will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

EXPOSITION GROUNDS,
Seattle, Wash., June 18, 1909.

Hon. JAMES S. SHERMAN,
Vice-President, Washington, D. C.:

Yourself and Members of the United States Senate are cordially invited to attend Alaska-Yukon-Pacific Exposition, now being held at Seattle, to continue until October 16. Journey to this section, we believe, would be instructive and pleasant to the Members of Congress.

J. E. CHILBERG, *President.*

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The telegram will be referred to the Select Committee on Industrial Expositions.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of the National Federation of Remedial Loan Associations, praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the money-loaning business in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. DEPEW presented memorials of sundry citizens of Chateaugay, Beaver Falls, New York, Potsdam, and Watertown, all in the State of New York, remonstrating against any reduction from the Dingley rates on news print paper and wood pulp, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PILES presented a petition of the Pacific Coast Lumber Manufacturers' Association, praying that an appropriation be made to enable the Interstate Commerce Commission to make valuation of the railroad property in the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 2634) granting an increase of pension to George W. Goshen (with the accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BACON:

A bill (S. 2635) for the relief of Martin Ball; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GALLINGER:

A bill (S. 2636) to provide for participation by the United States in certain industrial expositions of products and manufactures of the United States exclusively, to be held in the principal cities of South America; to the Select Committee on Industrial Expositions.

By Mr. MONEY:

A bill (S. 2637) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of Mattie H. Jarnagin (with the accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OWEN:

A bill (S. 2638) for the relief of the Saginaw Swan Creek and Black River band of Chippewa Indians in the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Claims.

IRON AND STEEL PRODUCTS.

On motion of Mr. PENROSE, it was

Ordered, That the paper entitled "Percentages of Increase and Decrease of Rates of Schedule C of H. R. 1438, Iron and Steel Products," be printed as a document (S. Doc. No. 109).

DUTY ON OIL.

On motion of Mr. OWEN, it was

Ordered, That a memorial on behalf of the independent oil producers and independent oil refiners, praying for a tariff on oil, be printed as a document, including the map (S. Doc. No. 88, pt. 2).

THE WOOLEN INDUSTRY.

On motion of Mr. WARREN, it was

Ordered, That 3,000 copies of Senate Document No. 70, Sixty-first Congress, first session, on the wool trade of the United States, be printed.

COMMITTEE SERVICE.

Mr. ALDRICH submitted the following resolution, which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LORIMER] be appointed to fill the vacancy in each of the following committees:
On Expenditures in the Navy Department (chairmanship);
On Manufactures;
On Pacific Islands and Porto Rico; and
On Private Land Claims.

THE TARIFF.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed, and the first bill on the calendar will be proceeded with.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes.

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

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Aldrich	Clapp	Gamble	Penrose
Bacon	Clark, Wyo.	Gore	Perkins
Bailey	Culberson	Guggenheim	Piles
Bankhead	Cullom	Hale	Rayner
Beveridge	Cummins	Heyburn	Root
Borah	Curtis	Hughes	Scott
Brandegee	Daniel	Johnson, N. Dak.	Simmons
Briggs	Davis	Johnston, Ala.	Smith, Md.
Bristow	Depew	Jones	Smith, S. C.
Brown	Dick	Kean	Smoot
Bulkeley	Dillingham	Lodge	Stone
Burkett	Dolliver	McLaurin	Sutherland
Burnham	Fletcher	Martin	Tillman
Burrows	Flint	Nelson	Warner
Burton	Foster	Oliver	Warren
Carter	Frye	Overman	Wetmore
Chamberlain	Gallinger	Page	

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Sixty-seven Senators have answered to the roll call. A quorum of the Senate is present.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, the matter which was before the Senate last night at the adjournment was with reference to the income-tax amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY]. It is my purpose to ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of that amendment immediately after the disposition of the schedules and the free list, whether any agreement is reached or not, and to continue its consideration before the Senate from day to day until it is disposed of. I would suggest with that understanding that the matter may go over.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, after conferring with a number of Senators who feel that it is inconvenient and undesirable for this matter to be postponed at one time until another time and then until a further time, there being uncertainty as to whether it would then be taken up or postponed again, and it also being the opinion of the Republican Senators who favor an income tax that the proper place to dispose of it is after the schedules have been completed, I am myself disposed to assent to any arrangement that will make it clear and definite.

I do not concur in the opinion that the proper place to dispose of this question is after all the other schedules have been disposed of, and I concur less now that the President of the United States and the chairman of the Committee on Finance recognize that it is necessary to supplement the revenues of this bill by some internal-revenue taxation.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. BAILEY. I do.

Mr. ALDRICH. I am not authorized to speak for the President of the United States, but so far as the chairman of the Committee on Finance is concerned, the Senator is inaccurate in that statement.

Mr. BAILEY. Well, Mr. President, I will be glad to have it appear in the RECORD that the Senator denies the necessity of raising additional revenue and yet intends to report and support a proposition to do it.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President——

Mr. BAILEY. I leave that for the Senator to settle with himself and his constituents.

Mr. ALDRICH. I think I will be able to make a statement upon that subject that will be satisfactory to the Senate. I certainly can make one that will be satisfactory to myself.

Mr. BAILEY. I have no doubt the Senator from Rhode Island will be able to make some kind of defense for this advance that will at least pass, even if it is not accepted by his friends on that side. But all the time until within the last week the whole objection to this income-tax amendment has been, I mean so far as announced on the floor and as it appears in the RECORD, that it was unnecessary taxation, and therefore unwise taxation. I perfectly understand that that is not the whole objection to it which Senators feel, and which Senators, whenever required to do so, would proclaim, but so far as the RECORD appears, that has been the sole argument against it.

If it be true that the bill under consideration will raise through its tariff schedules ample revenues to support the Government, then, obviously, no further money ought to be collected from the people, and, as obviously, if we are going to raise this $80,000,000 on the incomes of the country, we ought to reduce the collections by $80,000,000 on the consumption of the country. Holding to that view, I still contend that the first thing that ought to have been done in the consideration of this bill was to decide this income-tax amendment, so that if we did determine to raise a given amount of money in that way, we would raise that much less money in the other way.

But the two votes of the Senate have made it manifest that a majority, including some sincere friends of the income-tax amendment, desire it to go over. I believe I state the views of the Republican Senators who are cooperating in this; they have voted rather under protest heretofore; and in order to relieve them of that embarrassment, or, rather, to relieve them of the necessity of voting to take it up at once, when they think it would be and could be more properly disposed of at last, I am willing to agree to the arrangement of the Senator from Rhode Island, with the assurance, and that is all I ask—I do not ask even that it shall be made under the unanimous-consent agreement—with the assurance that there shall be no motion made to refer this subject to the committee or to any committee.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. If the Chair understands the request of the Senator——

Mr. HEYBURN. Does the Senator from Texas yield the floor?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield it for the present.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I do not desire to be contentious in this matter. I have pretty well defined views in regard to what I shall feel compelled to do in regard to these proposed measures. No one is or will be authorized to promise for me that I will not object or that I will not make a motion to refer this to a committee.

Mr. ALDRICH. There is no agreement suggested in regard to that.

Mr. HEYBURN. I will not comment upon anything the Senator from Rhode Island has said. I merely desire that no

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

railroad to equip their locomotives with safe and suitable boilers and appurtenances thereto—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. YOUNG of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 10890) to regulate the issue of injunctions from the federal courts—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STANLEY: A bill (H. R. 10891) to prevent the use of coupons and other devices—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AUSTIN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 57) providing for a joint commission to visit Porto Rico—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of Colorado: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 58) to restore the status of the Third Colorado Volunteer Cavalry who served during the civil war—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARDY: Resolution (H. Res. 79) relating to the use by any committee of the House of Representatives of any information affecting the financial interests of the country which can not be given to the people at large—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CARY: Memorial of the legislature of Wisconsin, respecting national aid for the construction of main highways—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the legislature of Wisconsin, asking Congress to remove the tariff on lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 10892) donating 100,000 acres of land to Cumberland College, Cumberland, Chaves County, N. Mex.—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. BOEHNE: A bill (H. R. 10893) granting an increase of pension to Reuben Miles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10894) granting an increase of pension to Henry Ripkey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BYRNS: A bill (H. R. 10895) granting a pension to G. B. Ward—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10896) for the relief of the estate of David F. Kennel—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 10897) granting an increase of pension to John P. Jefferries—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10898) granting an increase of pension to George Radell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER: A bill (H. R. 10899) granting an increase of pension to John A. Kellar—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10900) granting an increase of pension to Henry W. Snyder—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: A bill (H. R. 10901) granting a pension to D. W. Snider—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DODDS: A bill (H. R. 10902) granting a pension to John Halpine—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRANT: A bill (H. R. 10903) granting a pension to Feemster Penland—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HULL of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 10904) granting an increase of pension to Henry Jordon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULL of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 10905) granting a pension to Charles Roddy—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10906) granting a pension to Mary Jane Jackson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10907) for the relief of Joseph McAndrew—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10908) for the relief of the estate of Nathaniel Murray—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: A bill (H. R. 10909) granting an increase of pension to Hugh M. Cory—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10910) granting an increase of pension to Wyman F. Patten—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10911) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Nichols—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10912) granting an increase of pension to Henry T. Turner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10913) granting an increase of pension to William P. Gilleland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10914) granting a pension to Julia E. Sterns—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KELIHER: A bill (H. R. 10915) granting a pension to Annie McLeod—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McHENRY: A bill (H. R. 10916) granting a pension to Jane McNalley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 10917) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Allen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 10918) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Edward H. Bergmann—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 10919) granting a pension to Thomas J. Parker—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NICHOLLS: A bill (H. R. 10920) granting an increase of pension to Harrison N. Mott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10921) granting an increase of pension to Marlow F. Brandamore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 10922) granting an increase of pension to Harmon Varner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBERTS: A bill (H. R. 10923) granting an increase of pension to Almon N. Keeney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10924) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Goss—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10925) granting a pension to Margaret Halpin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 10926) for the relief of Zachariah Thomas—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10927) granting an increase of pension to Abner J. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 10928) for the relief of Mrs. M. L. H. Williams—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: A bill (H. R. 10929) granting a pension to Herbert P. De Lano—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 10930) granting a pension to Charles D. French—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WOODS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 10931) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Cole—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10932) granting an increase of pension to A. C. Fairman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Petition of permanent committee on temperance of the general synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of the United States, relative to the acts and duties of Congress in preventing the sale of intoxicants—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. CREAGER: Petition of the governor and 22 other state officials of Oklahoma, requesting legislation placing under jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission control of rates and charges of transportation by steamers engaged in coastwise trade—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FOCHT: Petition of Lewisburg (Pa.) Council, No. 926, Junior Order United American Mechanics, for legislation preventing immigration of all Asiatics save merchants, students, and travelers—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAMMOND: Petition of O. A. Call and 5 others, of Odin, and C. W. Dammann & Co. and 6 others, of Ormsby, all in the State of Minnesota, against a parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Petition of Spangler Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Bellaire, Ohio, against portrait of Jefferson Davis being placed on silver service of the battle ship *Mississippi*—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of Colorado: Petition of business men of Salida, Colo., against parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Petition of Independent Italian Political Club, to make October 12 a holiday, to be known as "Columbus Day"—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Mary L. H. Williams—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of the bar of Goldsboro, N. C., asking for establishment of a United States court in said city—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *June 22, 1909.*

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. JONES presented a petition of the Pacific Coast Lumber Manufacturers' Association, of Washington, praying that an appropriation be made to enable the Interstate Commerce Commission to pass upon the reasonableness of rates charged by various railroad companies for the transportation of freight, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. ROOT presented a petition of sundry citizens of Jamestown, N. Y., praying for the repeal of the duty on hides and sole leather, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Manhattan Council, No. 15, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of New York City, N. Y., praying for the adoption of the so-called "Overman amendment" to the present tariff bill increasing the capitation tax on immigrants from $4 to $10, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. OWEN. I present resolutions adopted at a meeting of the Oklahoma Traffic Association, held at Guthrie, Okla., which I ask may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GUTHRIE, OKLA., *June 12, 1909.*

Senator ROBERT L. OWEN,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: At a recent meeting of the Oklahoma Traffic Association the following resolutions were adopted, to wit:

Whereas under the laws of the United States only steamships of American registry are permitted to handle freight and passengers between two ports in the United States, thereby preventing the freest competition between water carriers; and

Whereas this restricted competition has made it possible for the rail carriers, through the ownership of some steamship lines and through threats of refusal to participate with other independent water lines in the bulk of the through traffic, to absolutely control the freight rates of the water carriers operating between Atlantic and Gulf ports to such extent as to frequently increase the freight rates of such water carriers far beyond a profitable basis for the service involved, to the detriment and often to the distress of the citizens of the southwestern portion of the United States; and

Whereas the United States Government not only establishes and improves but actually maintains the ports of entry of such water carriers, dredging channels, constructing and maintaining buoys, light-houses, and so forth, at the expense of the taxpayers, with the idea of cheapening transportation charges for the benefit of all the people; and

Whereas the control of water rates between the various United States ports has not been specifically placed under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission, in the belief that competition on the high seas between numerous water carriers would serve to sufficiently reduce such transportation charges; and

Whereas the very reverse of this condition has resulted, and rates are steadily being increased by the coastwise water carriers: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That we urgently request the Congress of the United States to pass an act at the earliest possible moment remedying the conditions above recited by placing under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission the control of rates and charges for the transportation of freight and passengers by all steamers engaged in the United States coastwise trade, and that we call upon all other interests in the Southwest, as well as any other sections of the United States where similar conditions exist, to aid us in securing this legislation.

As members of the state administration of the State of Oklahoma, we, the undersigned, wish to add our request to the above resolutions, that you use all proper efforts in an endeavor to see that the sense of said resolutions be made into law.

Respectfully,

C. H. Haskell, governor; Bill Cross, secretary of state; M. E. Trapp, state auditor; Charles West, attorney-general; J. A. Menefee, treasurer; Charles A. Taylor; state examiner and inspector; J. E. Love, chairman corporation commission; A. P. Watson, corporation commission; J. J. McAlister, corporation commission; E. D. Connant, superintendent public instruction; M. J. Kane, chief justice; J. J. Dunn, associate justice; R. L. Williams, associate justice; John B. Turner, associate justice; S. W. Hayes, associate justice; Henry M. Funvan, presiding judge circuit court of appeals; Thomas H. Doyle, judge circuit court of appeals; Henry G. Baker, judge circuit court of appeals; W. H. L. Campbell, clerk supreme court; Kate Barnard, committee charities and corrections; W. G. Ashton, assistant commissioner of labor; F. J. McComb, insurance commissioner.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. SUTHERLAND:

A bill (S. 2644) making an appropriation for the redemption of an internal-revenue stamp; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A bill (S. 2645) granting an increase of pension to William Armstrong;

A bill (S. 2646) granting a pension to Jacob S. Boreman; and

A bill (S. 2647) granting a pension to Elizabeth Henry (with the accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HALE:

A bill (S. 2648) granting a pension to Nannie B. Butler; to the Committee on Pensions.

AMENDMENTS TO THE TARIFF BILL.

Mr. BURTON submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

AMELIA L. DICK BOYD.

Mr. BURTON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 59), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Senate resolution 59.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Amelia L. Dick Boyd, widow of Charles W. Boyd, late a laborer of the United States Senate, a sum equal to six months' salary at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his demise, said sum to be considered as including funeral expenses and all other allowances.

TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS.

Mr. BULKELEY. I hold in my hand part 1 of a report of the Commissioner of Corporations on Taxation of Corporations, dealing with the system of corporate taxation in the New England States, and published by the Department of Commerce and Labor. A very limited edition was issued. I ask that 1,000 copies be printed as a document for the use of the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the order will be made.

Mr. BULKELEY. It is suggested that I should ask for the printing of 2,000 instead of 1,000 copies.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator know what the expense will be?

Mr. BULKELEY. The estimate is $166. The estimate was made by the printing clerk in the Secretary's office.

There being no objection, the order was reduced to writing and agreed to, as follows:

Ordered, That 2,000 copies of a paper, Taxation of Corporations, part 1, New England, be printed as a document, and that the usual number be not printed.

THE TARIFF.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed, and the first bill on the calendar will be proceeded with.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. ALDRICH. I should like to dispose of a few formal amendments before the discussion of the hide question is proceeded with.

Mr. MCLAURIN. I wanted to make some observations in reply to what had been said yesterday evening against my amendment. If the chairman has any formal amendments to present, I will wait until those are disposed of, if they will lead to no discussion.

Mr. CULLOM. Then there will be more Senators here to hear the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. ALDRICH. If the Senator wants to go on, I will not insist.

Mr. MCLAURIN. That is all right. I wish to make some observations further along in reply to the objections that were made to my amendment yesterday by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL].

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that the Senator from Rhode Island desires the floor.

Mr. MCLAURIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ALDRICH. I was making the request that the committee might be able to dispose of some amendments to which there will be no objection. They are merely formal amendments. I do not want to take up any amendment that will lead to discussion; but if Senators desire to proceed with the discussion of the hide question, I certainly have no objection.

Mr. MCLAURIN. I have no objection to the Senator from Rhode Island proceeding with his formal amendments. I think the chairman of the committee ought to be permitted to do so.

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

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Mr. BEVERIDGE. May I ask the Senator from Rhode Island a question before he takes his seat?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. OWEN. Certainly.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I believe I heard the Senator from Rhode Island say that he was in favor of putting a protective duty upon everything produced in the United States. Is it not true that the Senator has left binding twine on the free list in this bill; and is not that produced in the United States?

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, there are certain anomalies in this bill and in every other tariff bill for which neither the Senator from Indiana nor myself are responsible. I have never yet been able to vote for a bill or help construct a bill that did not have some things in it of which I did not approve.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I do not complain of that, but I merely wanted to point out to the Senator that if it be true that he has evidently left binding twine, where I think it should be, on the free list, then he was not accurate when he said he proposed to put a protective duty on everything produced in the United States. Here is the whole free list with many things so produced.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator probably did not understand my remarks, or, in any event, did not appreciate them. I say—and I will repeat it, if the Senator desires to have me—that there are things in this bill which I do not approve of, and I presume there will be when it becomes a law. I imagine there will be some things, when the Senator from Indiana finally votes for it, that he will not approve of—I judge so from his remarks in the past—but neither he nor I can construct a tariff bill that will not have some items in it which do not meet with universal approval.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I did not intend to interrupt the Senator except to say——

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I believe I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is entitled to the floor.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Will the Senator permit me just a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield further to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. OWEN. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator from Rhode Island will find it in the RECORD that he said he proposed to put a duty on everything produced in the United States. The free list which he reported and proposes to support contains many things which we produce in the United States and upon which he does not propose to put a protective-tariff duty. So that the statement which he first made, and which is in the RECORD, is not quite accurate. I do not complain of the Senator for that, but I merely called attention to the exceptions.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, there are many things put upon the free list——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is entitled to the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. OWEN. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. ALDRICH. In every tariff bill there are put upon the free list many things not produced in the United States, but which are used by our manufacturers or by our consumers, which free traders and protectionists alike agree ought to be on the free list. There is no question about that at all.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Does everybody agree on binding twine?

Mr. ALDRICH. There is one article which the Senator says is on the free list, which is a manufactured article, and there may be others, but they are very few in number. There may be some articles that will be put by the Senate upon the free list before we get through with the bill, but that does not change the character of the bill at all and does not change my statement as to the principle which governed the committee in the construction of this bill. If the Senator will follow the action of the committee carefully, intelligently, and industriously, he will find that that principle has governed.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. In just turning over the pages of the bill at random I find that bolting cloth is on the free list, and it is produced in the United States.

Mr. OWEN. I decline to yield further, Mr. President.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is not produced in the United States and has never been.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I find on the free list hair of the horse. That is produced in the United States.

Mr. OWEN. I decline to yield further.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma has the floor. He declines to yield further.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, ex-Governor Douglas is one of the greatest shoe manufacturers in the world. He says, in a public article relative to this matter, in the National Monthly:

I am not afraid of free shoes if I can have free hides and free leather. I would gladly swap any doubtful benefit from the duty on shoes for the certain benefits of free hides and leather.

I do not wish to detain the Senate at this late hour. The matter has been the subject of prolonged debate. If I believed that it would yield any substantial benefit to the cattlemen of this country to place this duty upon hides, I should support it. I do not believe anything of the kind; and while I do not think that these great monopolies can be altogether controlled by tariff schedules, I do believe that competition can be promoted by making many of these articles free.

Mr. FLINT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. OWEN. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. FLINT. I simply wish to ask the Senator a question. I judge from the statement he has read from the letter of Governor Douglas that Mr. Douglas, who is a very large shoe manufacturer, is of the opinion that, if we made the duty 10 per cent on hides, we should not make it any greater on shoes. That would be, I understand, his position. He is a very large manufacturer, as I have said, and from his statement I judge, if we have free hides, that he would be willing to have free shoes, and that if we had a 10 per cent duty on hides, he would be willing to accept a 10 per cent duty on shoes.

Mr. OWEN. I have no authority to speak for Governor Douglas. I will let him speak for himself, and will ask that his statement go into the RECORD.

Mr. ALDRICH. May I ask the Senator from Oklahoma a question?

Mr. OWEN. Certainly.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator seems to speak with authority for one of the shoe manufacturers. Can he tell us whether the tanners, who seem to be the principal people interested upon one side of this question, are willing to have leather put upon the free list?

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator from Rhode Island, in the first place, I deny that I speak for any manufacturer, but I offer to let the manufacturer speak for himself. I ask that the article from which I read be printed in the RECORD. I do not care to have it read, but should merely like to have it go into the RECORD. I do not think it would change a vote one way or the other if it were read; and I do not think it is necessary to take the time of the Senate to have it read in full.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oklahoma? The Chair hears none.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[From National Monthly, June, 1909.]

IS THE BEEF TRUST AIMING TO GOBBLE UP THE SHOE-MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY OF THE UNITED STATES.

By ex-Governor W. L. Douglas, of Massachusetts.

The boot and shoe manufacturers of this country are facing a crisis even greater than many of them realize.

Under present conditions—that is, with present duties on hides and leather—it does not take a prophet to foretell in a general way what will happen. The logic of tariff events has already proceeded far enough to indicate clearly the goal toward which we are rapidly traveling. This is no less than a gigantic trust controlling the beef packing, leather tanning, and shoe-manufacturing industries of this country.

This trust will, of course, be built around the present beef trust.

Such a trust is inevitable, providing the present duty of 15 per cent remains on hides. The advantage given by this duty to the beef trust, as the original owner of hides, is so great that competition with it will be hopeless as soon as it can establish itself in the leather-tanning and shoe-manufacturing industries.

Under the monopolistic influence of the tariff on hides, the beef packers' trust has already made great headway. It now controls directly about 55 per cent of the hides of this country. Indirectly, it is reasonably certain that it controls a large part of the 45 per cent of hides which it does not take off of cattle. To make its monopoly of the raw material of leather still more complete, it has recently gone into the hide-buying business. Thus the independent tanner is left with only a very restricted supply of raw material. If he could buy foreign hides without the payment of the 15 per cent duty, he would have some chance to compete with the packer tanners and the price of leather would be more likely to be reasonable. There is, however, no certainty of fair and reasonable prices for leather unless both hides and leather are put on the free list. The beef packers' monopoly has already gone so far that it is only a question of a very short time when free hides, without free leather, would be of little or no avail to shoe manufacturers and other users of leather.

By ownership and control, through community of interest, and by tanning contracts, the beef packers' trust has already become so dominant in the sole-leather tanning business that it is difficult to locate independent tanneries. More than 30 tanneries are now said to be under Armour-Swift-Morris control. To a less extent, the beef packers' trust is also connected with the tanning of upper leather.

Recently we have heard reports that the beef packers were becoming interested in the shoe-manufacturing business. To what extent, if any,

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

the packers have become manufacturers of shoes, I do not know. It seems clear to me, however, that the almost inevitable result of continuing the present policy of taxed hides and leather is to throw the entire leather-tanning and shoe-manufacturing business into the hands of the beef trust, which has, through its slaughtering interests, control of the country's hide supply and can dictate prices.

The New York Journal of Commerce of May 12 says:

"The strength of the hide market is giving tanners cause for anxiety, as they can figure out little profit at the prevailing prices of the raw material. Packers have the situation well in hand, it is said, and propose to get their asking figure, in the meantime not pressing offerings."

Under these conditions we see that the fight for free hides is a fight for existence on the part of the independent tanners. I predict that, if the duties on hides and leather are continued ten years longer, not only will the monopoly of the tanning industry by the beef trust be complete, but the boot and shoe industry will then be a part of the tariff-fostered and tariff-nourished beef trust. Independent shoe manufacturers can not pay 20 per cent more for leather than will its trust competitors and live. The handicap is too great. Then there will be a monopoly in the production of shoes and, as soon as the independents are killed, the 25 per cent duty on shoes will become effective and the prices of shoes in this country will be advanced to 20 or 25 per cent above foreign prices and, probably, above export prices. To-day there is no trust in the boot and shoe industry and prices are lower, quality considered, in this than in any country. This is true notwithstanding that we pay more for leather and for other tariff-taxed materials than is paid by our foreign competitors and notwithstanding that we pay, by far, the highest daily and hourly wages in any country. If the American people want to continue to wear the best and cheapest shoes on earth, they must see that their Senators and Representatives vote for free hides and free leather. There is no other road to cheap footwear.

About all that we can hope to get from the present Congress is free hides and reduced duties on leather. Why Congress hesitates to give us free hides I can not understand, unless our Senators and Representatives have ceased to think of the welfare of our 87,000,000 consumers and are concerned only about the few producers who constitute our great trusts. The facts and arguments are all against taxed hides. There is no sound reason, under any theory of protection, for continuing the burdensome and monopoly-producing duty on hides. Not only does the duty not protect the cattle raisers, but, if it did, there are so few of them, comparatively, that they should not be permitted to dictate the prices of hides, leather, and shoes to all of our citizens.

According to the census of 1890 there were 37,629 stock raisers and 5,483,618 farmers in this country; that is, the stock raisers constitute less than 1 per cent of our farming population and only about one-fifth of 1 per cent of our total population. Thus, assuming that the stock raisers are protected by the duty on hides, we see that for each stock raiser thus protected 500 consumers must pay higher prices for shoes. This ratio is not a proper one, even from the standpoint of a protectionist. But even this is much too high, according to Boyd's City Dispatch. This great agency for circular advertising said, on May 13, that it could find only 22,000 names of persons who can fairly be called stock or cattle raisers. On the assumption that the cattle raiser is protected, then 800 consumers of shoes are being taxed for the benefit of one stock raiser.

As our grazing lands are growing less and less each year and as we now have to import one-third of the hides consumed, we must either increase the taxes on the masses for the benefit of an almost insignificant few or see this few decline. No civilized country can raise enough cattle to furnish hides and leather for domestic use. Adequate grazing lands do not exist in highly populated and civilized countries. A tax on hides in this country, therefore, necessarily means a tax on footwear for 87,000,000 people. It can never mean anything else.

It is a mistake, however, to assume that the cattle raisers benefit appreciably by the duty on hides. Both the facts and the logic of conditions are against such an assumption.

A comparison of the prices of cattle, hides, and leather for the last twelve years indicates that there is practically no relation or connection between the prices of cattle and hides and not a close connection between the prices of hides and leather. Such a comparison is made in the following table:

Year.	Date.	Top prices, native steers, on hoof, Chicago, per 100 pounds.	Heavy native steer hides, Chicago, per pound.	Sole leather, Union No. 1, middling, per pound.
1897	Apr. 3	$5.40	$0.09	$0.29
1898	July 2	5.35	.12¼	.29
1899	Jan. 7	5.95	.11½	.28
1900	Apr. 7	5.80	.13½	.35
1901	Apr. 6	6.25	.10¼	.33
1902	July 5	8.50	.13	.35
1903	Apr. 4	5.60	.11¼	.34
1904	Oct. 1	6.55	.10½	.32
1905	Jan. 7	6.00	.13¾	.35
	Aug. 5	5.90	.15½	.36
1906	Jan. 6	6.25	.15¼	.37
	Feb. 3	5.85	.15¼	.37
	Apr. 7	6.35	.14¼	.35
	Sept. 1	6.85	.16½	.36
1907	Apr. 6	6.66	.14½	.38
	Sept. 7	7.25	.14	.36
1908	Apr. 4	7.50	.09½	.34
	July 4	8.40	.14½	.34
	Dec. 5	8.00	.16	.36
1909	Jan. 9	7.50	.16	.36
	Feb. 6	7.15	.16	.36
	Mar. 6	7.25	.14½	.36
	Apr. 3	7.35	.14	.36

The above prices of cattle are taken from Monthly Summaries of United States Department of Commerce and Labor and are for the specific dates mentioned. The prices of leather and hides are from a table of "Comparative prices of leather and hides for ten years," published in the Shoe and Leather Reporter of August 10, 1905, and later numbers.

Thus we see that the prices of hides are often high when the prices of cattle are low, and often low when the prices of cattle are high.

In 1905 and 1906 hides were selling above 15 cents when cattle were below 6 cents, while in 1902 hides were selling at 13 cents when cattle were selling at 8½ cents. In 1906 hides were selling at 16 cents when cattle were selling at 6.85 cents, while in 1908 hides were selling at 9½ cents when cattle were selling at 7½ cents. From April, 1908, to April, 1909, the price of cattle declined 2 per cent, while the price of hides advanced 47 cents. From February, 1906, to April, 1909, the price of cattle advanced 26 per cent, while the price of hides declined 8 per cent.

These figures disprove the claims of the beef packers that the cattle raisers are protected by the duty on hides. The Wall Street Journal of April 20, 1909, quotes "an official of Swift & Co." as follows:

"Any reduction in the hide tariff would injure the farmer, because the packers do business on so close a margin that cheaper hides would mean a slightly smaller return per pound to the farmer for beef on the hoof."

Is not this clear? Is not it beautiful—this solicitude of the packers for the farmers? The packers want the hide duty retained so that they will have to pay higher prices for cattle. How they do love the farmer!

As a matter of logic as well as of fact, the beef packers pay as little as possible for cattle and get as much as possible for hides. The price of cattle depends mainly upon the demand for beef, and the price of hides depends mainly upon the demand for leather. Hides, being an incidental or by-product of the butchering business and cattle being slaughtered primarily for beef, it is absurd to suppose that a duty on hides will materially change the prices paid for cattle. We may be certain that the packers would favor free hides if they thought that free hides would appreciably lower the prices of cattle.

The cattle raisers get nothing, or next to nothing, from the duties on hides and leather. They are, however, by these duties, compelled to pay materially higher prices for shoes, harness, saddles, and other leather goods.

In view of all the facts, there is no sound reason for retaining the duty on hides in order to protect cattle raisers or farmers. There is sound reason in favor of free hides in order to provide as cheap raw material as possible to the tanning and shoe-manufacturing industries, both of which are of great importance to all of our people. If the duty on hides is retained, it will be retained at the behest of the beef trust and for the purpose of enabling it to hold and extend its already great and harmful monopoly. Congress will not do its duty to our 87,000,000 shoe-wearing people unless it repeals the duty on hides. In my opinion, it should also put leather on the free list.

In conclusion, I wish to say that I hold somewhat different opinions from those held by some other shoe manufacturers. I am not afraid of free shoes if I can have free hides and free leather. I would gladly swap any doubtful benefit from the duty on shoes for the certain benefits of free hides and leather.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Will the Senator permit me to ask a question of the Senator from California?

Mr. OWEN. I yield the floor.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator from California made a suggestion just now, and I was curious to know whether or not we may expect that that will represent the view of the Finance Committee and the majority of this side rather than the expectation put forward by the Senator from Rhode Island, to wit, that if we have a 10 per cent duty on hides, then the Senator will be content with a 10 per cent duty on shoes.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, the Senator from California was not speaking for the committee.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I did not say that the Senator from California was speaking for the committee.

Mr. FLINT. I was not speaking for myself even.

Mr. HALE. I think the Senator was very unfortunate in the way he presented it.

Mr. FLINT. I simply presented the question whether the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] thought the shoe manufacturer to whom he referred would be willing to accept a 10 per cent duty on shoes if the duty on hides was put at 10 per cent.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Then we get it very clearly. I did not say, I will say to the Senator from Maine—and he will not find it in the RECORD—that the Senator from California spoke for the committee, or assumed to do so.

Mr. HALE. I did not understand that the Senator undertook to speak for the committee at all.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Not at all; but I was curious to know—because I think it is important and a new phase of this thing that I had not thought of at all is developing here—whether it is the intention, in case 15 per cent is put upon hides on that ground, that a differential of 10 per cent shall immediately be placed upon shoes. It is only our right to know and to have the thing cleared up as we go along.

Mr. HALE. I am very impatient at the persistence of the Senator from Indiana, who is continually urging upon the committee to tell beforehand what it intends to do. The chairman has stated with great plainness and distinctness, after his fashion, that when this fundamental question is considered and passed upon by the Senate the committee will take up the other subjects of manufacture, the advanced stages of this product. And for the Senator from Indiana to continually urge the chairman or the members of the committee to state for his satisfaction beforehand what they will do is not, it seems to me, a fitting thing to be done.

Mr. ALDRICH. And, Mr. President, when the committee do make their report they will not be governed by the opinion of

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Petroleum, by kinds, for the years 1904–1907, in gallons.

Country and kind.	1904.	1905.	1906.	1907.
Refined:				
Illuminating—				
South America	45,598,915	50,724,250	54,934,746	55,081,352
Asia	134,313,293	174,941,348	164,893,450	196,308,228
Oceania	21,517,840	28,997,401	22,260,688	27,767,540
British Africa	741,567,083	822,881,953	834,361,210	894,529,432
Lubricating—				
Europe	67,830,877	76,537,696	117,398,470	108,153,422
North America	88,810,130	97,357,190	146,110,702	136,140,226
Residuum (barrels):				
Europe	537,155	1,165,461	1,788,472	65,228,009

Total imports.

February.	Exports.	Imports.	Excess of exports.
1909	$126,036,204	$118,635,807	$7,400,397
1908	167,757,032	84,752,651	83,004,381
1907	159,517,221	123,005,683	36,511,538
1906	141,766,538	104,232,879	37,553,679
1905	106,870,782	103,084,413	3,783,369
1904	118,800,282	89,022,500	29,777,782
1903	125,583,024	82,622,246	42,963,778

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, we passed a Senate resolution inquiring into the question of this wonderful production of oil in Mexico, which was to swamp all of the American concerns. The President sent in his message, and without having the message read, I should like to have read the report of C. W. Hayes, chief geologist, who made the investigation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the paper will be read by the Secretary.

The Secretary read as follows:

The conclusions of general public interest derived from my personal inspection of the Mexican oil fields are briefly as follows:

While these fields promise to yield a large quantity of crude oil, its quality is such that it can not compete under present conditions in the markets of the United States or Europe with the higher grade petroleum of the Appalachian, Illinois, or mid-continent fields. Further, the conditions are such that the demand for fuel oil and refined products in Mexico exceeds the supply available at present or in sight in the near future. There is practically no coal in Mexico, and the railroads now dependent chiefly on Texas, Oklahoma, and English coal could consume several times the present production of oil if it were generally adopted as fuel. The increased production in the Mexican fields therefore will affect the United States by reducing the demand for coal; by reducing the demand for high-grade crude oil for refining to supply the local market, and to some extent by competing in the European market with American refined products.

Finally, the conditions in the Mexican fields are not favorable for the small operator, and it is highly probable that production as well as refining will remain in the control of a very few strong companies. The geological conditions under which the oil occurs are such as to increase the hazards and uncertainties encountered in the development of an oil field, and it is probable that both the difficulty of securing a steady supply of oil and the average cost of production will be correspondingly increased.

C. W. HAYES, *Chief Geologist.*

Mr. PENROSE. In addition to the menace from the Mexican fields, which, in the opinion of all practical independent oil producers who have visited that country, is a serious one, I ought to call the attention of the Senate to the Canadian fields. I would recall the fact that to encourage production the Ottawa government enacted a law giving a bounty of 54 cents per gallon on all oil produced in the Dominion. As a result of that bounty the production has increased quite rapidly, and large operations are being started not only in eastern and central Canada, but in the far northeast.

As to the amount of the duty fixed in the amendment, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that Austria imposes a duty on crude petroleum per gallon of nearly 5 cents; Roumania, a duty of 1.14 cents; India, a duty of 1.66 cents; Russia, a duty of 2.81 cents; Mexico, a duty of 4.86 cents; and Japan, 20 per cent ad valorem.

All of the above countries have high duties on the refined product per gallon. Therefore the amount of duty as fixed in the amendment which I have offered is smaller by over a half than any duty imposed by any other country in the world.

Mr. GUGGENHEIM. Mr. President, the oil industry is a very important one in the State of Colorado. To protect that industry, I shall vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania. In connection with that matter, I have a clipping here from a very important newspaper of Denver, which I send to the desk and ask to have the Secretary read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the paper will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

TWO NEW STRIKES OF OIL IN SECTIONS WIDELY APART GIVE PROMISE OF GREAT DEVELOPMENT OF THE INDUSTRY.

An industry that has long been a part of the commercial and industrial life of Colorado and that last year received a strong impetus through new development is the oil industry. For twenty years there have been a large number of good producing wells in Fremont County, near Florence, and the past six years have seen a new field developed in the Boulder district that is netting handsome returns to a number of operating companies; but in 1908 new strikes were made in two sections of the State that promise extensions beyond the $2,000,000 a year that is now produced. Discoveries were made in Rio Blanco County, on the western slope of the Rocky Mountains, and in Lamar, in the Arkansas Valley, which is believed to be the same field as in the Florence district.

PRODUCE 3,300 BARRELS A DAY.

The wells in the Florence district produce about 3,000 barrels a day, and those in the Boulder district about 10 per cent as much. The crude product is handled by refineries located in the districts, and gasoline, kerosene, and the numerous other products of petroleum are manufactured on an extensive scale.

The wells supply a large portion of this commodity that is consumed in Colorado and the States adjoining on the north, south, and west. Development is going on all the time in the Florence field and every few weeks a new well is opened that adds to the wealth of the community. In 1908 a large wax factory was opened at Florence to further increase the value of the residue from the refining process that was formerly sold for $1 a barrel, and the profits of the operating company will be increased by a handsome figure.

The business in the Florence field is practically controlled by the United Oil Company and that of the Boulder field by the Inland and Colorado companies.

MILLION AND A HALF FROM ONE WELL.

Explorations in the Florence field have developed about 275,000 acres of oil-bearing land, and there is about one well for each 750 acres. One well has produced nearly 1,500,000 barrels of oil and has netted the owners not less than $1,500,000 above operating expenses.

Development has not progressed far enough in the new districts to base any prediction on their future. The operators in the Rio Blanco County district declare their wells are located on the same field as the newly opened wells in the Bluff City (Utah) district, which has been heralded as the greatest oil district opened since the Texas and Kansas and Indian Territory fields.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, the State which I have the honor in part to represent has a present output of crude oil which is larger than was the entire production of crude oil in the United States at the period of the last census. It has a capacity of over 50,000,000 barrels output per annum at this time. That oil is being sold at from 20 cents to 41 cents a barrel, of 42 gallons—a very low price indeed. If refined oil was sold at any measurable degree in proportion to the cheapness of the crude oil of Oklahoma, it could be sold for illuminating purposes at not exceeding 5 cents a gallon wholesale. It costs only half a cent a gallon to refine the oil. The high price of petroleum in this country for illuminating purposes is not due to the high price of crude oil, but to artificial high prices fixed by the worst monopoly on earth, the Standard Oil Company. It is in spite of the very low price of crude oil that refined oil is still maintained at a high figure by the commercial machinery of the Standard.

Mr. President, I call the attention of my Democratic colleagues to the fact that the Wilson bill, the only tariff measure that the Democrats have presented to the country since the war, carried a 40 per cent ad valorem on crude oil and on its products. This tax on oil was presented in the Senate by Senator James K. Jones, the leader of the Democracy at that time. Without an objecting voice, it was adopted by the acquiescence of every Democratic Senator in this body. This item imposing a 40 per cent ad valorem tax on oil went to the House of Representatives. It was adopted by the House of Representatives, then controlled by the Democrats, and became the law.

I do not, because of that, say to the Senate that it was necessarily a wise or judicious thing to do, nor that it is worthy to be followed now, unless for other reasons this tariff is justified, but I do insist that a tax on crude oil of half a cent a gallon can not be regarded as un-Democratic with this Democratic precedent. The suggestion has just been made that the independent producer and independent refiners are being used as the cat's paw of the Standard Oil Company.

Mr. President, I confess that I have but little sympathy with that charge. I have caused to have presented to the Senate heretofore the proceedings of the independent oil refiners and oil producers in their session in this city on the 21st of April, 1909, which will be found in Senate Document No. 88 of the present session of Congress, and there is recorded a long list of men notable in the production and refining of oil in this country, men whose business acumen, whose business sense, whose skill, and whose good faith ought not to be impugned. They deserve better treatment at the hands of the Senate than either to be discredited in motive or in the intelligence of their prayer.

I grant that any duty carries with it some measure of protection, because any duty whatever put upon our statute book to that extent interposes a barrier against competition from

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

abroad, but this tax will interpose a barrier alone to the anticipated shipments of the Standard.

As far as my State is concerned, I favor this small import duty, because if the producers and refiners in my State are right in their apprehensions it will operate as a barrier to the Standard and give our independents a better chance to devlop competition with the Standard; and if the Mexican oil is brought in, it will compel the Standard to pay a revenue into the Federal Treasury.

"Oh," is is said, "we have never imported any oil and we never will, and therefore this tax is not justified." Very well; if that be true, I respectfully represent that the opposition to the tax is not justified as the tax, on this theory, is harmless.

Suppose, however, that this production in Mexico, which the producers so greatly fear, should grow by leaps and bounds, as it has done in Oklahoma. Mr. President, I call attention to the rapid growth of this production in Oklahoma. Only a few short years ago, in 1903, the total midcontinnental production was only 1,500,000 barrels, and now in Oklahoma alone I think it is no exaggeration to say that the output is 50,000,000 barrels. Mexico in 1906 had 1,000,000 barrels, in 1907, 4,000,000 barrels. Suppose the output in ten years, before another tariff bill may pass, is 100,000,000 barrels and the Oklahoma producer put out of business. What then of the consumer?

The good faith of the men who fear the Mexican production is abundantly vouched for not only by their own high character, but also by letters which they present from the highest officers of this Government; one from Martin A. Knapp, chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, which, without reading, I will ask to place in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that order will be made.

The letter is as follows:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,
Washington, May 21, 1909.

Mr. C. D. CHAMBERLAIN,
Secretary, etc., New Willard Hotel, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In response to your request of 20th instant, I write to say that, so far as I have information or belief, either official or personal, the producers and dealers of oil which you represent are entirely independent of and have no affiliation with the Standard Oil Company.

In the various investigations which the commission has conducted, both in formal proceedings under the act to regulate commerce and in compliance with the joint resolution of the Congress, nothing has been disclosed or suggested to indicate that the members of your association are not actual and active competitors of the Standard Oil Company. I have no reason to doubt that they are entirely independent and rival concerns. Nothing has come to my knowledge which would warrant a contrary belief.

Yours, very truly, MARTIN A. KNAPP, *Chairman.*

I hereby certify that I have compared the foregoing copy of a letter from Martin A. Knapp with the original bearing his signature, and find it a true copy.

Witness my hand and seal this 22d day of May, 1909.

[SEAL.] WARREN M. MITCHELL,
Notary Public, District of Columbia.

Mr. OWEN. Here is a letter from Frank B. Kellogg, who is prosecuting with all his might the Standard Oil Company, and who can not be suspected of any sympathy with them. I ask that the letter may go into the RECORD without reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is so ordered.

The letter referred to is as follows:

DAVIS, KELLOGG & SEVERANCE,
St. Paul, Minn., May 26, 1909.

C. D. CHAMBERLAIN,
New Willard Hotel, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: The refiners which you have represented in the past, members of the National Petroleum Refiners' Association, are, I have no doubt, independent of the Standard Oil Company. In the very thorough investigation we made and in all the testimony taken before the special examiner in the Standard Oil case, these refiners were treated as independent, and I believe them to be so.

I do not agree with you about the tariff on petroleum and its products. It does not seem to me that it will in any way injure you to have the tariff taken off. I do not wish, therefore, to be understood in any way as advocating the tariff on petroleum and its products. I am not, however, in the business, and every man is entitled to take a position to suit himself.

Very truly, yours, FRANK B. KELLOGG.

Mr. OWEN. Here is a letter from C. B. Morrison to like effect, which I ask may go into the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that order will be made.

The letter referred to is as follows:

MORRISON, BROWN & GOULD,
Chicago, May 25, 1909.

Mr. C. D. CHAMBERLAIN,
New Willard Hotel, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAMBERLAIN: Yours of the 20th instant just reached me, and in reply I have to say that if the question as to whether the petroleum interests which you represent are independent of the Standard arises at any time you are at liberty to call upon me, and I think I can satisfy any person that those interests are independent. From the time we commenced the suit in behalf of the Government against the Standard Oil Company and its affiliated companies you and those connected with your office were of great help to us, not only in posting us as to the facts, but in assisting us in gathering the testimony and in presenting it to establish the facts; and if there is any one thing that I learned thoroughly during the progress of that lawsuit, it was that you and the companies engaged in the petroleum business with which you were connected were wholly and completely independent of the Standard companies and independent of Standard interests. And you were not afraid to have your hostility to those interests known to everybody, because what you did in assisting the Government in its prosecution was done openly and fearlessly, and was greatly appreciated by the attorneys representing the Government.

It seems strange to me, knowing the facts as I do, that anyone at all posted should ever raise the question as to the independence of the companies which you represent. However, I can readily understand that one not going through it as we did might not be so thoroughly posted upon the situation as I am. I can also well understand how the real independent interests might be accused by honest men with affiliation with the Standard, because, as you know, it developed upon the taking of testimony that the Standard has at different times run, managed and controlled companies which held themselves out to be independent; and in one case some of these bogus independent companies employed counsel to appear before the legislature of Georgia and represent that they were real independent companies, and that the bill which they opposed was a bill in the interest of the Standard Oil Company, when, as a matter of fact, the Standard, and not the independent companies, was back of the opposition to the bill and paid the attorneys who appeared before the legislature and opposed the bill. So that after all it may not be strange that a real independent company should be suspected of affiliation with the Standard.

I wish you success in your efforts to uphold and advance the independent oil interests of the country.

Very truly, yours, C. B. MORRISON.

Mr. OWEN. Now, Mr. President, the increase of the production in Oklahoma has jumped in a few short years from nothing to 50,000,000 barrels per annum. These producers come here and submit their petition, which I submitted for the information of the Senate in Senate Document No. 88, parts 1 and 2. They point out what they expect from Mexico. Doctor Day's report only two days ago showed that Mexico from practically no production had jumped to a million barrels, then to 4,000,000 barrels the following year, and Lewis Emery, in his statement, which is before the Senate (S. Doc. No. 88), a man who has distinguished himself all his life as the most untiring opponent of the Standard Oil Company, nominated by the Democracy as its candidate as governor of Pennsylvania because he had distinguished himself as the opponent of the Standard Oil Company, comes here and points out in the most emphatic manner from personal experience what may be expected from the Mexican field.

I have in my hands a map of Mexico upon which Lewis Emery marked out the various fields in which oil had already been found. In a field near the Rio Grande, adjacent the Texas border; a field down the coast, below Tampico; a field down near to Veracruz; a field down on the Isthmus; and he states that for a distance of 800 miles these measures are oil bearing. He himself put down on the coast of the Gulf of Mexico, just below Tampico, a well which was so remarkable its story was published all over the world. He put down a well, an 8-inch hole, which struck a flow of oil that became an artesian fountain of oil and hot salt water, turning up the soil for 30 or 40 acres, boiling out two rivers of water, and pouring out an incredible volume of oil mixed with hot salt water of 159 degrees temperature, destroying the oil, but proving beyond the shadow of a doubt the enormous potentiality of the great oil-bearing measures of Mexico.

Mexico now charges us over 4 cents a gallon on crude petroleum, for any petroleum we may ship into Mexico. This amendment proposes only one-half of a cent a gallon on crude petroleum.

Mr. President, in my opinion the first duty of a legislator is to consider the welfare of the great body of the people of the country, to consider, as far as this oil matter is concerned, first of all the consumer; and in his name alone I shall speak in behalf of this proposed tax. His welfare is absolutely dependent on the development of competition by the independent producer and refiner. In 1887 the independent refiners refined only 5 per cent of the oil in this country, and now, by virtue of our more considerate interstate-commerce laws, the anti-rebate laws, and so forth, they have increased, and very much more rapidly in recent years than previously, until they have an output of 20 per cent of the refined oil used in this country.

The producers are afraid, because the Standard Oil Company purchases over 80 per cent, approximately, of the crude petroleum of the country, that if the Standard Oil Company controls the Mexican fields, it will naturally withdraw as chief purchaser of the crude oil of the American producer. Why should it not? Why should not the Standard Oil Company buy the cheapest oil available?

Any man in business, and in that business to make money, would buy his crude oil where he could get it the cheapest, and this Mexican field will furnish the cheapest oil in the world. If the Standard Oil Company does buy its supplies of crude there and can ship those supplies of crude into the United States

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

without tax, why should it continue to buy from the independent producer, who now produces 89 per cent of the oil of this country? And if the Standard ceases to buy, the independent producer in that degree is thrown out of business, the towns now dependent on the oil production and the allied industries dependent thereon fall into decay, the taxes paid to town, county, and State from such sources will cease, and Oklahoma might receive in this way an enormous injury. It shall not happen if my voice will prevent it.

When the independent producer diminishes and grows less and less and gradually goes out of business, the Standard Oil Company can thereafter the more easily control the crude oil in this country by purchase of a large part of such valuable production as remains, and, controlling the volume of production remaining, are in position to embarrass and destroy the independent refiner by irregular, defective, or deficient oil supply.

I earnestly call the attention of the Senate again to the important fact that, under our improving laws, the independents have increased from 5 per cent to 20 per cent. They are getting their refineries established all over the West, in Kansas, Oklahoma, Illinois, and at various other points. In Senate Document No. 88, Sixty-first Congress, first session, I submitted a map showing the price of refined oil where there was competition in refined oil by the independents and where practically there was no competition. That map, which I hold in my hand, shows that the price of oil goes down very decidedly where there is this competition.

I think it proper to say to the Senate that the competition in refined oil has to be most skillfully and carefully conducted by those who engage in it, for fear of their great antagonist, which has known no mercy in the past and has destroyed many and many an independent concern, as the history of the Standard Oil Company abundantly proves.

Mr. President, I believe that it is better for the consumer that we should have competition in this country. I believe that if oil is brought in from Mexico it will be brought in, not by the little independent, who has no oil fleet, but it will be brought in, if brought in at all, by the Standard Oil Company alone.

I think, if it is brought in, if the fears of the independent producer and refiner be well founded, there is no good reason why a small tax should not be imposed upon the crude oil, which would add to our revenues and at the same time would afford incidental protection to the independent producers and refiners. I for one will stand by the interests of my own State and the desire of my people, who believe that they are in jeopardy in this matter, and who have by their industry and enterprise developed an enormous industry in Oklahoma. I therefore shall cast my vote for this amendment. It has sound Democratic precedent, and was voted for by W. J. Bryan when he voted for the Wilson bill in 1904, not to mention every Democrat then in the Senate and, I believe, all who voted in the House. It is justified from a prospective revenue standpoint, and is in the best interest of the consumer.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, it had been my purpose to offer an amendment to the pending amendment, limiting its operation to the Republic of Mexico; but I have just conferred with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT], and he expresses it as his impression that the subsisting treaty between the United States and that Republic contains the "favored-nation" clause, and that such an amendment would fly in the face of that treaty obligation. I shall, therefore, not offer the amendment which I had intended to propose.

Perhaps I should say, however, that I should not have voted for the pending amendment, whether my own amendment had been adopted or rejected. My colleague [Mr. OWEN] has forcibly stated the situation as it exists in our State, and has reflected the feeling that prevails among the independent producers and refiners in the State of Oklahoma. But, for my own part, I regard the Mexican oil field as being, in great measure, a Mexican myth. I regard it, at least up to the present time, as being almost as much a myth as the story of the eagle, the serpent, and the cactus. My information is that crude oil is now selling to the railroads in Mexico at 25 cents per barrel, and that refined oil is retailing in Mexico at 34 cents per gallon. Of course, it is subject to an import duty of about 13 cents per gallon.

It is my information, and I think it is undisputed, that the Standard Oil Company is transporting crude oil from the United States in order to supply its refinery at Tampico, Mexico. This statement is based upon our consular report. Mexico maintains an enormous tariff against oil from the United States, and if Mexican oil needs this protection against our oil, it seems inconceivable that our oil should need protection against Mexican oil.

Mr. President, there is no doubt that there are a great many independent oil producers in the United States; that the vast majority of the producers are independent, as much so as anyone can be who is dependent upon any one overpowering concern for a market. There is good business sense on the part of the Standard Oil Company in not engaging largely in the production of crude oil. It is infinitely better for that concern to allow private individuals, to allow independent producers, to take the risk of sinking a dry hole, or a "duster," as it is called, the Standard reserving to itself the power to fix the price upon the output of crude oil.

Mr. President, I say without reserve that if I were convinced that there were an unlimited oil field in the Republic of Mexico, if I were convinced that the Standard Oil Company owned and controlled that field, if I were convinced that if free oil were adopted here the Standard would import Mexican oil with which to crush and destroy the independent producers and the independent refiners of the United States, I should not hesitate for one moment to cast my vote in order to shield the independent producer, in order to shield the independent refiner, and, more than all, in order to shield the American consumer. I would not base my vote upon any claim or pretense of protection in the way of tariff protection. I would not base it upon any idea or pretense of a tariff for revenue only. I would vote for it to safeguard and shield the independent producer, the independent refiner, and the American consumer against the coil of that serpent whose full embrace is death. I confess there is a good deal of human nature in me. I wish that this cup might pass from my lips. Many of the independent producers in the State of Oklahoma are my personal and my political friends. They would render me any possible service, and I would reciprocate. I would render them any possible service that I could without violence to my conscience and my convictions. Perhaps my attitude on this occasion is attributable rather to verdure than to virtue. Perhaps when I have grown older in statecraft and in political finesse I may revise both my views and my policies.

Mr. President, I am not unaware that I may now be making a serious, a fatal political mistake. I am not unaware that I may be ordering a political casket. I am not unaware that I may be like the ancient queen lighting my own funeral pyre.

But, sir, I shall never demand a protective duty in behalf of a product or an industry in my own State until I am willing to concede protection to every other industry in every other State of the American Union.

Mr. FLINT. Mr. President, the State of California is one of the largest producers of crude petroleum and oil. I have received communications from the various commercial bodies in the State asking me to vote for a duty upon oil. In addition to that, we had a hearing before the Committee on Finance in reference to this subject. Independent oil producers from every State in this Union producing oil appeared before the committee and stated that it was absolutely necessary for them to have a duty on oil or they could not exist; that the Mexican field would be such an important factor in the future that without this duty they would be driven from business, and that the entire oil business of the country would be left in the possession of one corporation. They convinced me that the only way that the independent oil companies could survive was by this duty, and for that reason I intend to support the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I have given this matter some thought. I shall not detain the Senate surely more than five minutes in expressing the conclusions that I have reached.

First, I have no doubt about the attitude of the independent oil refiners and the attitude of the independent oil producers. Indeed, nearly all the oil producers are independent. The Standard Oil Company and the independent refineries together produce but a small fraction of the oil used in the United States and exported from our country. I have no doubt they are entirely honest in their belief that they have something to fear from Mexico. Therefore they are entirely natural in their desire to build this wall between our country and our southern neighbor. I am not willing, however, to accept the judgment of the independent oil refiners. I would not accept it more quickly than I would accept the judgment of the Standard Oil Company.

I would not accept the judgment of the independent oil producers. They each have their view, and they are each entitled to a fair hearing; but it is for us to determine whether there is any reason for imposing this high protective duty upon oil.

In my opinion, the Standard Oil Company is just as well served with a duty on oil as any other manufacturer is served with a duty upon his product. The Standard Oil Company is

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

especially well served with a duty on oil, because, as I understand, there is no suggestion of repealing the provision which permits the Standard Oil Company to be reimbursed for all the duties which it pays upon imported oil. The Standard Oil Company—and if I am wrong about that, I beg to be corrected now—if I understand the law aright, if this great refiner of oil imports oil and pays a duty upon it and then exports the oil, it is then reimbursed for 99 per cent of the duty that it has paid; and it is not only reimbursed for the duty it has paid upon oil, but it is reimbursed the duty it has paid upon any package in which that oil may be contained.

Impose this duty upon oil and what is the result? The Standard Oil Company, if the time shall come, will import oil from Mexico, if the fears of the independent refiners are realized; it will pay the duty on that oil; it will export the oil to other countries of the world; and it will be repaid by the Government of the United States the duty it has expended. The proposition therefore is a little worse, as it seems to me, for the independent refiners and the independent oil producers than free oil.

If a duty on oil is tolerable at all, it is only tolerable in connection with a repeal of the provision which gives the oil refiner the opportunity to receive a rebate or reimbursement for the duty. That is true, because the United States is a very large exporter of oil, and we will continue to be a large exporter of oil, and if the Standard Oil Company takes this oil from Mexico without duty and uses it for export, it will displace just so much of the domestic oil that it has been in the habit of buying.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do.

Mr. OWEN. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that the Standard Oil Company has three refineries in Mexico—one at Tampico, one at Veracruz, and one at the City of Mexico. So if they desire to ship abroad the refined product, they would not bring it into the United States and then ship it out, although they might do so.

Mr. CUMMINS. Precisely; and yet that is the very thing which is feared. The only reason that is suggested for the imposition of the duty on oil is the danger of the Standard Oil Company importing oil from Mexico, refining it here, and in that way having the Mexican oil take the place of the domestic oil.

Mr. OWEN. The Senator, I think, does not understand the argument of the independent producer, because while of course the foreign market would be open to the refineries of the Standard Oil Company in Mexico or in this country, for that matter, under the theory on which the Senator now speaks it is not that market which would in anywise be affected by the tariff one way or the other, but it is the market within our own borders.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I understand that; but the result is precisely the same. The foreign market takes so much oil and the domestic market takes so much oil; and if the Standard Oil Company can reach those markets, even though you impose a duty upon the oil, without paying any duty, it makes no difference whether the Standard Oil Company exports it from Mexico or whether it exports it from the United States.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do.

Mr. PENROSE. In answer to the objection which the Senator from Iowa has made, I desire to state, for his information and the information of the Senate, that it is my purpose to offer a proviso at the proper time and at some suitable place in the bill abolishing the drawback provisions so far as they may apply to crude petroleum; but I do not understand that the Finance Committee has yet definitely acted on a drawback provision in this tariff bill, and therefore I withhold the amendment until the proper occasion and in the proper place.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I am very much gratified to hear that the abolition of the drawback is under consideration; but we ought to deal with the two things at the same time, because, as it seems to me, they are inseparably connected with each other. We might impose a duty on oil, and, even though the Senator from Pennsylvania afterwards offers the provision that he suggests, we might fail upon that, and in that way fall between these two propositions. I hope the Senator from Pennsylvania, if that be his purpose, will in some way couple it with the amendment that he has now offered.

Mr. PENROSE. Then, I will offer it now, Mr. President, and ask to have both amendments voted on together.

Mr. CUMMINS. I have no hesitation in saying that such a proposition makes the duty on oil much more consistent with my views of what should be done than the absence of that proposition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania submits a further amendment, which will be read for the information of the Senate.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add a provision at the end of the paragraph as follows:

Provided, That no drawback shall be allowed on exportations of petroleum or the products thereof.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania makes the request that the two amendments offered by him be voted upon together.

Mr. PENROSE. That they be considered as one amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That they be considered as one amendment. Is there objection to that request?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I desire to suggest, Mr. President, that I do not think those two propositions ought to be coupled together. I should like them to be voted on separately.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. President, I think that provision is hardly fair to those who wish to vote against the duty on oil, but wish to vote for the provision abolishing the rebate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being made, the amendments will be voted upon separately. The question is upon the first amendment submitted by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE].

Mr. CUMMINS. I have not yet concluded what I desire to say. I repeat the statement that the duty on oil, which I do not favor in any event, is only made tolerable by the suggestion just made by the Senator from Pennsylvania. I think many of the evil effects of the duty upon oil would be removed by the adoption of that amendment, although I am opposed to a duty on oil at the present time under any circumstance, and I will briefly submit to the Senate my reasons for that opposition.

I do not want the product of Mexico to supplant the product of the United States, and, as I have suggested more than once, I shall be perfectly willing to vote for an amendment or a proposition that will establish this arrangement: That whenever the imports of oil amount to 5 per cent of our domestic production, then there should be laid a duty on oil that is provided for in the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania; but we have never had any such imports, and, in my opinion, we never will, and we are legislating against a mere fear, a chimera.

I beg to recall the attention of the Senate to a message of the President of the United States, which was transmitted in response to a resolution that I had the honor to introduce some time ago, and which gives the results of the visit of the geologist, Doctor Hayes, to Mexico. I was unable to get the details. There was a confidential seal, apparently, placed upon the investigation, which prevented a full disclosure; but I want to read to the Senate the report actually made by Doctor Hayes to the Geological Survey.

Mr. SCOTT. If the Senator will allow me, that statement has already been put in by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER].

Mr. MCCUMBER. I just had it read, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. CUMMINS. If that be true, I will not then either add to the volume of the RECORD or consume the time of Senators in reading it again. But if there is anything that can be safely proceeded upon at this time as established as a reasonable basis for procedure, it is that we are in no danger of importations from Mexico, at least, at this time.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. CUMMINS. Yes.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. If the Senator is correct in thinking that we are not menaced by any threatened importations of oil, and if the Senator is correct in thinking that there will be no importations of oil from Mexico, what harm does the Senator see in the adoption of the proposed amendment?

Mr. CUMMINS. My answer to that is this: It is wholly impossible to unravel all the skeins of commerce. I do not know to what evil purpose the duty may be put. I may not be able at the present time to point out any danger, just as the Senator from Utah may be unable to point out any good, that will follow the imposition of the duty. But if I understand the policy of this country, it is not to put a duty upon an article until there is something to be protected here, and some danger to be apprehended from competition abroad. Therefore I take the safer course, and believe in keeping the channels of commerce open until we see that it is necessary to obstruct them in some fashion or other.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I did not intend by my question to indicate my own position with reference to the matter. So far as the information I have is concerned, I am inclined to think

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

there is very great danger of the importation of oil from Mexico.

Mr. CUMMINS. If that be the conclusion which the Senator from Utah has reached, it will necessarily determine his vote upon this proposition. I have reached a different conclusion, and therefore must register my vote against the duty on oil.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I desire to withdraw the amendment I have just offered providing for the abolishing of the drawback.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the Senator's privilege.

Mr. PENROSE. I now offer it again as an amendment to my original amendment. The vote will then be taken first on the amendment to the amendment—the drawback amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair was laboring under the impression that when the amendment was first offered, it was an amendment to another section of the bill. As a matter of fact——

Mr. PENROSE. It was a new paragraph.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As a matter of fact, the Chair understands that the Senator did offer it in the first place as an amendment to his amendment. The question, then, will be upon the amendment to the amendment, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. At the end of the paragraph, add the following words:

Provided, That no drawback shall be allowed on exportations of petroleum or the products thereof.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I do not think this is the proper procedure. The yeas and nays have already been ordered on the other amendment. I make the point of order that it is not in order to offer this amendment now. I desire to vote for the last amendment offered, and against the first. I shall be obliged to vote against both, if this course of procedure is adopted; and I insist that the roll be called, as it had been ordered on the original amendment. I make the point that this amendment is out of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair sustains the point of order made by the Senator from Oklahoma, and the roll will be called upon the first amendment.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLAY (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who is necessarily absent from the Chamber; but he informed me before leaving that he would vote the same way that I would on this proposition. He authorized me to state that he is paired with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], and that he would vote "nay," if present. I will therefore vote. I vote "nay."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (when Mr. GALLINGER's name was called). The present occupant of the Chair is paired on this vote with the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. The Senator from Massachusetts, if present, would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea."

Mr. JONES (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. I transfer the pair to the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. DIXON], and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. SHIVELY (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BRADLEY]. I transfer the pair to the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. TAYLOR], and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. OVERMAN (when the name of Mr. SIMMONS was called). My colleague is temporarily absent from the Chamber. He is paired with the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LORIMER]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. TILLMAN (when the name of Mr. SMITH of South Carolina was called). My colleague is ill, and therefore absent. If present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. WARREN (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. MONEY], which I transfer, so that he will stand paired with the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. STEPHENSON]. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BRIGGS. I have a pair with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER]. I transfer the pair to the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. BOURNE] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. BANKHEAD. The junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. MCLAURIN] is absent, with the understanding that he had a pair with the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH]. I notice that the junior Senator from Michigan has voted.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I did not hear the statement of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I beg pardon; that is all right.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I understood that the Senator from Mississippi if present would vote "nay."

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is true.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. And I voted "nay."

Mr. BANKHEAD. I did not observe that. I beg the Senator's pardon.

The result was announced—yeas 34, nays 40, as follows:

YEAS—34.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Guggenheim	Perkins
Borah	Cullom	Hale	Scott
Brandegee	Curtis	Heyburn	Smoot
Briggs	Depew	Kean	Sutherland
Bulkeley	Dick	McEnery	Warner
Burnham	du Pont	Nixon	Warren
Burrows	Elkins	Oliver	Wetmore
Burton	Flint	Owen	
Carter	Frye	Penrose	

NAYS—40.

Bacon	Crawford	Gore	Overman
Bailey	Culberson	Hughes	Page
Bankhead	Cummins	Johnson, N. Dak.	Paynter
Bristow	Davis	Johnston, Ala.	Piles
Brown	Dillingham	Jones	Root
Burkett	Dolliver	La Follette	Shively
Chamberlain	Fletcher	McCumber	Smith, Mich.
Clapp	Foster	Martin	Stone
Clay	Frazier	Nelson	Taliaferro
Crane	Gamble	Newlands	Tillman

NOT VOTING—18.

Beveridge	Dixon	Money	Smith, S. C.
Bourne	Gallinger	Rayner	Stephenson
Bradley	Lodge	Richardson	Taylor
Clarke, Ark.	Lorimer	Simmons	
Daniel	McLaurin	Smith, Md.	

So Mr. PENROSE's amendment was rejected.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, to be numbered section 37½.

Mr. PENROSE. There is an amendment pending, Mr. President, which I suppose I might as well withdraw, under the circumstances. I withdraw the drawback amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma submits the following amendment, which will be reported.

The SECRETARY. Insert in the bill a new paragraph, 37½, as follows:

Provided, That no person, firm, association, or corporation doing an interstate business and engaged in the production, manufacture, distribution, or sale of petroleum oil or of any of its products, shall, for the purpose of creating a monopoly or destroying competition in trade, discriminate between different persons, associations, or corporations, or different sections, communities, or cities, of the United States, by selling such commodity at a lower rate in one section, community, or city than in another, after making just allowance only for the difference, if any, in the grade, quantity, or quality, and in the actual cost of transportation from the point of production or manufacture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will suggest to the Senator the propriety of striking out the word "Provided."

Mr. OWEN. I will strike out the word "Provided."

Mr. President, one way in which the Standard Oil Company has heretofore oppressed its independent competitor has been by raising the price of oil in one part of the country to pay the expense of lowering the price where there is competition, and in that way breaking down a competitor in one locality and reimbursing itself by raising the price in another locality. This has gone to so great an extent that 13 different States of the Union have passed a similar proviso for the control of that character of manipulation, to wit, Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Kansas, Oklahoma, Missouri, Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Nebraska.

I regard the proposed amendment as a very important provision of law—one which will go far to abate the triumphant march of monopolies over their weaker competitors—and I hope that it will receive the support of those who are in charge of this bill, and that they will give their acquiescence to it.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, the amendment is not in order. It is practically an amendment to the Sherman Act. That, certainly, is against our agreement to proceed with the consideration of the schedules, and to dispose of them before taking up any administrative matters. I raise the point that it is not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. OWEN. I offer this, then, as an amendment at the end of the bill.

Mr. ALDRICH. That is not in order now. We are proceeding under a general order to dispose of the dutiable paragraphs before taking up any administrative matters.

Mr. OWEN. Then I give notice that I shall, at the proper time, offer this as an amendment to this bill.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that we now take up paragraph 433, and I offer the following amendment——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] offers an amendment to paragraph 433, which will be reported.

The SECRETARY. Paragraph 433, on page 173: Modify the committee amendment by inserting, on page 173, line 20, after the word "dollars," the words "and 25 cents;" and on line 21 by striking out "thirty" and inserting "forty."

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, yesterday after I concluded my address to the Senate, and while I was resting from the fatigue of it, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], as a part of his remarks, printed an extract from an article contributed by Mr. Carnegie to some magazine. I know that the Senator from Oklahoma would not willingly do any man an injustice, least of all a dead man, who can not speak in his own defense, but I feel that I owe it to the late Senator from Maryland, Mr. Gorman, to correct the misstatement Mr. Carnegie has made and which the Senator from Oklahoma has reproduced.

I will go out of my way to say that I do not believe that Mr. Carnegie would willfully misrepresent any man or any circumstance, but he has evidently very much confused his facts.

That part of the magazine article which the Senator from Oklahoma had printed begins in this way:

> To two Democrats belong the chief credit of defeating the revolutionary features of the Wilson bill—Senator Gorman, Democratic leader of the Senate, and Governor Flower, of New York, an influential leader in the House.

Mr. President, the honorable Roswell P. Flower was not a Member of the House of Representatives when the Wilson bill was pending in that body. He was elected to the Fifty-second Congress, but resigned his membership in that body in September, 1891, and was elected governor of New York the following November. Obviously, therefore, Mr. Carnegie is mistaken when he says that Governor Flower, as "an influential leader in the House," assisted him. I know just as well that he is mistaken in what he says about Senator Gorman as I do know that he is mistaken in what he said about Governor Flower.

The statement proceeds further to say that Mr. Carnegie wrote out the steel schedule, and Senator Gorman incorporated it in the Wilson bill exactly as Mr. Carnegie had prepared it. I waive the reflection upon the members of the committee, though I do not believe that the Finance Committee would have permitted Mr. Carnegie to write its schedule. The Democratic portion of the committee was composed of Daniel W. Voorhees, of Indiana; John R. McPherson, of New Jersey, who was sick and absent and whose place on the committee was filled by the Hon. Roger Q. Mills, who was, as I recall it, designated by special resolution of the Senate to act in the absence of the New Jersey Senator. Also on that committee was the late Isham G. Harris, of Tennessee; the late Senator Vance, of North Carolina; the late Senator Vest, of Missouri; and the late Senator James K. Jones, of Arkansas; and Senator Gorman was not even a member of the Finance Committee at that time.

Therefore Mr. Carnegie's recollection must be at fault, unless, indeed, we assume that the members of that committee would have permitted Senator Gorman to take from the hands of Mr. Carnegie a tariff schedule which he had prepared and that they would write it in the bill at Mr. Gorman's request.

It happens, Mr. President, that but one Democrat who served on that committee then is living to-day. He is a distinguished citizen of my own State, and although I have not always been able to agree with him on political questions, I pay him the tribute to say that no living man could have made Roger Q. Mills accept a tariff schedule written by Mr. Andrew Carnegie. I think I owe it to Senator Gorman, and I think I owe it to the other Democrats, to incorporate this statement in the RECORD.

Senator Gorman has in many places been held responsible for many of the matters that appeared in that bill with which the public was never quite content, and he has been represented as the man who prevented the framing of a bill acceptable to the Democratic masses of the country. There never was a greater injustice done any man, living or dead.

I happened once to be at a conference where there were assembled a number of Democrats charged with the responsibility of that bill, and I remember that Senator Gorman said to them:

> Gentlemen, I am ready to vote for the bill whenever you call the roll. I am simply trying to adjust the differences between my Democratic colleagues, if I can; and if you choose to call the roll to-morrow, I will vote for it. But I warn you there are others who will not.

And while he did exert his great talents and occupy himself day and night in an effort to reconcile the differences which existed, he was the one man in this Chamber who never threatened to assist in the defeat of that bill.

As to the particular question of iron ore, Mr. Gorman was not the Senator who insisted upon that. The Senators from Alabama—Senators Morgan and Pugh—were the ones who demanded a duty upon iron ore. There sat in this Chamber yesterday afternoon while I was addressing the body an ex-Member of the Senate who was a Senator in 1894, and he said to a Senator who sat beside him that the Senators from Alabama demanded the duty on iron ore, and the Senator to whom he made that statement now sits before me.

A Senator now near me heard one of the Senators from Alabama say that he would not vote for the bill unless a duty was laid on iron ore. I do not doubt that he meant it when he said that, though I have always doubted if he would have done it had he been put to the test. But if any man can be criticised for that provision, it is my duty to relieve the memory of Senator Gorman from the aspersion. He was my friend, and I do not hesitate to say, here and elsewhere, that I felt honored by his confidence and his friendship. I came here a very young man, and I found him always a wise counselor, but never a selfish one. His political methods were not what I had been taught to practice; but, sir, whatever of question there could have been about them, his methods were always employed on behalf of the Democratic party, and never for the benefit of Arthur P. Gorman.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I certainly had no disposition yesterday or at any other time to do any injustice either to the living or the dead. I have always remembered, and I have always practiced, the maxim that noble spirits war not with the dead. It was my own recollection that Governor Flower was not a Member of the House at that time. I was not distinct in that memory.

So far as what Mr. Carnegie said with reference to Senator Gorman, of course I had no way of verifying his statement. I do regard it as somewhat exceptional, as my remarks on yesterday abundantly proved. I stated then that I would have Mr. Carnegie's statement printed for whatever it was worth, and that every Senator could accept it or reject it in response to his own judgment.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] has called attention to this magazine article. The rules of the Senate forbid Senators from ascribing motives to Members of the body. There certainly ought to be a feeling on the part of every Member of the Senate about presenting and having published in the RECORD of this body any article written by responsible or irresponsible parties ascribing motives to those who have left us.

I knew Arthur P. Gorman as well as any man. I served with him in this body for nearly twenty years, and I know that whatever his opinions were and whatever his acts were, they were his own opinions and his own acts. He did not attempt to legislate at the suggestion or the dictation of any man, especially any man whose interests ran, perhaps, counter to the interests of the public generally.

I am very glad the Senator from Texas has called this matter to the attention of the Senate, and I hope that there will be no further insertion of articles in the RECORD ascribing motives to dead Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Rhode Island a question or two. He is proposing to increase the duties by the amendment pending on blasting caps and mining and blasting fuses, increasing them not only above the House bill and above the bill as first reported to the Senate, but above the Dingley law.

Mr. President, the last statement was not wholly correct, but partly so. It is proposed, as I understand the amendment, to increase the duty on mining and blasting fuses above the Dingley law. The Dingley law imposed 35 per cent; the House bill continued 35 per cent; and the Senate committee proposed in the first instance to reduce it to 30 per cent; and now it is proposed to raise it to 40 per cent. In the case of blasting caps the Dingley law was $2.36 per thousand. Both the House bill and the Senate committee bill as first reported fixed the duty at $2 per thousand. It is now proposed to make it $2.25 per thousand.

Mr. President, I see that in 1897 the amount of duties collected on blasting caps was a little over $14,000, and on the fuses mentioned about $4,000. The importations were very

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Also, a bill (H. R. 11116) granting an increase of pension to Henderson Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11117) granting an increase of pension to William S. Gregory—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11118) granting an increase of pension to Laban McGahan—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11119) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Gilbert—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11120) granting an honorable discharge to William Bush—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11121) granting an honorable discharge to John Thacker—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11122) granting an honorable discharge to Benjamin H. Pruett—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11123) granting an honorable discharge to Charles Abbott—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11124) to correct the military record of Capt. John C. Wilson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 11125) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Brooks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOULDEN: A bill (H. R. 11126) for the relief of Theodore Schroeter—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. McCALL: A bill (H. R. 11127) for the relief of J. Hovey Rand—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PATTERSON: A bill (H. R. 11128) granting a pension to Ernest E. Pearsall—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 11129) for the relief of Ramon Hernandez—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. YOUNG of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 11130) granting an increase of pension to Staford Oatman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Petition of Chicago (Ill.) Association of Commerce, composed of 3,000 firms, corporations, and individuals, protesting against legislation to tax the net income of corporations while omitting individuals and copartnerships engaged in competitive lines of business—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania: Petition of Mrs. R. Le Grant and other citizens of Pittsburg, Pa., against the increase of duty on women's gloves—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Petition of numerous cigar makers' unions of the State of Florida, against free cigars from the Philippine Islands—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANNA: Petition of citizens of Lisbon, N. Dak., against a parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HILL: Petition of Chamber of Commerce, New Haven, Conn., favoring an expert tariff commission—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Petition of W. H. Ragan and others, against placing engraved portrait of Jefferson Davis on silver service of the battle ship *Mississippi*—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. JOYCE: Petition of citizens of Frazeysburg, Ohio, against a parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. LOVERING: Petition of Brockton Printing Pressmen and Assistants' Union, No. 102, against the duty on print paper and wood pulp and against the tariff bill as it relates to the printing industry—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Petition of Hat Makers' Beneficial Association, Americo Vespucci Circle, for adoption of October 12 as a holiday, to be known as "Columbus Day"—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENRY W. PALMER: Petition of Plains Council, No. 660, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring enactment of anti-Asiatic immigration legislation—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. RUCKER of Colorado: Petitions of Chamber of Commerce of Rifle, Delta County Business Men's Association, Olathe Chamber of Commerce, Colorado Springs Chamber of Commerce, all in the State of Colorado, against any reduction of the tariff on sugar—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Denver Chamber of Commerce and Board of Trade, against reduction of duty on lead ore and lead products—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Denver Live Stock Exchange, favoring retention of the 15 per cent duty on hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Left Hand Grange, No. 9, of Minot, Colo., for a nonpartisan tariff commission—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Ramon H. Fernandez—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SPERRY: Resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce of New Haven, Conn., favoring the creation of a tariff commission—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Petition of chambers of commerce of Rifle, Olathe, and Plateau City, all of the State of Colorado, favoring retention of present rate of duty on sugar—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEEKS: Petition of directors of the Boston Chamber of Commerce, against federal tax on earnings of corporations—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *June 29, 1909.*

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a memorial of the Retail Grocers' Association of Brooklyn, N. Y., remonstrating against the assertion that the retail dealers of the country are responsible for the prevailing high-priced commodities, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. JONES presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Seattle, Wash., praying that an annual appropriation of $50,000,000 be made for the improvement of the waterways and harbors of the country, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. OLIVER presented a petition of North Orwell Grange, No. 128, Patrons of Husbandry, of Bradford County, Pa., praying for the retention of the duty on oleomargarine, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PILES presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Seattle, Wash., praying that an annual appropriation of $50,000,000 be made for the improvement of the waterways and harbors of the country, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

IMPRISONMENT OF NAVAJO INDIANS.

Mr. OWEN. I present the memorial of S. M. Brosius, on behalf of the Indian Rights Association, relative to the decision of the supreme court of Arizona in the habeas corpus proceedings instituted by that association on behalf of certain imprisoned Navajo Indians, and so forth. I ask that the memorial be printed as a document and also that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorial was ordered to be printed as a document (S. Doc. No. 118) and in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 28, 1909.*

To the Senate of the United States:

On behalf of the Indian Rights Association, I inclose as a memorial the decree of the supreme court of Arizona, with accompanying papers, in the matter of the petition by Bi-a-lil-le and other Navajo Indians for a writ of habeas corpus. These Indians have been imprisoned for one year and eight months and subjected to hard labor, upon approval of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, without a charge having been filed against them in any court of law, without benefit of counsel or proceeding by due course of law.

The decision in this case marks an epoch, guaranteeing to the red man those rights secured to our forefathers by Magna Charta.

Very respectfully,

S. M. BROSIUS,
Agent Indian Rights Association.

IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT TRIAL.

INDIAN RIGHTS ASSOCIATION,
709 PROVIDENT BUILDING,
Philadelphia, April 15, 1909.

For the information of our members and the general public, we give below a decision recently rendered by the Arizona supreme court in the habeas corpus proceedings instituted by this association on behalf of certain Navajos who were imprisoned, as we contend, without warrant of law by the arbitrary action of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs. We also append a reply by Doctor Grammer to the article in The Outlook of January 30, 1909, by Hon. F. E. Leupp, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, defending his "law or no law" method of dealing with the Indians, as enunciated by him at the Lake Mohonk conference in October, 1908.

This matter was taken up by the association because it was believed to be one of fundamental importance in dealing with Indians. We contend that the Indian is a person within the meaning of the Constitution and can not be deprived of his liberty "without due process of law." The court of first instance in Arizona denied the application for

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

a writ of habeas corpus. The association appealed the case to the territorial supreme court, where a unanimous opinion was rendered reversing the lower court. The department has announced its intention of appealing from this decision, and the case may yet be argued in the United States Supreme Court. Under these circumstances, while the matter may not be regarded as finally settled, it is deemed proper to acquaint our members with the case as far as it has been developed.

It is worthy of note that criticism upon the commissioner's action, which he treated as a proof of bias and captious opposition on the part of the critics, has been sustained as rightful by a weighty judiciary. It is worthy of mention that the criticism upon the commissioner's action, which has been justified by such an important judiciary, was stigmatized at the Mohonk conference by the commissioner himself as so clearly biased that he had to asperse the motive of those who made it. It is not too much to say that the commissioner's attitude of pronounced hostility to any suggestion or criticism is one of the great difficulties in the way of this association.

It should be noted that after the habeas corpus proceedings were begun six of the Indians were released by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs. Bi-a-lil-le and Polly are still held in confinement in default of $5,000 bail.

In the supreme court of the Territory of Arizona, No. 273.

In the matter of the application of Bi-a-lil-le and seven others for a writ of habeas corpus—Opinion.

Appeal from the district court of the second judicial district; Hon. Fletcher M. Doan, judge.

Mr. O. Gibson, for petitioners; Mr. J. L. B. Alexander, United States attorney, for the respondent.

Opinion by Nave, J.: A group of Navajo Indians under the leadership of Bi-a-lil-le threatened serious trouble upon the Navajo Reservation. Upon the representations of the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of War sent two troops of cavalry into the vicinity of the reservation to serve as a repressing influence upon the Indians. After a conference with the Indian agent, the officer in command of the troops determined it to be wise to arrest Bi-a-lil-le and certain of his companions. Accordingly, he made a night march to Bi-a-lil-le's camp and captured him and his immediate followers about daybreak the next morning. While this arrest was being made, the troops were fired upon by other Indians in the vicinity. The fire was returned. The casualties were two Indians killed and one wounded; except that a horse of one of the soldiers was killed. Upon the recommendation of the Secretary of the Interior, without a trial or hearing of any sort, Bi-a-lil-le and seven of his companions were transported to Fort Huachuca, Ariz., "where," to quote the Secretary of the Interior, "they are to be confined for an indefinite period at hard labor. They can be released whenever it may be deemed wise to do so, each case to be considered on its own merits. The time for the release of these prisoners has been left to the judgment of the war Department."

These Indians, setting up in detail the facts of which the foregoing statement is a brief abstract, and averring that their detention is unlawful, petitioned the district court of the second judicial district for a writ of habeas corpus directed to the commanding officer at Fort Huachuca to the end that they be discharged. The writ was denied, and from its denial petitioners have prosecuted this appeal. The contention of petitioners is that they are deprived of liberty without due process of law, in contravention of Article V of the amendments to the Constitution of the United States.

The detention of these Indians is supported by the respondent upon three contentions. One of these contentions is that it is authorized by the provisions of section 2149, Revised Statutes of the United States, which reads as follows:

"The Commissioner of Indian Affairs is authorized and required, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, to remove from any tribal reservation any person being therein without authority of law, or whose presence within the limits of the reservation may, in the judgment of the commissioner, be detrimental to the peace and welfare of the Indians; and may employ for the purpose such force as may be necessary to enable the agent to effect the removal of such person."

The inadequacy of this contention is self-evident. Authority to remove troublesome persons from a reservation does not imply authority to detain them in confinement after such removal; hence the detention of these Indians is not maintainable by reason of the provisions of this section or of any of its implications.

The second centention is that the facts disclosed the petitioners to be prisoners of war, and hence lawfully to be held in military custody. We do not infer, from the facts, that a state of war existed at the time of the apprehension of the petitioners, nor does it appear that it was or is the view of the Secretary of the Interior or of the Secretary of War that a state of war existed then, or exists now between the Indians and the United States. It affirmatively appears that, though in the custody of the War Department, these Indians are maintained at the expense of the Interior Department and are to be confined at hard labor for an indefinite period as a punishment to them and an object lesson to the rest of their tribe, in the language of the Secretary of the Interior, because they "have defied the Government and its authorities; they have impeded the progress of the other Ipdians in their efforts to improve and better their condition; they armed themselves, * * * threatened to kill any person or persons who molested them, and fired first upon United States troops in the discharge of their duty." Confinement at hard labor is a characteristic of the punishment of criminals and not, under the code of modern civilized warfare, an incident of the detention of prisoners of war. We do not assume that we have jurisdiction to interfere with the treatment accorded them, were they, in fact, prisoners of war; but we point to the fact of their confinement at hard labor as inconsistent with a theory that they are regarded by the executive departments as prisoners of war. The consideration and freedom from unnecessary restraint which, within our judicial knowledge, marked the detention of Spanish prisoners during our recent war and has marked the detention, as prisoners of war, of Geronimo and his band of Apaches, warrant, as fully as our patriotic pride also demands, that we attribute to the executive departments the most enlightened chivalry in their attitude toward prisoners of war. It is manifest that petitioners are not prisoners of war.

As a third contention, it is urged with great earnestness that the Indians are but wards of the Government and therefore are subject to administrative correction of their conduct as are other wards to the correction of their guardians; that the disposition which has been made of these Indians is pursuant to a long-followed policy of the departments of the Interior and of War; and that it is highly salutary in safeguarding the relations of the Indians to the Government and to their white neighbors, and, indeed, among themselves. However salutary in its results and desirable such a method of dealing with recalcitrant Indians may be, and however long such a system may have prevailed, it can not be sanctioned unless there is authority for it in the acts of Congress. Indians are not wards of the executive officers, but wards of the United States, acting through executive officers, it is true, but expressing its fostering will by legislation. We may pass as unnecessary to determine the question whether Congress may constitutionally vest in executive officers such summary authority as is here sought to be exercised. Our attention has not been directed to legislation expressly authorizing such summary methods. Comprehensive authority is conferred upon the President by sections 463 and 465, Revised Statutes of the United States, to control the conduct of Indian affairs by his regulations; but we do not find a general rule or regulation promulgated by or under the authority of the President applicable in this case.

The Supreme Court of the United States, in Bad Elk *v.* United States (177 U. S., 529), has held that an executive officer in the Indian Service has no authority to direct arrests in the absence of law, rule, or regulation authorizing such direction, and that the conduct of an Indian is not to be held misbehavior in the absence of a law, rule, or regulation so defining it. Among the necessary implications of that decision is that, there being no law, rule, or regulation defining what conduct of Indians shall be deemed reprehensible and subject them to correction, it does not rest in executive discretion to administer corrective punishment. We deem this conclusion inevitable and determinative of this case, irrespective of the question whether such summary discipline might be sustained if pursuant to a rule or regulation.

The position of these particular petitioners, members of the Navajo tribe, is fortified by one of the stipulations of the treaty between the United States and the Navajos, which is as follows:

"If bad men among the Indians shall commit a wrong or depredation upon the person or property of anyone, white, black, or Indian, subject to the authority of the United States and at peace therewith, the Navajo tribe agree that they will, on proof made to their agent and on notice by him, deliver up the wrongdoer to the United States, to be tried and punished according to its laws." (Art. I, treaty of June 1, 1868. 15 Stat. L., 667.)

This stipulation amounts to a covenant that bad Indians shall not be punished by the United States except pursuant to laws defining their offense and prescribing the punishments therefor. While Congress by its legislation may disregard treaties, the executive branch of the Government may not do so.

The district court was in error in denying the writ of habeas corpus.

The proceedings in the court below were solely upon the petition. The United States attorney appeared on behalf of the United States and argued against the granting of the writ without filing a demurrer or other formal pleading. The trial judge rendered an opinion in writing, which appears as part of the record, in which we find it has been suggested by the court and agreed to by counsel that, in effect, "the ruling may be as though the writ had been granted and the applicants were here in person before the court. * * * If the writ should be granted by the court, the granting of the writ would be equivalent to the release of the applicants for the writ, and the writ will not be denied unless the court is satisfied from the hearing that the applicants would be remanded to the custody of those now having them in charge." The petition contains at full length what purport to be all of the proceedings of the departments of the Interior and of War, resulting in the detention of petitioners. In view of that fact, we construe the expression of the trial court as disclosing the stipulation that if the facts upon the petition disclose that petitioners are entitled to be discharged, the judgment of the court should be to discharge them. Therefore it will be adjudged that the judgment of the trial court be reversed and that the petitioners be discharged, with leave to the respondent, however, to present within fifteen days reasons, if any there be, why instead of discharging the petitioners we should remand the cause with direction to the trial court to grant the writ.

FREDERICK S. NAVE,
Associate Justice.

We concur:
EDWARD KENT, *Chief Justice.*
RICHARD E. SLOAN, *Associate Justice.*
JOHN H. CAMPBELL, *Associate Justice.*

SUPREME COURT,
Territory of Arizona, ss:

I, F. A. Tritle, jr., clerk of the supreme court of the Territory of Arizona, do hereby certify the foregoing to be a full, true, and correct copy of the opinion rendered by said supreme court on the 20th day of March, A. D. 1909, in the matter of the application of Bi-a-lil-le and seven others for a writ of habeas corpus.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of said court this 25th day of March, A. D. 1909, at Phoenix, Ariz.

[SEAL.] F. A. TRITLE, Jr.,
Clerk Supreme Court of Arizona.

In the supreme court of the Territory of Arizona, No. 273.

In the matter of the application of Bi-a-lil-le and seven others for a writ of habeas corpus.

At this day respondent gave notice of appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States, and moved the court that applicants be held on bail until the determination of the appeal by the Supreme Court of the United States under rule 34 of said Supreme Court, and it was ordered by the court that the notice of appeal be noted and that applicants be each enlarged in the sum of $5,000; and it was

Further ordered that respondent may have leave to withdraw its notice of appeal upon application to the Chief Justice therefor.

SUPREME COURT,
Territory of Arizona, ss:

I, F. A. Tritle, jr., clerk of the supreme court of the Territory of Arizona, do hereby certify the foregoing to be a full, true, and correct copy of the order made and entered by said supreme court on the 20th day of March, A. D. 1909, in the matter of the application of Bi-a-lil-le and seven others for a writ of habeas corpus, admitting applicants to bail.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of said court this 25th day of March, A. D. 1909, at Phoenix, Ariz.

[SEAL.] F. A. TRITLE, Jr.,
Clerk Supreme Court of Arizona.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Question of "law or no law" in treatment of the Indians.

REPLY OF THE INDIAN RIGHTS ASSOCIATION TO COMMISSIONER LEUPP'S SURPRISING ASSERTION.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Republican, March 15, 1909.]

To the editor of the Republican:

The question raised by Commissioner Leupp in his article on "Law or no law in Indian administration," in The Outlook of January 30, is of fundamental importance. The Indian Rights Association has undertaken to test the validity of his conclusion as to the relation of an executive agent to the law by an appeal to the courts; but it is eminently desirable that the public, who read the commissioner's vehement explanation, should know the issues involved. They are much larger than the question whether the commissioner was misrepresented by those who quoted his own words, "law or no law," as the keynote of his remarks about the Navajo Indians. But we must not fall into the custom which, according to Freeman, spoils so much historical writing, and content ourselves with allusions instead of telling a plain tale. The commissioner began his explanatory statement with the Mohonk conference, but the controversy can not be understood without going further back and beginning at the beginning.

In October, 1907, William T. Shelton, superintendent of the Eastern Navajo Reservation, Shiprock, N. Mex., requested that cavalry be sent into his reservation to arrest a troublesome Navajo named Bi-a-lil-le, that he might be confined long enough to show that the time for bad men was past; or, if this were not thought expedient, that the troops might be stationed in the vicinity of Bi-a-lil-le's camp long enough to give the Indian police courage. The more drastic of the two methods was chosen. The cavalry surrounded the Indians' hogans at daylight, and arrested Bi-a-lil-le and his men. There was some shooting by the soldiers and on the part of some Indians in the vicinity, though not by the prisoners, and two Indians were killed by shots in the back. A search of all the hogans only brought to light three old rifles, one Colt's revolver, and several knives. Such a lack of warlike equipment suggests that the milder remedy of camping in the vicinity by the troops would probably have been sufficient to overawe the Indians and reduce their spirits to the necessary subordination. Still, it is easier to discern the right course in the light of experience, and there is here no controversy over the killing of these Indians and the arrest of the band. They had been made to feel most unmistakably the power of the Government, and it might have seemed that they had been sufficiently schooled. If it was not thought wise to allow them to remain on the reservation, the superintendent had the undoubted authority to remove them, or if he was unwilling to set them at liberty in new scenes, he might have brought them into court. Western courts are not generally weakly indulgent to the red man. Neither of these lines of action, however, was taken. Without the decree of any court, martial or civil, Bi-a-lil-le and seven other Indians were incarcerated, with the approval of the commissioner, in a military prison in Arizona, at hard labor for an indeterminate period.

At the conference at Lake Mohonk, last October, Mr. Leupp tells us that he was intensely indignant when he heard that a resolution was to be offered that would test the sense of the conference upon such imprisonment without trial. The commissioner is obliged to admit that in his vehement anticipatory defense he said that he would take such measures if he thought the public safety required it, "law or no law." This language does not appear in the report, and the commissioner withdraws it as too crude and unqualified. Still, he claims that his character for clemency and fairness is so well known that it should have protected him from misconstruction. So, if he is obliged to confess that he spake unadvisedly with his lips, he also feels it necessary to charge his critics with "dishonesty" and "malice." After learning the facts and reading this explanation, most people will probably agree that the blunt and pointed expression that he withdraws describes his attitude very fairly. After all, the point of language is of minor importance. The main points are Mr. Leupp's attitude toward those who differ from him and his theory of the relation of the law to the public welfare.

The commissioner asserts with pride that his policy of treating Indian offenders in a state of barbarism by dealing out justice according to his own personal views has justified itself by its success, on the principle that "the proof of the pudding is the eating." No one, however, can read his passionate article, with its charges upon his critics of "malice," "dishonesty," "paltering," "vituperation," and "angry clamor," without realizing that his theory has made our commissioner a very lofty personage, who is inclined to regard any difference of opinion about the legality of his acts as a proof of moral obliquity. So far is he from inviting scrutiny and welcoming an interchange of opinion, that the very idea of the expression of criticism filled him with indignation, as he confesses in his case. Yet, if the Indian Commissioner has the right to put Indians in prison without trial, simply upon his own judgment that a prison is the best place for them, such a tremendous power ought to be carefully watched, and such a conference as Mohonk might well interest itself in the wisdom with which such extraordinary authority was exercised.

Indian agents, through whom he must gain his information, are but fallible men; and it was no less a person than Lincoln who said that no man could safely be trusted with absolute power over another. Indian agents are not a class of men who, according to the opinion of them expressed by President Roosevelt in a recent message, can wisely be allowed to feel themselves exempt from criticism. Even if the criticism should prove mistaken, the discussion could hardly fail to do good. It was, however, resented deeply by Mr. Leupp, and is characterized in scathing terms. His known kindness and clemency, he holds, should have prevented anyone from regarding the imprisonment of Indians for sixteen months without trial as an act of oppression. This is certainly a great claim.

There are, however, many who believe that the law of the land is a better defense of our rights than the kindly temper of our officials. Indeed, it is the deepest source of our controversy with the commissioner that on his statement at Mohonk and in his treatment of these Indians he shows an inadequate sense of the value of law as a means of securing the public weal. He ignores the courts. His theory is that the public safety is to take precedence of the public safeguards. This mistake lay at the bottom of the worst excesses of the French Revolution. To quote Lord Morley:

"Couthon laid the theoretic basis [of the infamous law of Twenty-second Prairial] in a fallacy that must always be full of seduction to shallow persons in authority: 'He who would subordinate the public safety to the inventions of jurisconsults and to the formulas of the courts is either an imbecile or a scoundrel.' As if the public safety could mean anything but the safety of the public! 'All becomes legitimate and even virtuous,' Helvetius had written, 'on behalf of the public safety.' But Rousseau was wiser in his marginal note: 'The public safety is nothing unless the individual enjoys security.'"

Have we not an example of Couthon's fallacy in the commissioner's article in the Outlook, when he writes: "The mere technical definition of the rights of any person under the law is always subordinate to the question of the social order?" What better way is there of teaching an Indian the greatness of the law than by showing that it can save as well as punish? How can the social order be better preserved than in the exaltation of the law? Bi-a-lil-le and Polly, with their companions, in prison for sixteen months, knotting on a cord the days of their imprisonment at the discretion of a distant commissioner, will hardly agree that the right to liberty or a fair trial comes under the head of a "mere technical definition."

In spite of the warnings of the commissioner of possible evils in consequence of the liberation of these men, the Indian Rights Association applied for a writ of habeas corpus. The court of first instance denied the application, but the denial was anticipated. Nevertheless, something has been accomplished, since six of the prisoners have since been released. An appeal has been taken in behalf of the other two, and the friends of order and liberty will not rest until, if necessary, the Supreme Court of the United States has decided whether or not Indians are persons within the meaning of the article of the Constitution that declares that no person (except certain classes in which Indians are not included) shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. Of one thing we may be absolutely certain, and that is that the greatest tribunal in the world, as Bryce has taught us to call it, will give no countenance to the doctrine, so fruitful of tyranny and injustice, that the law can be safely ignored if in the judgment of an official its restraints stand in the way of the public welfare.

CARL E. GRAMMER,
President of the Indian Rights Association.

PHILADELPHIA, *March 1, 1909.*

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, June 22, 1909.

SIR: In accordance with your oral request to be informed of the action of the department in the matter of the prosecution of the appeal in the Supreme Court in the case of Bi-a-lil-le and others, petitioners for a writ of habeas corpus, I beg to say that after careful consideration of the matter the Government has decided not to prosecute the appeal. Instructions have to-day been given to the United States attorney for Arizona, by wire, to ask leave of the chief justice of the supreme court of Arizona, in accordance with an order of that court, to withdraw notice of the appeal; also instructing him to have the petitioners discharged from custody at once, and stating that this department has requested the Secretary of the Interior to arrange, by wire, to have the petitioners restored to their homes in the Navajo Reservation at government expense.

Respectfully,

LLOYD W. BOWERS,
Acting Attorney-General.

S. M. BROSIUS, Esq.,
Agent Indian Rights Association,
McGill Building, Washington, D. C.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan:

A bill (S. 2787) to discontinue suit in United States court against James C. Eslow, surety; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 2788) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of William H. Smith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2789) granting a pension to Catherine O'Keefe;

A bill (S. 2790) granting a pension to Emeline Fields;

A bill (S. 2791) granting an increase of pension to Gardner B. Clark;

A bill (S. 2792) granting an increase of pension to J. A. Stephenson;

A bill (S. 2793) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Eding; and

A bill (S. 2794) granting a pension to Katherine Van Strate (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TALIAFERRO:

A bill (S. 2795) granting an increase of pension to Nicholas Graddick (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BOURNE:

A bill (S. 2796) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Thomas (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GUGGENHEIM:

A bill (S. 2797) granting an increase of pension to Josephine S. Jones (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan:

A bill (S. 2798) granting an increase of pension to Jesse Gray; to the Committee on Pensions.

AMENDMENTS TO THE TARIFF BILL.

Mr. BURTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States,

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. DICK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

THE TARIFF.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed, and the first bill on the calendar will be proceeded with.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes.

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

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Aldrich	Chamberlain	Frye	Page
Bacon	Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Perkins
Bailey	Crane	Heyburn	Piles
Beveridge	Cullom	Hughes	Scott
Borah	Cummins	Johnson, N. Dak.	Shively
Brandegee	Curtis	Johnston, Ala.	Simmons
Briggs	Daniel	Jones	Smith, Mich.
Bristow	Davis	Kean	Smith, S. C.
Brown	Dick	Lodge	Smoot
Burkett	Dillingham	McCumber	Sutherland
Burnham	Dixon	Nixon	Taliaferro
Burrows	Fletcher	Oliver	Taylor
Burton	Flint	Overman	Tillman
Carter	Foster	Owen	Warner

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Fifty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum of the Senate is present.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I want to ask permission to place upon the record a statement.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. DAVIS] was detained from the Senate by the death of his wife, and not being able to return because of the demands made at home, he requested that during his absence he be paired in favor of free lumber, free wood pulp, free hides, free iron ore, and generally for free raw materials. It not being customary to make this announcement as the votes were taken from time to time, I failed to make any announcement of the matter, although he desired to have it done. I merely wish to have it placed on record so that his position in the matter might not be misunderstood.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution reported from the Committee on Finance yesterday, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which shall authorize the levying of a tax on incomes.

Mr. ALDRICH. I am quite willing to have that done, provided it can be agreed upon that there shall be no debate.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Indiana rises to a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Unanimous consent having been given, can that unanimous consent be displaced by a subsequent unanimous consent? I think that question has been raised four or five times in the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair would suppose that it could, of course.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I should like to know the opinion of the Senator from Maine and the Senator from New Hampshire about that matter. The question has been discussed here four or five times as to whether or not a unanimous consent having been entered into subsequently it could be destroyed or modified by a unanimous consent.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair would think that the Senate could take any action it desired at any time by unanimous consent.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I do not concur in the view that a unanimous consent once granted can be set aside. I do not think the Senator from Nebraska would ask that, or any other Senator. I think when a Senator gets unanimous consent he can at least be sure that that will not be set aside. That is one of the things which I think the Senate could not do. But it is at the most an understanding, and that understanding one Senator might say would interfere with a unanimous consent or violate its spirit at least; another might not. But in view of the fact that the Senator from Nebraska always voted not to settle this income-tax question until these schedules were finished, he will have to take his own course. I object.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Objection is made.

Mr. BROWN. I have no desire to press it. I simply wanted to give the Senate an opportunity, if it was willing at this time, to get the Constitution out of the question for future days at least. It seemed to me that the friends of an income-tax law, and its enemies as well, could find no objection to remitting to the States an opportunity to give Congress the undoubted power to pass a law that would be valid after it was passed. But it need not be considered now. I do not press it.

Mr. BAILEY. Of course quite a number of us here think that is not necessary, and yet would not object to doing an unnecessary thing, provided we were sure it was not a hurtful thing. At any rate, I think the entire question ought to be considered together. I should myself prefer to pass an income-tax bill or amendment, and then if any Senator doubted the constitutionality of it, I would relieve his doubts by passing the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nebraska or any other suitable amendment. But I hardly think we ought to discuss that until we find what we are going to do about the other. I hope the Senator will let the matter go until then.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Upon the general parliamentary question which I addressed to the Chair, I think it has been the practice in the Senate always where a unanimous consent is entered upon that it could not afterwards be destroyed by a subsequent unanimous consent, the reason being the very fact that there might be different people there; that the men who had agreed to the unanimous consent in the first place, and relying upon it, might be away in committee rooms and at work, or elsewhere, and there would be a unanimous consent obtained later which would destroy that one, and to any Members of the Senate who believed that the original unanimous consent was operative and relied upon that unanimous consent an injustice would be done. I think that has been practically the practice in the Senate.

Mr. CULLOM. I call for the regular order.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I merely take a moment now to call attention to it, because, as a matter of fact, it is a parliamentary question which we ought to have the Chair to rule upon.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair understood that it was practically a moot question, and therefore simply announced his impression without making a distinct ruling.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Unanimous consent, of course, being something for the Senate itself to determine after it has so agreed, there ought not to be any wrong impression about the unanimous consent. Of course, a unanimous consent is not binding as a parliamentary proposition at all. Any Senator who sees fit to do so can at any time violate a matter of unanimous consent. It is a matter of his own conscience. But the rule of the Senate has been that when a unanimous consent has been entered into it can not subsequently be modified or destroyed by a unanimous consent.

Mr. CULLOM. I call for the regular order.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, agreeing in the main——

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. TILLMAN. I just wanted to discuss the proposition in one sentence. I am not a parliamentarian, but I have great faith in common sense. While I agree with the contention of the Senator from Indiana as to there being a possible absence of men who agreed to a unanimous consent once, whose rights would be invaded if it was afterwards changed, the Senator himself will not deny that the entire Senate can always change a unanimous consent. In other words, whenever a man who was present at the preceding session when a unanimous consent was given is there and the roll shows that every Senator is in his place, it is utterly absurd to say that the Senate can not change the unanimous consent.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. It is more absurd in appearance than in reality. A sufficient answer to that is what I believe has been the unbroken practice of the Senate. Otherwise a unanimous consent, which has no legislative binding at all, but only a binding upon the honorable understanding of Senators, might be made absolutely worthless.

Mr. TILLMAN. In that case the Senate would be binding itself to something it could not undo. It would be like a law of the Medes and Persians.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Of course, as I said two or three times, any Senator can violate a unanimous consent from a parliamentary point of view.

Mr. TILLMAN. But only the whole Senate can change a unanimous consent.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. It is binding in honor only as an understanding among Senators; but once entered into, as a matter of fact no Senator ever violates it, and as a matter of practice it never has been violated.

Mr. TILLMAN. Unless the whole Senate were present at the time.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

of the protectionist has always been to cut off, or at least to restrict, competition. If tea is too high because of the fact that importers have combined for the purpose of running up the price, the way to combat that is to leave unrestricted the importation of tea, and competition is calculated to reduce the price of it, as it is the price of any other article.

Besides that, the sharper the competition the better the article sold and the cheaper the price. On the contrary, the advocates of this protective duty, especially in this instance, and I believe in many other instances, contend that the less the competition the better the article and the cheaper the price. It does not need anything more than the statement of the proposition to refute it. Its statement is its best refutation. How long would it take, if it were possible, out of the 15,000-pound tea industry in this country now, to develop a large producing industry, until there would be a tea trust in this country, just as there is a shoe trust and a steel trust and other trusts that afflict the country? I do not believe in the doctrine of protection——

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. McLAURIN. I do.

Mr. TILLMAN. Does the Senator think it is possible to have a cotton trust in this country?

Mr. McLAURIN. No; I do not.

Mr. TILLMAN. Because it is produced upon each farm, and the tea will have to be produced in small quantities on each farm, and therefore the possibility of a trust in tea is absurd.

Mr. McLAURIN. It may be absurd to the Senator from South Carolina. A great many things are absurd to that Senator. I think probably everything that does not strike into his mind at first blush is absurd to that Senator. But I do not regard it as absurd, Mr. President, and I do not think that in his time or in my time there will be any production of tea such as there is of cotton.

I did not intend to say this much, and had I not been interrupted I would not have said it. I merely intended when I rose to ask for the insertion of the letter which has been put into the RECORD.

I shall not vote for this amendment; but I am going to move now an amendment to the amendment to insert the word "five" where the word "ten" is.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, it seems to me there should be no difficulty in any Senator arriving at a vote on the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina. As I understand the title of the bill now before the Senate, it is "An act to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes." This amendment, in the first place, is a revenue producer and in full line with the title of the bill.

In the second place it is a protection to an American industry, and an infant industry at that. It seems to me that our Democratic brethren should have no hesitation in arriving at their conclusion, if they see fit, with a view to producing revenue, and it seems to me my Republican brethren should have no difficulty in arriving at a conclusion on the ground that we are protecting an American industry.

So far as I am concerned, I shall vote for this amendment upon the theory of protection. The protection of industries in the West, in the East, and all through this country is Republican doctrine, and I want to see this doctrine extended to the people of the South. I want to see the time come when we will not be dependent upon foreign nations for the tea we buy, or rather the filth we buy, at their own prices, and I hope that the Republicans in the Senate will see fit, one and all, to cast their votes in favor of this amendment; and if our Democratic brethren want to call it something else, let them call it something else, but let us pass this amendment substantially with unanimity.

I want to see it passed, because I believe it is right, and it would be a great pleasure to me to cast my vote in favor of a measure which is suggested by my distinguished friend the Senator from the State of South Carolina.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I am utterly opposed to this amendment. I am opposed to it for the same reason that I would be opposed to raising the revenues of the United States by a poll tax. It is a tax upon the common people almost as harsh in its operation as would be a poll tax.

I have in my mind a letter by Mr. W. J. Buttfield, of New York, of June 21, 1909, submitting an argument in favor of this proposition, in which he states as a reason that this tax will come out of the retailer and not out of the consumer, on the ground that these teas, which cost only from 15 to 18 cents, are retailed at from 50 to 75 cents a pound.

Mr. BRADLEY. Will the Senator from Oklahoma suffer an interruption?

Mr. OWEN. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY. I should like to know how the Senator can reconcile his position on this matter with his vote on the question of oil.

Mr. OWEN. The Senator's interruption I will answer now, although its obvious purpose is to interrupt and confuse the argument which I was making, and therefore is not a proper or a courteous interruption. The Senate has too often seen this character of interruption, and against it I enter my emphatic protest. A Senator is almost obliged, as a matter of courtesy, to yield to an interruption, but when the interruption is for the purpose of distracting his argument, leading it to one side and making abortive the attempt of the speaker to make a point, I regard the interruption as entirely improper and unjustified.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President——

Mr. OWEN. I yield again to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BRADLEY. May I say a word?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. OWEN. With pleasure.

Mr. BRADLEY. I want to say that it was far from my purpose to be discourteous to the Senator from Oklahoma. I simply could not understand how that matter was. I did not mean any harm by it; but I supposed the reason of it is that Oklahoma is interested in oil and South Carolina is interested in tea.

Mr. OWEN. I understand perfectly well the spirit of the interruption, and while I am willing to accord to the Senator a genial good purpose in that interruption, his suggested explanation of my position I will answer now. I stood for a tax on oil because I believed the importation from Mexico was threatening this country on a vast scale. I believed it would be used by the most gigantic trust in this country to break down the independent producer and the independent refiner. I voted for a tax on oil because if the import on a large scale of Mexican oil did become an agency of oppression of the independent competitor in the hands of a giant monopoly, such import would at least be abated to the extent of being compelled to pay a revenue tax to the United States Treasury.

That is a very different proposition from this case, proposing to tax the people of the United States $9,000,000, on the theory of the proponents, for the purpose of protecting an infant industry, which, by the very figures of its advocates, giving the retail price of 70 cents a pound for tea imported at the price of 18 cents a pound, shows that there is already a protection of over 50 cents a pound between the import price and the retail price.

What more protection is needed than the protection now afforded by the monopolistic prices of this great tea combination, which is a well-recognized trust? Since that margin is so very large for the tea producer, I think he will suffer no harm.

What I believe to be the policy of this Government is to raise the revenue from those who can best afford it, and there are many sources of income from those who can better afford it than the man who drinks tea. I should be glad ordinarily to support my colleague. I have almost always found myself in accord with him; and in this case, where his interest in a local industry has led him to favor this matter, I shall not criticise him. He thinks it will serve the purpose of his State and of the country and will raise a large volume of revenue. I shall not criticise him, but I do propose to put on the record my emphatic protest against raising the revenues by this character of tax. I am opposed to it for the same reason that I would oppose a tax upon coffee—because it is so universally used. I am opposed to it because I do not believe it is needed; and if I did think it was needed, I should still oppose it, because I think it would be better to let the people who make tea at 10 cents a day continue at that business rather than to have the people of this country engage in competition with low-priced imported tea and low-priced labor of that character, when they could be better employed in more profitable labor.

I will submit this letter of Mr. A. J. Buttfield as a part of my remarks, entering my emphatic dissent from the argument which it contains, and using his facts as he represents them to be as a sufficient justification of my objection.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

The letter referred to is as follows:

TEA.

Summary of facts submitted to the Senate of the United States relative to the proposed duty on tea.

There is but little relation between import costs and retail prices of tea in the United States.

Sworn and other undisputed evidence shows that:

Sold by—	United States retail price per pound.	United States import value per pound.
Five different teas, Great Atlantic and Pacific Tea Co.	[a]$0.72	$0.16
Nine different teas, Grand Union Tea Co.	.71½	.16
Imperial tea, Grand Union Tea Co.	1.00	.17
Gunpowder tea, Grand Union Tea Co.	.60	.16
English breakfast tea, Grand Union Tea Co.	.50	.11
Do.	.40	.11
White Rose brand, Seaman Brothers, of New York.	.60	.12
Salada brand, Salada Tea Co., of Canada.	.60	[b].15
Lipton's best grade, Lipton & Co., of England.	.80	[c].18
Lipton's lowest grade, Lipton & Co., of England.	.60	[d].17
Tetley & Co. brand, Tetley & Co., of England.	.80	.18½
All tea imported by the United States average about.	.60	.32½
All tea imported by England average about.		

[a] Average.
[b] Retailed in Canada at 40 cents.
[c] Retailed in England after paying 10 cents tax at 42 cents.
[d] Retailed in England after paying 10 cents tax at 34 cents.

NOTE.—The first two-named companies are the largest retailers of bulk tea in the United States and the other four are the largest sellers of packet teas.

Retail prices in the United States are not affected by tariff.

The Grand Union Tea Company (the largest retailers of tea in the United States) retailed their teas while duty was in force at from 40 cents to 75 cents per pound; after duty was removed at from 40 cents to $1 per pound.

This company sells no teas under 40 cents.

Seeman Brothers, vice-presidents of the association formed to combat a duty on tea, advertise that price and quality of their teas will remain unchanged "tariff or no tariff." This firm stated to the Ways and Means Committee this year that it is the largest American distributer of "packet" teas.

One-half of a duty on tea was, and will be, paid by the foreign producer. Of the remaining 50 per cent a considerable amount will be paid by foreigners retailing tea in this country without contributing to its support, and the balance will be deducted from the retailers' excessive profits.

This was the testimony before Congress in 1897, again in 1902, and is also confirmed by the Hon. SERENO E. PAYNE, in his statement before the House, April 7, 1909. The price of "medium" Japan teas advanced from 19/21 yen in 1901 to 27/29 yen in 1903, and to 29/31 yen in 1908. The average cost of all teas imported into the United States in 1902 was 12.4 cents; in 1904, 16.1 cents; and in 1908, 17.1 cents.

R. Fukao, agent of the Osaha Shosen Kaisha, stated in the San Francisco News last month that if an 8-cent duty was levied on tea, Japan would be compelled to pay $2,000,000 of same. This is exactly one-half of such a duty on the 50,000,000 pounds annually exported to the United States from Japan and Formosa.

Consular Report No. 3491, dated May 26, 1909, states that one Japan tea district alone was petitioning their Government for a subsidy of $1,000,000, due to the fear of a United States tariff on tea.

A duty on tea will not be paid by the ultimate consumer. It will encourage consumption by discouraging importation of the lowest grades, which, while genuine, are without any drinking merit. It will protect, in measure, the tea trade of this country from foreign distributive competition. It will compel the foreign producers and the foreign firms now retailing their teas throughout this country to the detriment of the American merchant to contribute $5,000,000 to $7,000,000 per annum toward the revenue of the United States, thus relieving the American taxpayer to a like amount. Is there in the entire schedule a better source of revenue?

Respectfully submitted.

W. J. BUTTFIELD.

NEW YORK, *June 21, 1909.*

Mr. BAILEY obtained the floor.

Mr. McLAURIN. I merely want to say that inasmuch as I am opposed to any tax on tea and will vote against any tax on tea, I withdraw the amendment I offered.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Mississippi withdraws the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I would rejoice very much if all men could be emancipated from all taxes. But as that is impossible, I have usually followed the plan of taxing those who are best able to bear it with the least of inconvenience. I have also in the levy of tariff duties followed the plan of laying those duties on such articles, where that was possible, that would pour into the Public Treasury as nearly as could be every dollar which was added to the price of a given commodity.

I was taught as a Democrat that the ideal revenue-producing article was one which was imported into this country from other countries and not produced at all in this country. Obviously, sir, there is no possibility of a protection resulting from the levy of a duty on that kind of an article, and every farthing which that duty takes out of the pockets of the people is put into the Treasury of the Government.

It was this view of the matter that moved the early Democrats. Possibly I offend at this day by referring so often to the early Democrats, but I must be excused for thinking they were the better Democrats—and I mean that as no reflection—than the Democrats of this day. They had less of local matter to disturb them and to divert them, and though there was enough there was still less of local influences operating upon their minds. It was this view that led the early Democrats to favor a tax on both tea and coffee. It was an ideal and purely revenue tax. But in the course of time coffee became such an article of universal use that the Democrats first remitted the tax on it when produced in certain countries and imported into this country in the vessels of the United States or in the vessels, I believe, of Holland. Thus they began their concession to that policy which would exempt an article of common and daily, not to say an article of necessary, use.

We followed that recently. I follow it resolutely myself. I would not vote for a tax on coffee. If coffee were on the dutiable list I would hesitate to remove it until I could first also remove some of those articles which are even of more common, more universal, and more necessary use than coffee itself.

But I will never consent except where the revenues of the country imperatively require it to transfer any article of common and necessary use from the free list to the dutiable list.

But, sir, as I understand it, though I may not know much about the consumption of tea, it lacks very much of being an article of common, and much less of necessary, use. The statistics before us show that we consume less than 1 pound per capita per annum in the United States. That is an abundant proof that it is used by a very small per cent of our people, and it is used by those who can well afford to pay this duty to the Government.

I may be mistaken in my facts; if so, I will be mistaken in my vote, but I undertake to say that if we go back to the old State of Mississippi not one out of every 20 constituents of the Senator from Mississippi indulges in the use of tea. I feel warranted in saying that of the people of my own State not one in 30 use it. I was never in a farmhouse in my life, as I now recall, where they had tea. I have been on some plantations where they had a mansion and where they lived on the very fat of the land where they had tea, but the people who owned that plantation and lived in that mansion were as well able to pay a tax on tea as any other people of my acquaintance. But, going back to the people who live on the modest farms, I do not recall that I ever sat at one of their tables in my life and found tea there. Coffee is always there; tea is never there.

I do not think a Democrat can put these two articles on the same level. They do not fall within the same rule. In the first place, they are not equally an article of necessary and common use. In the next place, they are not used equally by the people who can ill afford to pay any tax at all. My own experience is supplemented, confirmed, and reenforced by statistics here that show the use of only 1 pound or less than 1 pound per capita per annum. That means that the people who use it are a small per cent of our people, because everybody understands perfectly well that, if they use it at all, they will use more than 1 pound per capita per annum; and if they did not, then that is only 10 cents, and raises $9,000,000 toward the support of our Government.

Mr. President, when I can find an article that will raise $9,000,000 of revenue to this Government, which is used by less than one man out of twenty, and that one man who uses it is well able to pay the tax, I think I am fortunate in selecting it. Not only so, but, according to the statement here, there are only 12,000 pounds of tea produced in the United States. If there were 12,000,000 pounds, it would make no difference with me, for I have no sympathy with the plan of building up an industry by taxing the people who must use the products of that industry.

I have absolutely no sympathy with that. I think if a man can not engage in an industry in this country without taxing other people to support it, he ought to close that one up and engage in one by which he can support both himself and family. But neither do I believe that any man ought to be permitted to continue in the business unless he can pay his fair share of taxes along with everybody else.

But admitting that the full duty of 10 per cent is added to the cost of every pound of tea grown or produced in the United States, that would mean $1,200 which the tea consumers pay to the tea producers as against $9,000,000 the tea consumers pay to the Government.

Now, sir, I challenge these Democrats who talk about being for revenue only, as I am, and who regret even incidental protection, as I do, to point out another article on that list that would put as little in the producer's pocket and as much revenue

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

theory as a protectionist is, and always has been, that the protection of the home industry always lowers the price of the article. I have no apology to make, though the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] said a while ago that the majority would have to apologize for some of their votes. I shall not, for I have voted consistently on this tariff bill from the standpoint of a protectionist. If we can produce tea in this country, it will only be a short time before this production will bring the price down. This has been proved in the case of every article protected, manufactured or agricultural, in the history of protective tariffs. That is the kind of a protectionist I am.

Mr. DIXON. And that is the kind of a protectionist I am; but when you start with only 12,000 pounds to supply an importation of 90,000,000 pounds, when we know it will take years to grow the tea plant, it is a different proposition. If it takes five years, the people will pay $50,000,000 for the sake of establishing the industry; and if it takes ten years, they will pay over $100,000,000.

Mr. SCOTT. If this proposed duty be imposed, the people will not pay a cent more for tea than they are paying to-day. The Senator from South Carolina stated the case very properly when he said that the history of the price of tea substantiated the assertion that when the duty went on or went off it did not change the price of tea to the consumer.

Mr. DIXON. I want to confess that the Senator from South Carolina has almost demonstrated to me that the consumer does not pay the tariff duty.

Mr. TILLMAN. On this thing.

Mr. DIXON. But there is another feature of it that I think the friends of the inheritance tax, the income tax, and the corporation tax do not take into consideration. There is no question of the widespread feeling here that some Senators would like to get some kind of revenue that would make it impossible to add an inheritance-tax or a corporation-tax or an income-tax provision to this bill. Here you are adding $10,000,000 in one lump sum, and every time you add $10,000,000 to the revenues under the bill it is one more vehement argument why neither the income nor inheritance nor corporation tax should be adopted. I think the vote on this tea proposition is surrounded with a lot of difficulties, and I would beg the Senator from South Carolina to let us avoid the dangers which come with it and take 10 cents a pound bounty on tea. I assure him that from what I have heard in the Chamber I think it will receive almost a unanimous vote on the Republican side.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. DIXON. Gladly.

Mr. PERKINS. I want to give my friend from Montana an object lesson which will enable him to ease his conscience and vote for the proposed amendment of the Senator from South Carolina. Twelve years ago layer raisins and Zante currants, but raisins in particular, were worth from 10 to 15 cents a pound. We succeeded in getting a duty of 6 cents a pound placed upon them under what is known as the "Dingley law." We were then producing no raisins, comparatively speaking, in the United States. To-day raisins are selling for 3 and 3½ cents a pound in California, and we are producing enough layer raisins of the best quality to supply every person in the United States with them.

Mr. SCOTT. That is good Republican doctrine.

Mr. DIXON. The Senator from California has undoubtedly convinced my friend from West Virginia of the potency of his argument.

Mr. PERKINS. It is unanswerable, it seems to me.

Mr. DIXON. I will ask the Senator from California to what extent raisins were raised in California at the time the duty was imposed?

Mr. PERKINS. Comparatively speaking, there were none raised. We demonstrated the fact that it was practicable to raise them, but they had not been raised to any extent until this duty was placed upon them.

Mr. DIXON. What were raisins selling for when we put on 2 cents a pound duty?

Mr. PERKINS. From 10 to 15 cents a pound for layer raisins. To-day they are sold at retail in California at 3 cents a pound in any quantity, and we are selling them by the carload for 3 cents a pound.

Mr. DIXON. In that case the duty was 2 cents per pound?

Mr. PERKINS. Two cents per pound.

Mr. DIXON. Which is about 20 per cent, or less than 20 per cent. In this case we are asked to vote for a duty of not less than 50 per cent on the higher grades of imported tea; and in the case of tea which is imported at 15 cents per pound, it would be a matter of 66⅔ per cent.

Mr. PERKINS. The report of the Agricultural Department shows that it costs to raise tea in Ceylon and Formosa from 10 to 12 cents a pound.

Mr. DIXON. Then we would be putting on a 100 per cent duty under the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina. I want to help the Senator——

Mr. TILLMAN. How much duty did you put on Montana wool?

Mr. DIXON. About 7 cents a pound.

Mr. TILLMAN. How much is wool worth without it?

Mr. DIXON. Wool is worth about 23 or 24 cents in the market.

Mr. TILLMAN. What was it worth without a duty?

Mr. DIXON. When we had no duty, the woolgrower went bankrupt and wool was worth nothing.

Mr. TILLMAN. Very well; then the duty on wool, when wool sold for 10 cents per pound, was about 50 or 60 per cent. You hug it and how sweet it is, and you wrap yourself in it and keep it. [Laughter.]

Mr. DIXON. It is a fine duty, Mr. President, but the Senator forgets that we were raising 50,000,000 pounds of wool at the time the duty was put on. Suppose we had only been raising 1,200 or 12,000 pounds of wool in this country?

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, the Senator may be uncomfortable, but I have demonstrated, beyond all possibility of reasonable dispute, that this is a protective duty, which will develop the tea industry in the South.

Mr. DIXON. There is no question about that.

Mr. TILLMAN. Very well, then; the Senator ought to stop caviling and complaining and other objections, and he ought to "go it blind," like he has been "going it blind" after our friend from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] all these months. [Laughter.]

Mr. DIXON. I confess the Senator from Rhode Island has been a little more reasonable in his demand for protective duties than is the Senator from South Carolina in this case.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. DIXON. I do.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I should like to ask the Senator from South Carolina how long it takes a tea plantation to get started and to become a producing plantation?

Mr. TILLMAN. I think you can begin to gather the leaves the third year; and as the plant grows in size and in strength, with the deep-root system, the foliage will increase and the yield increase. It will take ten or twelve years for a bush to get to its full productive capacity.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Has the Senator any idea what it costs per acre to plant a tea plantation?

Mr. TILLMAN. I have not; but I would not think it would be very expensive when lands are so cheap. The main trouble is preparing the land for the plants, underdraining, cutting out the roots, putting on lime, and all that sort of thing.

Mr. DIXON. The Senator from South Carolina frankly says that he wants 10 cents a pound, as a matter of protection, to develop the tea industry in the South.

Mr. TILLMAN. I say "protection" on the other side, but I want $9,000,000 for revenue on this side. [Laughter.] This is the only proposition that has come in here that catches you all; and it is only by all sorts of quibbling and inconsequential reasoning that you can vote against this proposition. I ought to get the vote of every solitary Republican protectionist in this Chamber, and I ought to get the vote of every solitary Democrat for revenue in this Chamber.

Mr. DIXON. The Senator shoots with a double-barreled gun.

Mr. TILLMAN. Surely; it is the only double-barreled gun that has been in here, too. [Laughter.]

Mr. DIXON. But when he asks the Democratic Senators to vote for a 66 per cent duty upon a tariff for revenue, and the Senator asks us to vote $50,000,000——

Mr. TILLMAN. Do not multiply it so. It is only eight or nine million dollars to begin with, though I do not know what it might grow to, as the quality of tea improves and people begin to like it better.

Mr. DIXON. The Senator says it will take three years before they can begin to pick tea leaves from the plants. If everybody in the South started tea farms the minute this bill passed——

Mr. TILLMAN. But I am not afraid about them all starting. I am afraid the number who will be benefited by this will be very limited.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Mr. DIXON. Now, cold-bloodedly, the Senator wants this duty for the purpose of developing a new industry. I am wholly in sympathy with that, but the price we have to pay for it is too big.

Mr. TILLMAN. I tell you you do not have to pay anything—that is where the good part of it comes in—because the consumer will not have to pay any more for his tea than he does now.

Mr. DIXON. I want the Senator from Rhode Island to take note of the new Democratic doctrine enunciated this morning by the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. TILLMAN. If it be that this is new Democratic doctrine, which gets $9,000,000 of revenue and $1,200 protection, I will stand the responsibility for it at any time and anywhere.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. DIXON. I do.

Mr. JONES. As I understand, the Senator from South Carolina is urging the Republicans to vote for his amendment on the ground of protection. I wonder whether or not the Senator indorsed the Democratic platform of a few years ago, which denounced protection as robbery, and whether the Senator is trying to have the Republicans here commit robbery.

Mr. TILLMAN. No; you will not rob anybody if we only get $1,200 from it.

Mr. JONES. Twelve hundred dollars is as much robbery as a larger sum.

Mr. DIXON. I observe the Senator from Washington and the Senator from South Carolina are firing the other barrel now.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. DIXON. I do.

Mr. STONE. I should like permission of the Senator from Montana to ask the Senator from South Carolina whether any part of the forty-three thousand and odd dollars appropriated in the last agricultural appropriation bill for experiments in tea culture, among other things, has been expended in South Carolina?

Mr. TILLMAN. I can not pretend to tell you, sir. I think they have been trying to experiment in the different States, from Texas all the way east.

Mr. DIXON. Would it hurt the feelings of the Senator from South Carolina, in spite of his protest against the doctrine of paying a bounty, if, notwithstanding his own opposition in the matter, the Senate deliberately ran over the Senator, figuratively speaking, and put 10 cents a pound bounty on tea?

Mr. TILLMAN. I am not here to complain of what the Senate does. If the Senate does not give me anything, I shall not worry. I believe I have presented a case here which is entitled to support in two particulars. It demands that every protectionist in this Chamber shall support this duty, and it demands that every tariff-for-revenue Democrat in this Chamber shall vote for this duty, knowing that we have a deficit.

Mr. DIXON. If we are honest, we are going to have a unanimous vote.

Mr. TILLMAN. A unanimous vote; and I am going to watch the men who vote "nay."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. DIXON. I ask for the yeas and nays.

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

Mr. GUGGENHEIM (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky, [Mr. PAYNTER], who is unavoidably absent. I shall therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. HUGHES (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH], and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. RAYNER (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. STEPHENSON]. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. WARREN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. MONEY], and therefore withhold my vote.

The roll call having been concluded, the result was announced—yeas 18, nays 55, as follows:

YEAS—18.

Bailey	Dick	Heyburn	Smith, Mich.
Bradley	du Pont	Nixon	Tillman
Bulkeley	Elkins	Perkins	Wetmore
Burnham	Frye	Root	
Carter	Gallinger	Scott	

NAYS—55.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Gore	Oliver
Bacon	Clay	Hughes	Overman
Bankhead	Crawford	Johnson, N. Dak.	Owen
Beveridge	Culberson	Johnston, Ala.	Page
Borah	Cullom	Jones	Penrose
Bourne	Cummins	Kean	Shively
Brandegee	Curtis	La Follette	Simmons
Bristow	Daniel	Lodge	Smith, S. C.
Brown	Davis	Lorimer	Smoot
Burkett	Dillingham	McCumber	Stone
Burrows	Dixon	McLaurin	Sutherland
Burton	Fletcher	Martin	Taylor
Chamberlain	Flint	Nelson	Warner
Clapp	Foster	Newlands	

NOT VOTING—19.

Briggs	Frazier	Money	Smith, Md.
Clarke, Ark.	Gamble	Paynter	Stephenson
Crane	Guggenheim	Piles	Taliaferro
Depew	Hale	Rayner	Warren
Dolliver	McEnery	Richardson	

So Mr. TILLMAN's amendment was rejected.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, as I understand the rules, we will be privileged to offer amendments to the bill when it goes into the Senate. I desire to give notice of my intention to offer an amendment or a new section of the bill providing for a bounty upon domestic tea, to extend over a period of five years.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, it is not necessary, under the agreement made here, or under the rules of the Senate, for the Senator to reserve an amendment to the bill in the Senate.

Mr. ALDRICH. No; that can be done without such a reservation.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I simply wish to give notice that that is my intention.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. An amendment can be offered after the bill gets in the Senate without any reservation. That was discussed here for a whole day.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I propose to offer an amendment providing for a bounty on domestic tea extending over a period of five and possibly ten years, the bounty to consist of 10 cents a pound.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, before we dispose of the dutiable schedules, I wish to offer an amendment proposing a reduction of 5 per cent per annum on all of the items of all of the schedules, except Schedule H—the liquor schedule—for the next ensuing five years, provided that under the amendment such rate shall not be reduced or fixed below the point at which it would produce an amount equal to the difference in the cost of the production of any such article in the United States and abroad. I propose that the difference in the cost of the production of any such article in the United States and abroad shall be determined upon proper evidence, duly recorded by a nonpartisan commission of five experts, to be appointed by the President of the United States and confirmed by the Senate.

I do not intend to take the time of the Senate to go into an elaborate discussion of this proposition. As I understand, the Democratic party is committed to a gradual reduction of the tariff schedules. As I understand the Republican platform, the Republican party is committed to writing these schedules in the light of the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad. The Senate has not been furnished with any evidence sufficient to show what that difference in the cost of production at home and abroad is. I propose that the difference shall be determined by a nonpartisan board of five experts, to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. Many of the schedules are recognized to be far above the maximum revenue-producing point, and lowering them would increase the revenue to be derived from such schedules by increasing imports.

I desire a record vote upon the matter; and, without debating it further, I ask a vote of the Senate upon it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma will be read by the Secretary for the information of the Senate.

The SECRETARY. On page 193, after line 2, insert:

That the rate fixed on all articles enumerated in section 1 of this act, in schedules A, B, C, D, E, F, G, I, J, K, L, M, N, shall be reduced 5 per cent per annum of the rate fixed in this act, annually on June 30, for each of the next ensuing five fiscal years: *Provided*, That such rate shall not hereunder be reduced or fixed below the point at which it would produce an amount equal to the difference in the cost of the production of any such article in the United States and abroad.

The difference in the cost of the production of any such article in the United States and abroad shall be determined, upon proper evidence duly recorded, by a nonpartisan commission of five experts, to be appointed by the President of the United States and confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. ALDRICH. I move to lay the amendment on the table.

Mr. OWEN. Upon that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. OWEN. I offer an amendment which I will ask the Secretary to report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will report the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma.

The SECRETARY. On page 193, after line 2, insert:

That the rate fixed on all articles enumerated in section 1 of this act in Schedules A, B, C, D, E, F, G, I, J, K, L, M, and N shall be reduced 5 per cent per annum of the rate fixed in this act, annually on June 30, for each of the next ensuing five fiscal years: *Provided*, That if such graduated reduction shall cause a diminution of the annual revenue from any one or more of the articles enumerated therein, the President is directed to restore the rate on any such article or articles severally at the point at which any such article is found to have had the greatest normal revenue-producing power.

Mr. ALDRICH. I move to lay the amendment on the table.

Mr. OWEN. Upon that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I will ask the Secretary to report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will report the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma.

The SECRETARY. On page 193, after line 2, insert:

471½. That the rate fixed on all articles enumerated in section 1 of this act, in schedules A, B, C, D, E, F, G, I, J, K, L, M, N, shall be reduced 5 per cent per annum of the rate fixed in this act, annually on June 30, for each of the next ensuing five fiscal years: *Provided*, That if such graduated reduction shall cause a diminution of the annual revenue from any one or more of the articles enumerated therein, the President is authorized and directed to restore the rate on any such article or articles severally at the point at which any such article is found to have had the greatest normal revenue-producing power: *And provided further*, That such rate shall not hereunder be reduced or fixed below the point at which it would produce an amount equal to the difference in the cost of the production of any such article in the United States and abroad.

The difference in the cost of the production of any such article in the United States and abroad shall be determined from time to time, upon proper evidence, duly recorded, by a nonpartisan commission of five experts to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. ALDRICH. I move to lay the amendment on the table.

Mr. OWEN. Upon that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island to lay the proposed amendment on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. OWEN. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will report the amendment proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma.

The SECRETARY. On page 193, after line 2, insert:

That the rate fixed on all articles enumerated in section 1 of this act in Schedules A, B, C, D, E, F, G, I, J, K, L, M, and N shall be reduced 5 per cent per annum of the rate fixed in this act, annually on June 30, for each of the next ensuing five fiscal years.

Mr. ALDRICH. I move to lay the amendment on the table.

Mr. OWEN. Upon that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island.

The motion to lay upon the table was agreed to.

Mr. OWEN. I present the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will report the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma.

The SECRETARY. In paragraph 637, at the end of line 17, insert the following proviso:

Provided, That no person, firm, association, or corporation doing an interstate business and engaged in the production, manufacture, distribution, or sale of petroleum oil or of any of its products, shall, for the purpose of creating a monopoly or destroying competition in trade, discriminate between different persons, associations, or corporations, or different sections, communities, or cities of the United States, by selling such commodity at a lower rate in one section, community, or city than in another, after making just allowance only for the difference, if any, in the grade, quantity, or quality, and in the actual cost of transportation from the point of production or manufacture.

Mr. ALDRICH. I move to lay the amendment on the table.

Mr. OWEN. On that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island.

The motion to lay upon the table was agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, I think that completes the consideration of the schedules and paragraphs, and I ask that the amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Texas is pending.

Mr. LODGE. I understand that the amendment of the Senator from Texas is now pending under the agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the understanding of the present occupant of the chair.

Mr. LODGE. It was offered, and is pending.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The amendment has been offered.

Mr. LODGE. I move to amend the pending amendment by striking out the body of the amendment and inserting the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will report the amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The SECRETARY. As a substitute for the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas insert the following:

SEC. —. That whenever any country, dependency, colony, province, or other political subdivision of government shall pay or bestow, directly or indirectly, any bounty on grant upon the exportation of any article or merchandise from such country, dependency, colony, province, or other political subdivision of government, and such article or merchandise is dutiable under the provisions of this act, then upon the importation of any such article or merchandise into the United States, whether the same shall be imported directly from the country of production or otherwise, and whether such article or merchandise is imported in the same condition as when exported from the country of production or has been changed in condition by remanufacture or otherwise, there shall be levied and paid, in all such cases, in addition to the duties otherwise imposed by this act, an additional duty equal to the net amount of such bounty or grant, however the same be paid or bestowed. The net amount of all such bounties or grants shall be from time to time ascertained, determined, and declared by the Secretary of the Treasury, who shall make all needful regulations for the identification of such articles and merchandise and for the assessment and collection of such additional duties.

Mr. ALDRICH. I move to amend the substitute offered by the Senator from Massachusetts by adding to it the language which I send to the Secretary's desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will report the amendment to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Rhode Island.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add to the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts the following:

That every corporation, joint-stock company or association, organized for profit and having a capital stock represented by shares, and every insurance company, now or hereafter organized under the laws of the United States or of any State or Territory of the United States or under the acts of Congress applicable to Alaska or the District of Columbia, or organized under the laws of any foreign country and engaged in business in any State or Territory of the United States or in Alaska or in the District of Columbia, shall be subject to pay annually a special excise tax with respect to the carrying on or doing business by such corporation, joint-stock company or association, or insurance company, equivalent to 2 per cent upon the entire net income over and above $5,000 received by it from all sources during such year, exclusive of amounts received by it as dividends upon stock of other corporations, joint-stock companies or associations, or insurance companies, subject to the tax hereby imposed, or if organized under the laws of any foreign country, upon the amount of net income over and above $5,000 received by it from business transacted and capital invested within the United States and its Territories, Alaska, and the District of Columbia during such year, exclusive of amounts so received by it as dividends upon stock of other corporations, joint-stock companies or associations, or insurance companies subject to the tax hereby imposed.

Second. Such net income shall be ascertained by deducting from the gross amount of the income of such corporation, joint-stock company or association, or insurance company from all sources, (first) all the ordinary and necessary expenses actually paid within the year out of income in the maintenance and operation of its business and properties; (second) all losses actually sustained within the year and not compensated by insurance or otherwise, including a reasonable allowance for depreciation of property, if any, and in the case of insurance companies the sums required by law to be carried to premium reserve fund; (third) interest actually paid within the year on its bonded or other indebtedness to an amount of such bonded and other indebtedness not exceeding the paid-up capital stock of such corporation, joint-stock company or association, or insurance company, outstanding at the close of the year; (fourth) all sums paid by it within the year for taxes imposed under the authority of the United States or of any State or Territory thereof; (fifth) all amounts received by it within the year as dividends upon stock of other corporations, joint-stock companies or associations, or insurance companies, subject to the tax hereby imposed: *Provided*, That in the case of a corporation, joint-stock company or association, or insurance company, organized under the laws of a foreign country, such net income shall be ascertained by deducting from the gross amount of its income from business transacted and capital invested within the United States and any of its Territories, Alaska, and the District of Columbia, (first) all the ordinary and necessary expenses actually paid within the year out of earnings in the maintenance and operation of its business and property within the United States and its Territories, Alaska, and the District of Columbia; (second) all losses actually sustained within the year in business conducted by it within the United States or its Territories, Alaska, or the District of Columbia not compensated by insurance or otherwise, including a reasonable allowance for depreciation of property, if any, and in the case of insurance companies the sums required by law to be carried to premium reserve fund; (third) interest actually paid within the year on its bonded or other indebtedness to an amount of such bonded and other indebtedness, not exceeding the proportion of its paid-up capital stock outstanding at the close of the year which the gross amount of its income for the year from business transacted and capital invested within the United States and any of its Territories, Alaska, and the District of Columbia bears to the gross amount of its income derived from all sources within and without the United States; (fourth) the sums paid by it within the year for taxes imposed under

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

the authority of the United States or of any State or Territory thereof; (fifth) all amounts received by it within the year as dividends upon stock of other corporations, joint-stock companies or associations, and insurance companies, subject to the tax hereby imposed.

Third. That there shall be deducted from the amount of the net income of each of such corporations, joint-stock companies or associations, or insurance companies, ascertained as provided in the foregoing paragraphs of this section, the sum of $5,000, and said tax shall be computed upon the remainder of said net income of such corporation, joint-stock company or association, or insurance company for the year ending December 31, 1909, and for each year thereafter; and on or before the 1st day of March, 1910, and the 1st day of March in each year thereafter, a true and accurate return under oath or affirmation of its president, vice-president, or other principal officer, and its teasurer or assistant treasurer, shall be made by each of the corporations, joint-stock companies or associations, and insurance companies, subject to the tax imposed by this section, to the collector of internal revenue for the district in which such corporation, joint-stock company or association, or insurance company has its principal place of business, or, in the case of a corporation, joint-stock company or association, or insurance company, organized under the laws of a foreign country, in the place where its principal business is carried on within the United States, in such form as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, shall prescribe, setting forth, (first) the total amount of the paid-up capital stock of such corporation, joint-stock company or association, or insurance company, outstanding at the close of the year; (second) the total amount of the bonded and other indebtedness of such corporation, joint-stock company or association, or insurance company at the close of the year; (third) the gross amount of the income of such corporation, joint-stock company or association, or insurance company received during such year from all sources, and if organized under the laws of a foreign country the gross amount of its income from business transacted and capital invested within the United States and any of its Territories, Alaska, and the District of Columbia; (fourth) the amount received by such corporation, joint-stock company or association, or insurance company, within the year by way of dividends upon stock of other corporations, joint-stock companies or associations, or insurance companies, subject to the tax imposed by this section; (fifth) the total amount of all the ordinary and necessary expenses actually paid out of earnings in the maintenance and operation of the business and properties of such corporation, joint-stock company or association, or insurance company, within the year, and if organized under the laws of a foreign country the amount so paid in the maintenance and operation of its business within the United States and its Territories, Alaska, and the District of Columbia; (sixth) the total amount of all losses actually sustained during the year and not compensated by insurance or otherwise, stating separately any amounts allowed for depreciation of property, and in the case of insurance companies the sums required by law to be carried to premium reserve fund, and in the case of a corporation, joint-stock company or association, or insurance company, organized under the laws of a foreign country, all losses actually sustained by it during the year in business conducted by it within the United States or its Territories, Alaska, and the District of Columbia, not compensated by insurance or otherwise, stating separately any amounts allowed for depreciation of property, and in the case of insurance companies the sums required by law to be carried to premium reserve fund; (seventh) the amount of interest actually paid within the year on its bonded or other indebtedness to an amount of such bonded and other indebtedness not exceeding the paid-up capital stock of such corporation, joint-stock company or association, or insurance company outstanding at the close of the year, or in case of a corporation, joint-stock company or association, or insurance company, organized under the laws of a foreign country, interest so paid on its bonded or other indebtedness, to an amount of such bonded and other indebtedness, not exceeding the proportion of its paid-up capital stock outstanding at the close of the year which the gross amount of its income for the year from business transacted and capital invested within the United States and any of its Territories, Alaska, and the District of Columbia, bears to the gross amount of its income derived from all sources within and without the United States; (eighth) the amount paid by it within the year for taxes imposed under the authority of the United States or any State or Territory thereof; (ninth) the net income of such corporation, joint-stock company or association, or insurance company, after making the deductions in this section authorized. All such returns shall as received be transmitted forthwith by the collector to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Fourth. Whenever evidence shall be produced before the Commissioner of Internal Revenue which in the opinion of the commissioner justifies the belief that the return made by any corporation, joint-stock company or association, or insurance company is incorrect, or whenever any collector shall report to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue that any corporation, joint-stock company or association, or insurance company has failed to make a return as required by law, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue may require from the corporation, joint-stock company or association, or insurance company making such return such further information with reference to its capital, income, losses, and expenditures as he may deem expedient; and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, for the purpose of ascertaining the correctness of such return or for the purpose of making a return where none has been made, is hereby authorized, by any regularly appointed revenue agent specially designated by him for that purpose, to examine any books and papers bearing upon the matters required to be included in the return of such corporation, joint-stock company or association, or insurance company, and to require the attendance of any officer or employee of such corporation, joint-stock company or association, or insurance company, and to take his testimony with reference to the matter required by law to be included in such return, with power to administer oaths to such person or persons; and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue may also invoke the aid of any court of the United States to require the attendance of such officers or employees and the production of such books and papers. Upon the information so acquired the Commissioner of Internal Revenue may amend any return or make a return where none has been made. All proceedings taken by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue under the provisions of this section shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Fifth. All returns shall be retained by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, who shall make assessments thereon; and in case of any return made with false or fraudulent intent, he shall add 100 per cent of such tax; and in case of refusal or neglect to make a return or to verify the same as aforesaid, he shall add 50 per cent of such tax. In case of neglect occasioned by the sickness or absence of an officer of such corporation, joint-stock company or association, or insurance company, required to make said return, the collector may allow such further time for making and delivering such return as he may deem necessary, not exceeding thirty days. The amount so added to the tax shall be collected at the same time and in the same manner as the tax originally assessed unless the refusal, neglect, or falsity is discovered after the date for payment of said taxes, in which case the amount so added shall be paid by the delinquent corporation, joint-stock company or association, or insurance company, immediately upon notice given by the collector. All assessments shall be made, and the several corporations, joint-stock companies or associations, or insurance companies, shall be notified of the amount for which they are respectively liable on or before the 1st day of June of each successive year, and said assessments shall be paid on or before the 30th day of June, except in cases of refusal or neglect to make such return, and in cases of false or fraudulent returns, in which cases the Commissioner of Internal Revenue shall, upon the discovery thereof, at any time within three years after said return is due, make a return upon information obtained as above provided for, and the assessment made by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue thereon shall be paid by such corporation, joint-stock company or association, or insurance company immediately upon notification of the amount of such assessment; and to any sum or sums due and unpaid after the 30th day of June in any year, and for ten days after notice and demand thereof by the collector, there shall be added the sum of 5 per cent on the amount of tax unpaid and interest at the rate of 1 per cent per month upon said tax from the time the same becomes due, as a penalty.

Sixth. When the assessment shall be made, as provided in this section, the returns, together with any corrections thereof which may have been made by the commissioner, shall be filed in the office of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and shall constitute public records and be open to inspection as such.

Seventh. It shall be unlawful for any collector, deputy collector, agent, clerk, or other officer or employee of the United States to divulge or make known in any manner whatever not provided by law to any person any information obtained by him in the discharge of his official duty, or to divulge or make known in any manner not provided by law any document received, evidence taken, or report made under this section except upon the special direction of the President; and any offense against the foregoing provision shall be a misdemeanor and be punished by a fine not exceeding $1,000, or by imprisonment not exceeding one year, or both, at the discretion of the court.

Eighth. That if any of the corporations, joint-stock companies or associations, or insurance companies aforesaid shall refuse or neglect to make a return as above specified on or before the 1st day of March in each successive year, or shall render a false or fraudulent return, such corporation, joint-stock company or association, or insurance company shall be liable to a penalty of not less than $1,000 and not exceeding $10,000.

That any person authorized by law to make, render, sign, or verify any return who makes any false or fraudulent return or statement, with intent to defeat or evade the assessment required by this section to be made, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall be fined not exceeding $1,000, or be imprisoned not exceeding one year, or both, at the discretion of the court, with the costs of prosecution.

That all laws relating to the collection, remission, and refund of internal-revenue taxes, so far as applicable to and not inconsistent with the provisions of this section, are hereby extended and made applicable to the tax imposed by this section.

Jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the circuit and district courts of the United States for the district within which any person summoned under this section to appear to testify or to produce books, as aforesaid, shall reside, to compel such attendance, production of books, and testimony by appropriate process.

Mr. FLINT. Mr. President, this amendment was offered by the chairman of the Finance Committee after careful consideration by the committee, and is in accordance with the recommendation of the President of the United States in his message of June 16, 1909. Prior to the receipt of the message of the President by the Congress of the United States the Finance Committee had considered the question of obtaining additional revenue. The committee were not altogether united on the question whether it was necessary to have revenue in addition to what would be produced by the pending bill. We considered not only the question of taxing corporations, as recommended by the President, but also the income tax and the tax upon inheritances, as passed by the House of Representatives.

The committee decided that it would be unwise to pass an income-tax amendment in form and substance like those introduced by the Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS]. We felt that, in view of the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Pollock case, it would be indelicate, at least, for the Congress of the United States to pass another measure and ask the Supreme Court to pass upon it, when they had already passed upon the proposition in that case.

We felt in the matter of the inheritance tax that it was unwise to adopt the measure as passed by the House of Representatives, for the reason that a large number of the States of the Union have adopted inheritance taxes as a means of revenue in those States, and that it would be a hardship upon the people of those States to have the additional burden of a national tax on inheritances.

When the President of the United States recommended the passage of a bill for a tax on corporations, on the privilege of doing business, the committee agreed that it was a proper measure to recommend to Congress for additional revenue. As I stated, there were members of the committee who believed that the present bill will produce sufficient revenue, but there are others of the committee—a majority, I believe—who believe it is necessary to have additional revenue.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

in the management of trustees for the ultimate benefit and use of two boys of the third generation, who are being at this time reared and educated in England, and are, as I understand it, now actually citizens of a foreign country. The $150,000,000 of American property for the protection of which this Government maintains its army and navy, its courts, its legislative and executive branches of government, yields no direct service to its overlord, the Federal Government.

THE "DEAD HAND" STILL IN EVIDENCE.

In this and hundreds of other cases, the "dead hand" is once more in direct evidence, in some degree directing and controlling the conditions under which men and women of this and succeeding generations must earn their living, and yet that "dead hand" gives little or nothing in return.

Whatever may be the remedy, if there be a remedy, it is apparent to us all that a condition of society that permits two of its members to absorb one hundred and fifty millions (and the natural increase will probably double the amount by the time they reach maturity) of the accumulated earnings of others by the mere accident of birth is an abnormal and dangerous condition for society and government.

We may hold up our hands in holy horror at this assertion and say this is "rank socialism," but it is nevertheless true.

Even the Wall Street Journal as recently as October, 1906, in discussing the dangers from "swollen fortunes," said:

President Roosevelt isn't the only one who has discovered in great individual fortunes a possible peril to American liberties. As long ago as 1849 Horace Mann, one of the most patriotic and unselfish servants of the people this country has ever produced and to whom it owes in largest measure its present great system of public-school education, said: "Vast fortunes are misfortunes to the State. They confer irresponsible power; and human nature, except in the rarest instances, has proved incapable of wielding irresponsible power without abuse. The feudalism of capital is not a whit less formidable than the feudalism of force. The millionaire of our day is no less dangerous to the welfare of the community than was the baronial lord of the middle ages."

In the April 10, 1906, issue of that conservative journal, the Boston Herald, I find the following editorial:

"Shall not a man do what he will with his own?" This question is raised again by the publication of the will of E. C. Swift, the Chicago meat packer, who died last week. He left property valued at $10,000,000 and upward, and with the exception of $5,000 to the Methodist Church at Sagamore, in this State, and $2,000 to the cemetery in that town, made in public bequests, the bulk of his great fortune is left to the widow; his daughter, an only child; and his son-in-law. Coming so soon after a similar disposition of a far greater property by Marshall Field, who made no public bequest except an endowment to the museum which bears his name, the Swift will naturally causes some discussion. Legally, of course, a man may do what he will with his own except so far as the State steps in with its inheritance tax and takes a tithe in partial compensation for the care and protection which it has given to the fortune builder in his work in amassing riches. But if these two Chicago examples illustrated the rule rather than the exception in the disposition of vast estates, there would very soon arise a popular demand for an income tax or heavier "death duties" or some other method of limiting the size of individual fortunes or preventing that practical reestablishment here of the law of primogeniture and entail, which the framers of our Constitution sought to abolish.

It is well known that Andrew Carnegie has advocated for years a progressive inheritance tax and that only recently in an address in New York City he reaffirmed, with exceptional significance, his belief that the state should exact from every large estate "a tremendous share, a progressive share."

President Roosevelt, in a recent message to Congress, said:

I feel that in the near future our National Legislators should enact a law providing for a graduated inheritance tax by which a steadily increasing rate of duty should be put upon all money or other valuables coming by gift, bequest, or devise to any individual or corporation. In any event, in my judgment, the pro rata of the tax should increase very heavily with the increase of the amount left to any one individual after a certain point has been reached. It is most desirable to encourage thrift, and a potent source of thrift and ambition is the desire on the part of the breadwinner to leave his children well off. This object can be obtained by making the tax levy very small on moderate amounts of property left; because the prime object should be to put a constantly increasing burden on the inheritance of those swollen fortunes which it is certainly no benefit to this country to perpetuate.

My own judgment is that the provisions of the House bill in fixing the minimum of value of estates to be taxed should have made the limit fifty thousand instead of ten thousand, as applied to the direct heirs. As to collateral heirs, I would fix no minimum, but include all estates.

Why should not the Senate adopt the House inheritance-tax provision?

Why is it that it has been stricken from this bill by the Senate committee with not a voice raised in protest against the action of the Finance Committee?

No question is raised as to its being constitutional, for the Supreme Court of the United States within less than ten years has expressly held that such a tax is constitutional, while holding that the income tax is not constitutional.

Its provisions reach the same class that would an income tax.

Its collection is easy and certain, whereas in actual experience the income tax has not been easy and certain of collection.

It has all the virtues that are claimed for the income tax, without a question raised as to the vices of the income tax in the matter of its enforcement and constitutionality.

Are we simply acting on the assumption that all legislative wisdom rests in the Finance Committee of the Senate?

Because an agitation has been raised here and in the newspapers over an "income tax," will we pass by in silence an actual opportunity to enact an inheritance tax, which nearly every individual Senator admits is more easily enforced and with no doubt as to its validity?

The psychological moment for the enactment into law of this most meritorious of measures is now presented to us. I am quoting from my friend the Senator from Oregon. [Laughter.]

We know, as experienced legislators, that not in years will its enactment be so easy as now. If we disagree with the Finance Committee amendment and adopt the House provision, there can no legislative situation arise so that it will be possible for it to "go out in conference."

What say you, Senators, on the other side of this Chamber?

From what I have seen and heard and know of the sentiment among many Republican Senators on this side of the Chamber, I am certain that if you will vote with us a graduated inheritance tax will become a permanent part of the Nation's revenue within the next thirty days, and that its final passage will mark a milestone in the economic history of this great Republic.

Mr. President, I ask leave to insert, as a part of my remarks, a table showing the main provisions of the American inheritance-tax laws, by States.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, permission will be granted.

The table referred to is as follows:

Main provisions of American inheritance-tax laws.

State.	Dates of principal acts.[a]	Collateral.		Direct.	
		Rates.	Exemptions.	Rates.	Exemptions.
		Per cent.		Per cent.	
Arkansas	1901	5			
California	1903, 1905	1½-15	$500-$2,000	1 - 3	[b] $4,000
Colorado	1901, 1902	3 - 6	500	2	10,000
Connecticut	1889, 1897	3	10,000	⅔	10,000
Delaware[c]	1869, 1883	5	500		
Idaho	1907	1½-15	500- 2,000	1 - 3	[b] 4,000
Illinois	1895	2 - 6	500- 2,000	1	20,000
Iowa	1896, 1904 [d]	5	1,000		
Kentucky	1906	5	500		
Louisiana[e]	1904	5		2	10,000
Maine	1893, 1901	4	500		
Maryland	1845, 1874	2½	500		
Massachusetts	1891, 1907	3 - 5	1,000	1 - 2	10,000
Michigan	(1893) 1899, 1903	5	100	[f] 1	2,000
Minnesota	(1875) 1905	1½- 5	10,000	1½- 5	10,000
Missouri	(1895) 1899	5			
Montana	1897	5	500	[f] 1	7,500
Nebraska	1901	2 - 6	500- 2,000	1	10,000
New Hampshire	(1878) 1905	5			
New Jersey	1892, 1894	5	500		
New York	(1885, 1891, 1903, 1905	5	500	1	10,000
North Carolina	(1847) 1901	1½-15	2,000	¾	2,000
North Dakota	1903	2	25,000		
Ohio	1893, 1894 (1904)	5	200		
Oregon	1903	2 - 6	500- 2,000	1	[g] 5,000
Pennsylvania	1826, 1887 (1897)	5	250		
South Dakota	1905	2 -10	100- 500	1	5,000
Tennessee	1891, 1893	5	250		
Texas	1907	2 -12	500- 2,000		
Utah	1901	5	10,000	5	10,000
Vermont	1896, 1904	5			
Virginia	(1844) 1896	5			
Washington	1901, 1907 [h]	3 -12		1	10,000
West Virginia	(1887, 1904, 1907	3 - 7½		1	20,000
Wisconsin	(1868) 1899, 1903	1½-15	100- 500	1 - 3	[i] 2,000
Wyoming	1903	5	500	2	[j] 10,000
Hawaii	1892, 1905	5	500	2	1,000
Porto Rico	1901	3 - 9	200	1 - 3	200

[a] Dates in parentheses indicate acts which have been repealed or declared unconstitutional.

[b] Widows and minor children taxable only on the excess above $10,000 received by each.

[c] Tax payable only by strangers in blood.

[d] Discriminating rates against nonresident aliens introduced by Iowa in 1904) chap. 51).

[e] Tax not payable when the property bore its just proportion of taxes prior to the owner's death.

[f] Applies to personal property only.

[g] Decedent's estates of less than $10,000 are also exempt.

[h] Discriminating rates against nonresident aliens introduced by Washington in 1907 (chap. 217).

[i] Widows taxable only on the excess above $10,000.

[j] For the surviving husband or wife and children, if residents of Wyoming, $25,000.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I do not agree with the Senator from Montana [Mr. DIXON] that the psychological moment is at hand for the adoption of the inheritance tax. I have not the slightest idea that there is any probability of the programme laid down by the committee being changed in any respect. But I am in thorough accord with the view of the Senator from Montana in regard to the wisdom and propriety of an inheritance tax. I favor, equally, the income tax. But I regard the inheritance tax as a matter of far greater importance, and that it ought to be added to our permanent fiscal system, not only for the purpose of raising revenue, but for the further and more important purpose of abating the increasing danger of the accumulation of fortunes swollen beyond all reason, which now constitute a menace to the stability of our finance and of our commerce and to the liberties of the people of the United States and of the civilized world.

I suggest to the Senate a progressive inheritance-tax amendment, which I ask the Secretary to read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read the amendment proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma.

The Secretary read as follows:

PROGRESSIVE INHERITANCE TAX AMENDMENT.

Suggested to the Senate by Mr. OWEN.

In lieu of sections 34 and 35, insert the following:

"A legacy duty shall be and is hereby imposed upon the transfer of any right, title, and interest in or to any property, real or personal, by will, grant, or transfer in any manner, or under the intestate law of any State or Territory, or of the United States, from any person in anticipation of death, or of any person dying, who is seized or possessed of such property while a resident of the United States, or of any of its possessions; or when the property of such decedent lies within the United States, or within any of its possessions, and the decedent or grantor was a nonresident of the United States, or of any of its possessions, at the time of his death, in accordance with the following schedule, to wit:

"Where the clear value of the entire estate is less than $100,000 it shall be exempt from legacy duty, otherwise, subject to the following duties, to wit:

"Where the clear value of the entire estate is between $100,000 and $300,000, 1 per cent; between $300,000 and $500,000, 2 per cent; between $500,000 and $600,000, 3 per cent; between $600,000 and $700,000, 4 per cent; between $700,000 and $1,000,000, 5 per cent; and upon every excess in the clear value of such estate over and above $1,000,000 there shall be automatically added in addition to 5 per cent, and accumulative as to each additional increase, 1 per cent additional legacy duty to be laid upon each increase in the clear value of such estate of $1,000,000, or the major fractional part thereof, until such duty reaches 100 per cent cumulative duty upon such additional increase in the clear value of such estate.

"*Provided*, That when such estate, by will, devise, grant, or inheritance law goes to collateral kin, there shall be imposed the following additional legacy duty upon such portion only of such estate as may descend to such persons severally, to wit:

"Brothers and sisters, or their descendants, 3 per cent; uncles and aunts, or their descendants, 5 per cent; other persons, not children or parents, 10 per cent.

"*Provided*, That any property conveyed, in anticipation of death, by any person, as a gift or grant to the extent conveyed without adequate consideration, where such estate would come within the rule imposed by this act, fixing such legacy duties, such conveyance, gift, or transfer, however made, shall be subject to the legacy duty herein provided, as if it were the estate of a decedent, and the estate shall be chargeable therewith unless otherwise paid. Where corporate stocks or bonds are transferred or placed under a trust for transfer within five years previous to death, as a gift, either in whole or in part, to that extent such transfer shall be conclusive evidence of its character as a legacy.

"*Provided, however*, That property devised or bequeathed to any religious, educational, patriotic, charitable, or benevolent corporation or institution shall be exempt from legacy duty.

"The legacy duty hereby imposed shall be a lien and charge upon the property of every person who may die as aforesaid, from the date of the death of such person, and shall be payable within one year, bearing 6 per cent from the date of the death for the first twelve months, and thereafter at the rate of 10 per cent until fully paid.

"The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to submit to Congress rules and regulations for the collection of the same for further congressional action."

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, the Finance Committee has struck out the inheritance-tax provision of the House of Representatives. It should have been heavily increased and made progressive on the swollen fortunes of the country. The most important need of the people of the United States of this generation requires the abatement of the gigantic fortunes being piled up by successful monopoly, by successful stock jobbing, by skillful appropriation under the protection of the law of all the opportunities of life, and which have brought about a grossly inequitable distribution of the proceeds of human labor and of the values created by the activities of men.

I have framed this provision for the express purpose of proposing a readjustment in the distribution of wealth in this country in a manner which will restore to the people who have created these values the gigantic sums appropriated either by fraud or by the permission and the assistance of the law itself.

DISTRIBUTION OF WEALTH.

Mr. President, I have heretofore shown to the Senate in a manner most conclusive that the very great part of all of the wealth of this country has already passed into the hands of less than 10 per cent, and over half of the national wealth into the hands of less than 1 per cent of the people. (P. 3282, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 15.)

Spahrs's table for the distribution of wealth in the United States, taken from his work, "The Present Distribution of Wealth in the United States," when our national wealth was $60,000,000,000, is as follows:

Class.	Families.	Per cent.	Average wealth.	Aggregate wealth.	Per cent.
Rich	125,000	1.0	$263,040	$32,880,000,000	54.8
Middle	1,362,500	10.9	14,180	19,320,000,000	32.2
Poor	4,762,500	38.1	1,639	7,800,000,000	13.0
Very poor	6,250,000	50.0			
Total	13,500,000	100.0	4,800	60,000,000,000	100.0

The inequalities have been steadily growing worse, and when a single person's fortune is estimated at a thousand millions and is gathering in $50,000,000 per annum of the net proceeds of the products of the labor of this country, while millions of human beings can not lay aside $50 apiece per annum, what must be the inevitable result? It is this condition, half understood, that is developing rapidly a sentiment of radical socialism, discontent, and social unrest.

Moody's Manual of 1907, page 30, presents a "General Summary" of corporations offering stocks and bonds for sale to the stock exchanges and recorded by him in great detail in a volume of nearly 3,000 pages, as follows:

	Total stocks and bonds.
Steam railroad division	$15,436,758,000
Public utilities division	8,130,464,000
Industrial division	10,156,333,000
Mining division	2,525,173,000
	36,248,668,000

In addition to this enormous volume of corporate wealth, which comprises a registered one-third of our national wealth, there is an unregistered volume of corporations which are close corporations which do not sell stock, which are personal corporations, amounting to thousands of millions of dollars.

I respectfully call your attention to the Statistical Abstract of 1907, Table 244, which sets forth the wealth of the United States, which shows clearly where its approximate ownership may be found, to wit:

Table 244, Statistical Abstract, 1907.

Real property	$62,341,492,134
Live stock	4,073,791,736
Farm implements and machinery	844,989,863
Manufacturing machinery, tools, etc	3,297,754,180
Railroad equipment	11,244,752,000
Street railway, shipping, waterworks	4,840,546,909
Agricultural products	1,899,379,652
Manufactured products	7,409,291,668
Imported merchandise	495,543,685
Mining products	326,851,517
Clothing and personal ornaments	2,000,000,000
Furniture, carriages	5,750,000,000
Total for United States	107,104,211,917

Where do the city laborers under protection come in as joint heirs of modern prosperity?

What part of this wealth created by labor is theirs?

They have no real estate, no live stock, farm machinery, manufacturing machinery, railroads, or under any visible classification. The only thing that they can have under this tabulation is clothing and a little personal property.

And yet the products of the labor in our specified manufacturing industries of 1905 reached a total of $14,802,147,087, for 5,470,321 wage-earners, whose product was therefore worth $2,708 per capita.

These people received $2,611,540,532 in wages (Stat. Abst. U. S., 1907, p. 144), or $479 per capita.

This $479 each must feed and shelter and clothe and educate and provide leisure and the joyous participation in the common providences of God for an average of three people, or about $160 each per annum, or about an average of $13.33 per month.

There can hardly be much margin of saving under the circumstances for sickness, ill health, accident, or loss of employment.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

In New York City, with over four millions of people, less than 1 in 40 has any real estate.

ENORMOUS WEALTH INHERITED BY A MAN'S CHILDREN IS WORTHLESS IN THE HIGHEST AND BEST SENSE.

Mr. President, it takes a human being of the first magnitude to administer an estate of $10,000,000 with wisdom and efficiency. No human being can properly consume the income of such an estate, which, at 5 per cent, will make an income of $500,000 per annum, $1,366 per diem—about a hundred dollars an hour for every waking hour.

Since such vast sums of money can not be properly used by the individual in the gratification of any just personal needs, and since its possession frequently leads to the wildest extravagances, to the establishment of false standards of life, and often leads to harmful dissipation and vice, and sometimes even to the corruption of our legislatures, of our administrative offices, and of the judiciary itself in the crafty ways by which we all know human beings can be misled, a wise public policy should establish a system of government which will restore to the people so much of the swollen fortunes developed by our modern methods as justice demands.

No thoughtful student will deny that these gigantic fortunes represent values created by the labors and the activities of our people. No man can deny the moral righteousness of restoring to the people by legacy duty that which they have created and which has been taken from them under legal processes and by fair legal means, in the best view of the case, and by crafty, unfair, and illegal means in the worst view of the case.

THE TAX MORALLY AND ETHICALLY JUST.

It will do no harm to the legatees of these swollen fortunes to contribute to the State a reasonable percentage of such fortunes. They receive these fortunes as a gift, without effort, without service, and are purely beneficiaries of a public legal gratuity, which permits them to receive, without consideration, vast sums by authority of a public statute.

It is true, Mr. President, that the usual inheritance statute itself, based upon the obligation of the parent to provide for his child, is thereby justified; that the child, the wife, the dependents have moral claim for support out of the proceeds of the labor, self-sacrifice, ambition, or providence of the parent; but these considerations are abundantly recognized and provided for in the amendment which I have the honor to submit. They are more than provided for; they are left rich beyond every possible desire or need of a well-ordered mind or a well-disposed heart.

We all agree that it would be unwise to remove or weaken the incentive of an abundant reward as a compensation for the great personal virtues of industry, providence, enterprise, self-sacrifice, and labor, and the proposed legacy duty will not remove a reasonable incentive, while it will put, perhaps, a check on unrestrained ambition not content with tens of millions, but greedily disposed to acquire hundreds of millions at the expense of a just distribution of wealth. Common sense and sound public policy demand that a fair incentive be not taken away from the humbler citizens, who now, in vast numbers, have not a sufficient supply of this world's goods to protect themselves against an illness of thirty days, and from whom every incentive of hope is removed except the pittance of a meager daily bread.

While we should be considerate of the incentive to labor, industry, providence, and self-sacrifice on the part of strong and powerful men, we should see to it that this incentive is not taken away from millions of weaker men, or permit one man, with the advantage of the accumulated millions drawn from his ancestors, UNDER THE AUTHORITY AND PERMISSION OF OUR LAWS, to appropriate all of the opportunities of life, and thus deprive millions of feebler men of the incentive which we all agree is of the highest importance in developing human beings.

THE PRACTICE SUSTAINED BY FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

Mr. President, the plan proposed is lawful and has been passed upon by the Supreme Court of the United States in Magoun *v.* Illinois Trust and Saving Bank (107 U. S., 283), in which the court held that the inheritance-tax law of Illinois makes a classification for taxation which the legislature had power to make, and that the inheritance-tax law does not conflict in any way with the provisions of the Constitution of the United States.

The court in this case shows that these laws have been in force in many of the States of the United States—Pennsylvania, 1826; Maryland, 1844; Delaware, 1869; West Virginia, 1887; Connecticut, New Jersey, Ohio, Maine, Massachusetts, 1891; Minnesota, by constitutional provision.

The constitutionality of said taxes has been declared and the principles explained in many cases referred to in the case above mentioned. For example, in the United States *v.* Perkins (163 U. S., 625), Klapp *v.* Mason (94 U. S., 589), United States *v.* Fox (94 U. S., 315), Mager *v.* Grima (8 Howard, 490), and so forth.

With the consent of the Senate, I submit a record of the inheritance tax of the British Empire, the German Empire, and of the German Independent States; and, without objection, I will print in the RECORD these tables without reading them.

THE PRACTICE SUSTAINED BY FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

D. Max West, in his work on Inheritance Tax, fully sets forth the practice of every nation in this regard. I freely quote from his work and call attention of the country to it.

England has adopted the progressive inheritance tax, reaching as far as 15 per cent on great estates.

Inheritance tax of the British Empire:

In the finance act of 1894 (57 and 58 Vict., chap. 30) Sir Vernon Harcourt simplified the system of death duties, removed the more glaring anomalies, and greatly extended the application of the progressive principle. For the old probate, account, and estate duties he substituted a new estate duty graduated according to the size of the estate, real and personal, from 1 to 8 per cent, as follows:

When the principal value of the estate—
Exceeds £100 and does not exceed £300, 30 shillings.
Exceeds £300 and does not exceed £500, 50 shillings.
Exceeds £500 and does not exceed £1,000, 2 per cent.
Exceeds £1,000 and does not exceed £10,000, 3 per cent.
Exceeds £10,000 and does not exceed £25,000, 4 per cent.
Exceeds £25,000 and does not exceed £50,000, 4½ per cent.
Exceeds £50,000 and does not exceed £75,000, 5 per cent.
Exceeds £75,000 and does not exceed £100,000, 5½ per cent.
Exceeds £100,000 and does not exceed £150,000, 6 per cent.
Exceeds £150,000 and does not exceed £250,000, 6½ per cent.
Exceeds £250,000 and does not exceed £500,000, 7 per cent.
Exceeds £500,000 and does not exceed £1,000,000, 7½ per cent.
Exceeds £1,000,000, 8 per cent.

By the finance act of 1907 the estate duty on estates exceeding £150,000 was increased to the following scale:

When the principal value of the estate—
Exceeds £150,000 and does not exceed £250,000, 7 per cent.
Exceeds £250,000 and does not exceed £500,000, 8 per cent.
Exceeds £500,000 and does not exceed £750,000, 9 per cent.
Exceeds £750,000 and does not exceed £1,000,000, 10 per cent.
Exceeds £1,000,000 and does not exceed £1,500,000, 10 per cent on the first £1,000,000, 11 per cent on the remainder.
Exceeds £1,500,000 and does not exceed £2,000,000, 10 per cent on the first £1,000,000, 12 per cent on the remainder.
Exceeds £2,000,000 and does not exceed £2,500,000, 10 per cent on the first £1,000,000, 13 per cent on the remainder.
Exceeds £2,500,000 and does not exceed £3,000,000, 10 per cent on the first £1,000,000, 14 per cent on the remainder.
Exceeds £3,000,000, 15 per cent on the remainder.

In addition to this estate duty, calculated on the value of the estate as a whole, collateral heirs still have to pay legacy duty on their legacies or distributive shares of personal property, and succession duty on the corresponding shares of real estate and on leaseholds, settled personalty, and legacies charged on land, which are not subject to legacy duty, according to the following consanguinity scale:

	Per cent.
Brothers and sisters and their descendants	3
Uncles and aunts and their descendants	5
Great uncles and great aunts and their descendants	6
Other persons	10

The German Empire has a similar system, imposing the following imperial inheritance tax.

	Per cent.
Parents, brothers, and sisters, and their children	4
Grandparents and more distant ancestors, parents-in-law and stepparents, children-in-law and stepchildren, grandnephews and grandnieces, illegitimate children acknowledged by the fathers and their offspring, adopted children and their offspring	6
Brothers and sisters of parents and relatives by marriage in the second degree in collateral lines	8
In other cases	10

The tax is progressive, the rates given above being increased in the case of inheritance over 20,000 marks by one-tenth; for each further sum, at first of 20,000 or 25,000 marks and afterwards of 50,000 or 100,000 marks. For amounts over 1,000,000 marks the tax is levied at two and one-half times the basic rates, making the maximum rate 25 per cent. In the case of the immediate relatives, subject to the 4 per cent rate, the progression applies only when the value of the inheritance is more than 50,000 marks. On large amounts the German tax is considerably heavier than the French, because the progressive rates apply to the entire amount of the inheritance, not merely to their respective fractions; but when an inheritance is valued at a sum slightly in excess of that to which a lower rate applies, the higher rate will be collected only in so far as it can be paid out of half the amount by which the inheritance exceeds the preceding class limit.

Besides this, the German independent States also have a progressive inheritance tax, according to degree of consanguinity, as well as a progressive rate.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Rates of German inheritance taxes in force January 1, 1906.

	Alsace-Lorraine.	Anhalt.	Baden.	Bavaria.	Bremen.	Brunswick.	Hamburg.	Hesse.	Lippe.	Lubeck.	Mecklenburg-Schwerin.	Oldenburg.
	Per cent.	Per cent.	Per cent.	Per cent.	Per cent.	Per cent.	Per cent.	Per cent.	Per cent.	Per cent.	Per cent.	Per cent.
Husband or wife	[a]3				[b]2- 3					[b]2- 4		
Children	1				2- 3		2- 4			2- 4		
Other descendants	1				2- 3		4- 8			4- 8		
Adopted children	1	4- 6	([c])		[d]5- 7½	2½	6-12	5	3	6-12	1	4
Stepchildren	9	6- 9	6	4	5- 7½	2½	4- 8	8	3	6-12	2	4
Parents	1		1	[e]4	5- 7½		6-12	[f]5		6-12		
Grandparents, etc	1		1- 2	[e]6	5- 7½		6-12	5		6-12		
Stepparents	9	6- 9	6	4		2½		8	6	6-12	4	7
Children-in-law	9	6- 9	6	4	5- 7½	2½	4- 8	8	3	6-12	3	4
Brothers and sisters	6.5	4- 6	3- 4	4	5- 7½	2½	6-12	[d]5	3	6-12	1	4
Nephews and nieces	6.5	4- 6	3- 4	6	5- 7½	2½	8-16	5	3	8-16	2	4
Uncles and aunts	6.5	6- 9	6	6	10-15	5	8-16	8	6	8-16	3	7
Grandnephews, grandnieces	7	4- 6	3- 4	6	10-15	2½	10-20	8	6	10-20	3	7
Great uncles, great aunts	7	8-12	6	6	10-15	5	10-20	10	6	10-20	6	7
Cousins-german	7	8-12	6	6	10-15	5	10-20	10	6	10-20	3	7
Great-grandnephews and nieces	8	10-15	3- 4	8	10-15	2½	10-20	10	6	10-20	6	7
Great-great uncles and aunts	8	10-15	10	8	10-15	5	10-20	10	6	10-20	6	7
Relatives of the sixth degree	8	10-15	10	8	10-15	5	10-20	10	10	10-20	6	10
More distant relatives and strangers	9	10-15	10	8	10-15	5	10-20	10	10	10-20	8	10

	Prussia.	Reuss (elder line).	Reuss (younger line).	Saxe-Altenburg.	Saxe-Coburg.	Saxe-Gotha.	Saxe-Meiningen.	Saxe-Weimar.	Saxony.	Schaumburg-Lippe.	Schwarzburg-Rudolstadt.	Schwarzburg-Sondershausen.	Wurttemberg.
	Per cent.	Per cent.	Per cent.	Per cent.	Per cent.	Per cent.	Per cent.	Per cent.	Per cent.	Per cent.	Per cent.	Per cent.	Per cent.
Husband or wife		[b]3											
Children													
Other descendants													
Adopted children													
Stepchildren	2	3	4- 6	6	5	5		4		2	2	5	3
Parents	4	6	8-12	6	6	8	6	6	3	4	8	5	3
Grandparents, etc			2- 3	([f])		[g]2							2
Stepparents			3-4½	4		[g]2							3
Children-in-law	4	6	8-12	6	6	8	6	6	4	4	8	5	4
Brothers and sisters	4	6	8-12	6	6	8	6	6	3	4	8	5	3
Nephews and nieces	2	3	4- 6	4	5	5	4	4	2	4	2	4	2
Uncles and aunts	2	3	6- 9	4	6	6	4	4	3	4	4	5	3
Grandnephews, grandnieces	4	6	8-12	5	6	8	6	6	4	4	8	5	4
Great uncles, great aunts	2	6	8-12	4	6	8	4	4	4	4	8	5	4
Cousins-german	4	6	8-12	5	6	8	6	6	8	4	8	8	6
Great-grandnephews and nieces	4	6	8-12	5	6	8	6	6	6	4	8	8	6
Great-great uncles and aunts	2	6	8-12	4	8	10	4	4	8	4	8	5	8
Relatives of the sixth degree	4	6	8-12	5	8	10	9	6	8	4	8	8	8
More distant relatives and strangers	4	6	8-12	[h]5	8	10	9	6	8	4	8	8	8
	8	8	10-15	[h]6	8	10	9	8	8	8	8	8	8

[a] Only 1 per cent of offspring also inherit.
[b] Exempt if with issue.
[c] Not exempt if children are excluded.
[d] Unless children are excluded.
[e] Exempt on 1,000 M. and on 20 per cent of the excess.
[f] Exempt on the interstate portion.
[g] Exempt on the compulsory share (one-half the interstate portion).
[h] Relatives, 5 per cent on the interstate portion.

Progressive rates are a recent development in Germany. Schaumberg-Lippe had a slightly progressive collateral-inheritance tax as early as 1811, but the maximum rate was only 3 per cent, and the progressive feature was omitted from the law of 1880. The recent progressive movement began in a small way in Baden in 1899, grandparents being taxed 2 per cent instead of 1 when the amount exceeded 5,000 marks, and certain collateral relatives 4 per cent instead of 3 on amounts over 3,000 marks. More complete applications of the progressive principle were made by Hamburg and Lubeck in 1903, by Bremen in 1904, and by Anhalt and Reuss (younger line) in 1905, the rate on all inheritances of more than 50,000 marks being subjected to additions of 5 or 10 per cent for each 50,000 or 100,000 marks, up to a maximum of one and one-half or two times the basic rate.

In most of the States gifts inter vivos were taxed like inheritances, but in some cases they were taxable only when made in contemplation of death or when formally authenticated.

Bavaria has the beginning of a tax on corporations as a substitute for the inheritance tax; the real estate of juristic persons, except charitable and religious institutions, is subject to a tax of 1 per cent once in twenty years.

France in like manner has a progressive inheritance tax, changing in accordance with the degree of consanguinity, as shown by the following table:

	1 to 2,000 francs.	2,001 to 10,000 francs.	10,001 to 50,000 francs.	50,001 to 100,000 francs.	100,001 to 250,000 francs.	250,001 to 500,000 francs.	500,001 to 1,000,000 francs.	Over 1,000,000 francs.
	Per cent.	Per cent.	Per cent.	Per cent.	Per cent.	Per cent.	Per cent.	Per cent.
Direct line	1.00	1.25	1.50	1.75	2.00	2.50	2.50	2.50
Husband or wife	3.75	4.00	4.50	5.00	5.50	6.00	6.50	7.00
Brothers and sisters	8.50	9.00	9.50	10.00	10.50	11.00	11.50	12.00
Uncles and aunts, nephews and nieces	10.00	10.50	11.00	11.50	12.00	12.50	13.00	13.50
Great uncles and great aunts, grandnephews and grandnieces, cousins-german	12.00	12.50	13.00	13.50	14.00	14.50	15.00	15.50
Relatives of the fifth and sixth degrees	14.00	14.50	15.00	15.50	16.00	16.50	17.00	17.50
Relatives beyond the sixth degree and strangers in blood	15.00	15.50	16.00	16.50	17.00	17.50	18.00	18.50

	1,000,001 to 2,000,000 francs.	2,000,001 to 5,000,000 francs.	5,000,001 to 10,000,000 francs.	10,000,001 to 50,000,000 francs.	Over 50,000,000 francs.
	Per cent.	Per cent.	Per cent.	Per cent.	Per cent.
Direct line	3.00	3.50	4.00	4.50	5.00
Husband or wife	7.00	7.50	8.00	8.50	9.00
Brothers and sisters	12.00	12.50	13.00	13.50	14.00
Uncles and aunts, nephews and nieces	13.50	14.00	14.50	15.00	15.50
Great uncles and great aunts, grandnephews and grandnieces, cousins-german	15.50	16.00	16.50	17.00	17.50
Relatives of the fifth and sixth degrees	17.50	18.00	18.50	19.00	19.50
Relatives beyond the sixth degree and strangers in blood	18.50	19.00	19.50	20.00	20.50

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Switzerland in like manner has the progressive inheritance tax, a full account of which will be found on page 41, West, Inheritance Tax.

In the Netherlands; Austria-Hungary; Italy; Russia; the Scandinavian countries, Norway, Sweden, and Denmark; Belgium; Spain; Portugal; Greece; Roumania; Bulgaria; and in Spanish America, Uruguay, Chile, Brazil, Argentina, Guatemala, and Mexico, and Japan this system prevails.

In Australasia they have heavy, progressive taxes imposed, not for the financial consideration alone, but *also for the purpose of breaking up large estates*, rising to 10 per cent in Victoria, New South Wales, South Australia, and Western Australia; 13 per cent in New Zealand; and to 20 per cent in Queensland.

Mr. President, some time ago I called the attention of the Senate to the fact that the mortality tables of Australia, and particularly of New Zealand, show that they do not have much more than half the death rate we have in this country; and it is directly due to the more equal distribution of wealth and the better opportunity of life afforded to the man who toils.

Sir Charles Dilke, in Problems of Greater Britain, part 6, chapter 1, declares that the institution of private property has not been weakened nor capital driven from the colonies by these progressive taxes. The Cape of Good Hope, Cape Colony, has like duties. Seven of the principal colonies of Canada have succession duties with elaborate progressive scales: Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Manitoba, Prince Edward Island, and British Columbia.

INHERITANCE TAX IN THE UNITED STATES.

The inheritance tax has been recognized in the United States by the act of July 6, 1797; by the war-revenue act of July 1, 1862; by the act of June 30, 1864; by the act of April, 1898.

This law was repealed April 12, 1902 (32 U. S. Stats., 92).

The receipts from the inheritance tax of 1898 are shown in the following table:

Fiscal year.	Receipts.	Percentage of internal revenue.
1898-99	$1,235,435.25	0.452
1899-1900	2,884,491.55	.977
1900-1901	5,211,898.68	1.698
1901-2	4,842,966.52	1.781
1902-3	5,356,774.90	2.322
1903-4	2,072,132.12	
1904-5	774,354.59	
1905-6	142,148.22	

American inheritance-tax laws, by States.

State.	Collateral.		Direct.	
	Rates.	Exemption.	Rates.	Exemption.
	Per cent.		*Per cent.*	
Arkansas	5			
California	1½-15	$500-$2,000	1-3	[a] $4,000
Colorado	3-6	500	2	10,000
Connecticut	3	10,000	1-2	10,000
Delaware [b]	5	500		
Idaho	1½-15	500-2,000	1-3	4,000
Illinois	2-6	500-2,000	1	20,000
Iowa	5	1,000		
Kentucky	5	500		
Louisiana [c]	5		2	10,000
Maine	4	500		
Maryland	2½	500		
Massachusetts	3-5	1,000	1-2	10,000
Michigan	5	100	[d] 1	2,000
Minnesota	1½-5	10,000	1½-5	10,000
Missouri	5			
Montana	5	500	[d] 1	7,500
Nebraska	2-6	500-2,000	1	10,000
New Hampshire	5			
New Jersey	5	500		
New York	5	500	1	10,000
North Carolina	1½-15	2,000	3-4	2,000
North Dakota	2	25,000		
Ohio	5	200		
Oregon	2-6	500-2,000	1	[e] 5,000
Pennsylvania	5	250		
South Dakota	2-10	100-500	1	5,000
Tennessee	5	250		
Texas	2-12	500-2,000		
Utah	5	10,000	5	10,000
Vermont	5			
Virginia	5			
Washington	2-12		1	10,000
West Virginia	3-7½		1	20,000
Wisconsin	1½-15	100-500	1-3	[e] 2,000
Wyoming	5	500	2	[f] 10,000

[a] Widows and (except in Wisconsin) minor children taxable only on the excess above $10,000 received by each.
[b] Tax payable only by strangers in blood.
[c] Tax not payable when the property bore its just proportion of taxes prior to the owner's death.
[d] Applies to personal property only.
[e] Decedents' estates of less than $10,000 are also exempt.
[f] For the surviving husband or wife and children, if residents of Wyoming, $25,000.

NEED OF FEDERAL LAW TO PREVENT EVASION.

I call the attention of the Senate to this important fact in considering this matter, that whenever a fortune grows very large the owner of that fortune can easily transfer his residence from a State which has an inheritance-tax law to a State which has no inheritance-tax law, and in that manner evade it. For that reason it is of the highest importance that the Federal Government should lay its hand upon the inheritance tax and upon the gigantic fortunes which are built up under our system of laws permitting monopoly to grow and flourish in this country, so that, at the death of the ambitious individual who has profited by our system, the people of the United States may have restored to them that which has been created by their labor.

Mr. President, I have no idea whatever that the amendment which I have the honor to propose will receive respectful consideration now; I do not offer it with any such view. I offer it because I desire the people of the United States to consider it, not because I expect the Finance Committee to consider it. This provision, if adopted by the people of the United States, will provide an enormous amount—not tens of millions, but hundreds of millions—that ought to go back to the people of the United States; and with that fund we could then have available a supply sufficient to improve the roads of the United States from the Atlantic to the Pacific, to improve the waterways of the United States and make transportation cheap, so that the tremendous outflow of the wealth of the people of the United States and their products might find an easy pathway to the sea and to the commerce of the world.

When this policy shall have been adopted by the people of the United States, it will check the very dangerous accumulations of gigantic fortunes which now comprise a serious menace to the people of the United States. Where a single fortune reaches a thousand millions and an annual income of fifty millions, increasing, as it must, in compounding geometric ratio and being typical, it is obvious that such an unequal distribution of the proceeds of human labor is not only unjust, unwise, but is dangerous to the peace and stability of the world.

Fifty millions of annual accumulations in one hand means the deprivation of many millions of people of a part of their slender earnings, and the accumulated force of all the demands of all of the great fortunes of the country, with their total exactions, means the impoverishment of the weaker elements of society by artificial exactions, depriving them of their reasonable opportunity to the enjoyment of life, of liberty, of the pursuit of happiness, and of the enjoyment of the fruits of their own industry.

Monopoly and plutocracy have more power in this Republic than they have in the kingdoms of Europe, where duties on inheritances universally prevail.

If the managers of this bill strike out the inheritance tax on any pretense whatever, I shall certainly regard it as a temporary triumph of selfishness over the influence of patriotism and righteousness. It will be impossible to prevent for a great while the imposition of inheritance taxes, first, because it is right; second, because the judgment and the conscience of the American people, with their increasing intelligence, will not sustain the party now in power in such a gross lack of its obvious duty—a duty earnestly recommended by the President of the United States in his message of December 3, 1906, and approved by such men as the noble-hearted Andrew Carnegie, who, in 1889, wisely said:

> By taxing estates heavily at death the state marks its condemnation of the selfish millionaire's unworthy life. It is desirable that nations should go much further in this direction. Indeed, it is difficult to set bounds to the share of a rich man's estate which should go at his death to the public through the agency of the state.

He also said:

> There are exceptions to all rules, but not more exceptions, we think, to this rule than to rules generally, that the "almighty dollar" bequeathed to children is an "almighty curse." No man has a right to handicap his son with such a burden as great wealth.

He also said:

> This policy would work powerfully to induce the rich man to attend to the administration of wealth during his life, which is the end that society should always have in view, as being by far the most fruitful for the people. Nor need it be feared that this policy would sap the root of enterprise and render men less anxious to accumulate, for, to the class whose ambition it is to leave great fortunes and be talked about after their death, it will attract even more attention, and, indeed, be a somewhat nobler ambition, to have enormous sums paid over to the state from their fortunes.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope that the managers of this bill will do themselves the credit, and the Republican party the honor, to put into this bill a substantial progressive inheritance tax, even if they do not approve the form of the amendment I have the honor to propose.

Mr. President, I submit a table of the proceeds of the inheritance taxes in the United States, and also in the several States.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

PROCEEDS OF INHERITANCE TAXES IN THE UNITED STATES.

The inheritance taxes paid in the various States now amount to about $10,000,000 a year. Below are shown the receipts from this source for four years past:

Proceeds of state inheritance taxes, 1902–1906, in comparison with the estimated true value of taxable wealth in each State, 1904.

[In most cases the receipts reported are net receipts exclusive of commissions, etc.]

State.	Taxable wealth, 1904 (millions).	Inheritance-tax receipts.			
		1902–3.	1903–4.	1904–5.	1905–6.
Arkansas	$781	$1,605	$66	$755	$850
California	3,881	[a] 285,868	[a] 286,561	[a] 532,713	[a] 292,705
Colorado	1,101	[b] 5,960	[b] 5,961	[b] 48,646	[b] 48,647
Connecticut	1,317	249,730	265,781	284,117	274,259
Delaware	221	1,618	3,272	3,102	
Illinois	8,534	[b] 460,857	[b] 460,858	[b] 688,312	[b] 688,312
Iowa	3,943	[b] 117,333	[b] 141,721	[b] 141,722	190,748
Louisiana	980		10,694	57,001	86,655
Maine	749	31,227	73,899	69,076	70,534
Maryland	1,417	67,115	91,559	76,665	107,820
Massachusetts	4,533	506,147	562,193	694,181	712,720
Michigan	3,149	[a] 163,572	[a] 181,539	187,036	289,025
Minnesota	3,229	3,422			159,455
Missouri	3,598	142,564	122,030	305,551	213,131
Montana [c]	636	[b] 8,506	[b] 8,506	[b] 6,038	[b] 6,038
Nebraska	1,949	[b] 2,804	[b] 2,805	[b] 2,120	[b] 2,120
New Hampshire	493				3,277
New Jersey	3,022	138,932	438,635	202,068	200,780
New York	13,440	4,665,736	5,428,052	4,627,951	4,713,311
North Carolina	812		16,000	5,324	4,073
Ohio [c]	5,693	39,276	78,209	406,744	124,457
Oregon	766		6,826	23,192	15,290
Pennsylvania	10,814	1,300,835	1,080,578	1,677,185	1,507,962
South Dakota	629				1,450
Tennessee	1,058	[b] 56,007	[b] 56,007	[b] 34,310	[b] 34,310
Utah	407	44,144	39,393	9,971	39,889
Vermont	342	29,440	37,227	41,058	40,581
Virginia	1,235	19,612	12,797	20,215	28,742
Washington	986	8,292	25,774	[b] 33,267	[b] 33,268
West Virginia	814	1,367	6,443	10,495	26,052
Wisconsin	2,734		4,320	125,965	103,917
Wyoming	256			[b] 4,373	[b] 4,373

[a] Refunds deducted.
[b] One-half the receipts for two years.
[c] The figures here given represent the States share only; that is, in the case of Montana, three-fifths of the total receipts; and in the case of Ohio, three-fourths of the net receipts.

The following table shows the receipts from the national tax on legacies and distributive shares of personal property during the two fiscal years when it was most fully in operation, in comparison with the estimated value of all personal property in each State or collection district:

Proceeds of the national tax on legacies and distributive shares of personal property, 1900–1902, in comparison with the estimated true value of personal property, 1900.

State.	Value of personal property, 1900 [a] (millions).	Legacy-tax receipts.	
		1900–1901.	1901–2.
Alabama	$401	$1,353.10	$5,935.90
Arkansas	296		2,062.21
California and Nevada	1,235	88,518.41	61,497.39
Colorado and Wyoming	596	2,083.26	7,748.33
Connecticut and Rhode Island	704	358,954.73	641,096.10
Florida	168	282.27	
Georgia	453	3,144.68	24,812.96
Hawaii		5,303.76	1,051.56
Illinois	2,711	345,636.55	325,964.84
Indiana	1,106	9,355.47	19,194.24
Iowa	1,316	19,533.59	44,274.50
Kansas, Oklahoma, and Indian Territory	1,278	6,964.17	107.20
Kentucky	569	12,934.06	13,350.17
Louisiana and Mississippi	$703	$20,186.62	$20,076.69
Maryland, Delaware, and District of Columbia	759	[b] 217,581.10	[b] 99,417.05
Massachusetts	1,442	452,944.61	559,296.97
Michigan	1,035	66,498.47	67,780.66
Minnesota	1,056	17,961.27	23,147.10
Missouri	1,243	78,078.32	91,011.72
Montana, Idaho, and Utah	665	2,843.40	162,744.19
Nebraska	751	1,732.90	10,547.10
New Hampshire, Maine, and Vermont	652	67,813.64	114,115.15
New Jersey	1,107	295,935.17	79,861.37
New Mexico and Arizona	254	455.71	660.55
New York	4,533	2,314,425.51	1,608,843.83
North Carolina	343	2,577.13	3,215.10
North and South Dakota	500	[c]	83.93
Ohio	2,100	175,067.92	69,321.70
Oregon and Washington	602	[d] 141.21	[d] 6,641.72
Pennsylvania	3,917	571,019.10	660,753.94
South Carolina	247	2,780.25	6,793.95
Tennessee	445	6,395.58	7,383.18
Texas	1,013	18,264.77	18,643.32
Virginia	508	8,373.08	15,791.19
West Virginia	326	2,865.09	10,564.64
Wisconsin	943	33,890.78	62,176.07
Total	35,980	5,211,898.68	4,842,966.52

[a] Including stocks and bonds of railroads, etc.
[b] Including Accomac and Northampton counties, Va.
[c] Included with Nebraska.
[d] Including Alaska.

Mr. President, these tables show what a small inheritance tax will do, and I call attention to the fact that the state taxes on inheritances are very small and the tax runs to small estates, which I do not think at all desirable as far as a federal inheritance tax is concerned. The federal tax—inheritance tax—in my judgment, should be confined to large estates and should be made progressive, so as to abolish the present skillful evasion of the constitutional law laid down by our ancestors against the rule of primogeniture and entail.

ENTAIL AND PRIMOGENITURE.

Mr. President, it is contrary to the welfare of the human race to permit estates in perpetuity, and it is against the spirit of the common law and it is against the constitutional rule everywhere in force in our Republic forbidding primogeniture and entail.

The rule of primogeniture is so well understood that no man would be so imprudent as to attempt to leave his estate subject to such a will. And the law of entail is equally well understood, but it is in recent years avoided in various ingenious ways.

For example, by placing the property in trust; by incorporating estates and placing the stock in the hands of trustees, the corporation itself having a perpetual life. By the perpetual life of corporations has grown up a method of evading the wise spirit of the rule forbidding primogeniture and forbidding the accumulation of vast properties in a single hand. In my judgment there should be no apologetical treatment of this matter.

The accumulation of gigantic fortunes in a single hand, with the huge power of increase where the income can not be consumed, is dangerous to the commercial liberties of the people; and because dangerous to commercial liberties of the people it is dangerous to the political and civil liberty of the people.

Mr. ALDRICH. Do I understand that the Senator from Oklahoma has offered an amendment?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. No; the Senator from Oklahoma has not offered an amendment.

Mr. CUMMINS rose.

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

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Aldrich	Chamberlain	Flint	Owen
Bacon	Clapp	Gallinger	Page
Beveridge	Clark, Wyo.	Gamble	Penrose
Borah	Crane	Guggenheim	Piles
Bourne	Crawford	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Brandegee	Cullom	Jones	Scott
Briggs	Cummins	Kean	Simmons
Bristow	Curtis	La Follette	Smith, Mich.
Brown	Daniel	McCumber	Smoot
Bulkeley	Davis	McLaurin	Warren
Burkett	Dick	Nelson	Wetmore
Burrows	Dillingham	Newlands	
Burton	du Pont	Oliver	
Carter	Fletcher	Overman	

Mr. CURTIS. The junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. WARNER] requested me to announce that he is unavoidably detained from the Senate this afternoon.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Fifty-three Senators have answered to the roll call. A quorum of the Senate is present.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I am sure that no Senator can be more conscious than I am of the unfortunate conditions which surround us, and particularly which surround me, as I enter upon the consideration of the subject before the Senate. It is late in the afternoon; Senators have been in continuous attendance now for seven and a half hours. We are at the end of a long and weary debate upon subjects that have not always been interesting. We are jaded not only in body, but in mind as well. We are suffering with excessive heat; and I discover a sort of half-sullen indifference that does not bode well for one who attempts to engage the attention of the Senators upon questions so serious and difficult. I would gladly defer until to-morrow morning, if it were possible, what I have to say upon this subject; but inasmuch as the hour appointed for adjournment has not yet arrived, and as I would rather suffer the discomfort of entering upon my address and of inflicting upon you the tortures of it than to allow the amendment to be voted upon without further remark, I intend between now and 7 o'clock to submit as slowly, as calmly, and as deliberately as I can some observations with regard to the proposed income-tax law.

I know that you will forgive me if I endeavor to postpone what I have most at heart to say upon this matter until to-morrow. There are some things, however, that I can say as well this afternoon as at any other time.

Until within a few days ago the issue was, Shall the present Congress adopt any income-tax amendment? And upon that issue

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

nation and bore down upon the energies and the industries of the common man; and when, Mr. President, 85 per cent of that fearful burden was collected from the peasantry of France, which forced them from their little homes and farms into the sinks and dives of Paris, where the French revolution was born.

The history of taxation is well worthy of the attention of those who believe that, in order to maintain a republic, we must always have at the base of our civilization an intelligent, free, and, to some extent, an unburdened citizenship. No, Mr. President, we will not repeal all taxes; but we will distribute the burdens; though we may not do it this session, and I do not suppose we will, we will do it before this fight is over.

Mr. President, I have called attention to that period when the revenue act of 1898 was before Congress. Certain newspapers of the country and, to a certain extent, all the great corporations without any exception, bitterly opposed that tax. They did not know how easy it would be apparently, not heretofore having had a special tax laid upon them, to transfer it. The main proposition of taxing corporations was defeated, but the amendment covering two classes of business went through. Of course certain stamp taxes were enacted which the corporations were supposed to pay. Then they began this contest. They demonstrated the fact, as a practical proposition, that they could transfer it; they demonstrated, as a matter of law, that they had a right to transfer it; and they demonstrated, as a matter of law, that there was no power in Congress to prevent the transfer. So to-day we are advised through newspapers that the great corporations in the land are saying, "put on this tax in preference to the income tax."

I do not want it to be understood that I am charging that the Finance Committee has gone about this for the purpose of doing such a thing. They may stand upon the legal proposition that, rather than submit another question to the Supreme Court, they would do this; but the result of the legislation is the same. Whether from one motive or another, the result of it is that the great corporations, controlling the great industries in this country, are standing side by side with the Committee on Finance in support of this proposition in preference to the income tax. Why? Because they can transfer this tax; while that class of men, that vast amount of wealth to which the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] called attention, can not transfer.

Speaking of the decisions, Mr. President, and the idea of going to the Supreme Court again, I will digress to say just a word now, rather than later. It seems to me, with all due respect to those who suggest this proposition, that it is based upon an incorrect idea both as to the function of the court and the relation of the people to the court. It is a great tribunal; it is a tribunal having power to wreck or to sustain the Government, although without command of sword or purse.

But, Mr. President, think of this argument: Away back, just after the Constitution was adopted, Congress put a tax upon what they then called "luxuries" or "wealth;" those who had carriages, and could use them for their own personal use. Wealth went to the Supreme Court of the United States and tested that proposition, and said that it was a direct tax under the Constitution; but the Supreme Court sustained the tax.

We come down to the great civil war, and the fathers who organized the Republican party—Abraham Lincoln, Salmon P. Chase, Charles Sumner, and that class of men—again laid the taxing power upon the wealth of this country in the form of tax on incomes. Wealth went again to the Supreme Court, and did what? Asked them to reconsider the opinion of fifty-odd years before, when they had settled and said what a direct tax was. The court passed upon it again. In a short time the same class of people went again to the Supreme Court; and, notwithstanding the fact that there had been a unanimous opinion as to what a direct tax was, they again asked them to reconsider it.

The next time those who were seeking to escape taxation, having three decisions of the Supreme Court before them, they went again to the Supreme Court and asked them to reconsider; and the Supreme Court, with that patience and broad mindedness which has always characterized that great tribunal, again went carefully into the question, reviewed its former decisions, went into the history of the Constitution and its making, and again told the wealth of this country what constituted direct taxes. Four times they had interpreted the Constitution by a unanimous judgment of the court; but still again they came and asked the Supreme Court to once more review its decisions. For nearly one hundred years, beginning with those who wrote the Constitution of the United States, down until years after the close of the great war those who were seeking to escape taxation went again and again to the Supreme Court, and in the face of those decisions, unanimous as they were, asked for a review and a reconsideration of the question. The Supreme Court, with patience and care, examined the subject again in all its ramifications. Time passed on, and in 1894 another law was enacted taxing the incomes of the country, and notwithstanding the five decisions of the Supreme Court defining a direct tax, the untaxed wealth and the untaxed incomes of this country traveled their way to the Supreme Court again and asked the Supreme Court to review five unanimous decisions as to what is a direct tax. They succeeded in what? By a bare majority of one, against the decisions preceding, they succeeded in establishing a different rule of interpretation. As to that decision Mr. Justice White said:

> My inability to agree with the court in the conclusions which it has just expressed causes me much regret. Great as is my respect for any view by it announced, I can not resist the conviction that its opinion and decree in this case virtually annuls its previous decisions in regard to the powers of Congress on the subject of taxation, and is therefore fraught with danger to the court, to each and every citizen, and to the Republic.

As to that decision these are searching words of Mr. Justice Harlan:

> In my judgment, to say nothing of the disregard of former adjudications of this court and of the settled practice of the Government, this decision may well excite the gravest apprehensions. It strikes at the very foundation of national authority, in that it denies to the General Government a power which is, or may become, vital to the very existence and preservation of the Union in a national emergency such as that of a war with a great commercial nation, during which the collection of duties upon imports will cease or be materially diminished. * * * The decision now made may provoke a contest in this country, from which the American people would have been spared if the court had not overturned its former adjudications and had adhered to the principles of taxation upon which our Government, following the repeated adjudications of this court, has always been administered. Thoughtful, conservative men have uniformly held that government could not be safely administered, except upon principles of right, justice, and equality—without discrimination against any part of the people because of their owning or not owning visible property, or because of their having or not having incomes from bonds and stocks. But by its present construction of the Constitution the court, for the first time in all its history, declares that our Government has been so framed that in matters of taxation for its support and maintenance those who have incomes derived from the renting of real estate or from the leasing or using of tangible property, bonds, stock, and investments of whatever kind, have privileges that can not be accorded to those having incomes derived from the labor of their hands or the exercise of their skill or the use of their brains.

Since that bare majority of one has been obtained, Senators urge that the great masses of the American people, who are asking to have this tax burden distributed, shall not go again to the court to have that question considered, out of a mere delicacy of consideration for that tribunal.

Mr. President, that great tribunal, whose judgments and decrees deal with the destiny of 46 sovereign Commonwealths and with all the plans and purposes of a great Nation, within whose jurisdiction are found the rights and liberties of the humblest citizen, and the complex and ever-haunting problems of state and national sovereignty, can not be too jealously guarded or profoundly honored to suit me. If we differ upon that question we differ only as to the method of making known our respect for its power and our concern for its continued usefulness and honor. As a citizen, I bow uncomplainingly to its judgment; as a lawyer, I seek its decisions as the wisest and most profound expositions of the law to be found among our own people or elsewhere, controlling and authoritative, not simply because the Constitution makes them so, but because of their learning and research and wealth of reasoning; but, sir, as a legislator, sworn to uphold and maintain the Constitution, pledged to preserve it in all its integrity of purpose, I most respectfully submit that I am not precluded from carrying to that tribunal for its reconsideration a question upon which they were all but evenly divided. Where great and powerful intellects trained in constitutional law, each determined to arrive at a sound and righteous conclusion, differ by a bare margin of one, and by such difference overturn the precedents and practice of a century, and by such difference overturn the precedents upon which we had collected millions from the American people and fought the great battles of the Union, who will tell me that under such circumstances it is an assault to the dignity of the court or an undermining of its confidence to ask it again to reconsider that question?

Mr. President, the mere change of opinion upon a specific question of law submitted is a small item to mar the confidence of the people in that august body. Our confidence is best assured and most definitely determined when it is ascertained that although specific errors may creep in, errors which are human, the inherent bent of its innate strength and virtue, the compelling power of its intellectual integrity are to correct those errors, so that, in the wide sweep of the years, its judgments may stand the test of reason and the strain of time. Sir, I honor that tribunal by appealing to its great patience, its tolerance, its willingness so magnificently exhibited upon scores of occasions to reexamine its own opinions. Let us do our

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

duty as we understand it, with a due regard to the rights of the people and our sworn obligations here, and trust the great jurists, who now occupy places upon that bench and who rank well in heart and brain with their great predecessors, to protect and preserve the integrity and honor of that bench, and transfer it unimpaired and untarnished to succeeding generations.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DIXON in the chair). Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. BORAH. I do.

Mr. CLAPP. I move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. President, do I understand that it is the desire of the Senator from Idaho to discontinue at this time?

Mr. BORAH. I would prefer not to go on.

Mr. BURROWS. If the Senator would prefer to go on, there is ample time——

Mr. BORAH. I would prefer to discontinue for the present.

Mr. CLAPP. Of course I would not have made the motion if it were not agreeable to the Senator from Idaho.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair did not fully understand the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. CLAPP. I move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The question is not debatable, Mr. President.

Mr. BURROWS. I suggest to the Senator from Idaho, if it would not be disagreeable to him, that it is only half past 5, and we could proceed for a little time longer.

Mr. BORAH. If it is desired, I can proceed until 6 o'clock.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I think a motion to adjourn is not debatable; and I ask the Chair to submit to the Senate the motion of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP].

Mr. BURROWS. Of course, it is not debatable——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands the motion is not debatable, and that the debate is proceeding by unanimous consent.

Mr. BURROWS. But the Senator from Idaho says he is willing to proceed until 6 o'clock.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator from Idaho does not desire to continue, it is possible that some other Senator can go on and let the Senator from Idaho rest. A good many Senators, in addition to the Senator from Idaho, desire to speak on this subject.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. If a motion to adjourn is made, unless the Senator making it withdraws it, it can not be debated.

Mr. SMOOT. Is there not a unanimous-consent agreement that we shall continue in session until 7 o'clock?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Unless the Senator withdraws it——

Mr. CLAPP. I do not withdraw it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP]. [Putting the question.] By the sound the "noes" appear to have it.

Mr. CLAPP and Mr. LA FOLLETTE called for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays are demanded.

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. You will not find a quorum here, if you call the roll.

Mr. BURROWS. There ought not to be any difficulty about this matter. I understand the Senator from Idaho is willing to proceed until 6 o'clock.

Mr. BULKELEY. Some of us who have been sitting here all day listening, however, are just as eager to go as the Senator who has been speaking.

Mr. KEAN. We should like to get through with this bill, if we can.

Mr. BULKELEY. I do not see how you can finish it to-night.

Mr. BAILEY. You will not make any progress by trying to force a man to speak when he is exhausted.

Mr. SMOOT. I have no desire to do so, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a second to the demand for the yeas and nays?

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

Mr. DILLINGHAM (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN]. As he is not present, I withhold my vote.

Mr. FLETCHER (when Mr. TALIAFERRO'S name was called). The senior Senator from Florida [Mr. TALIAFERRO] is paired with the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS].

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BRIGGS (after having voted in the negative). I inquire if the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that he has not.

Mr. BRIGGS. I have a pair with that Senator, and therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. McLAURIN. I inquire if the Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that he has not.

Mr. McLAURIN. Then I withhold my vote, as I am paired with that Senator.

Mr. BACON. I desire to announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. FRAZIER] is absent from the Chamber on account of illness.

The result was announced—yeas 34, nays 17, as follows:

YEAS—34.

Bacon	Clay	Hughes	Page
Bailey	Crawford	Johnson, N. Dak.	Perkins
Borah	Culberson	Jones	Piles
Bourne	Cummins	La Follette	Simmons
Bristow	Daniel	Money	Smith, S. C.
Brown	Dick	Nelson	Stone
Bulkeley	Fletcher	Newlands	Warner
Clapp	Foster	Overman	
Clark, Wyo.	Gamble	Owen	

NAYS—17.

Brandegee	Curtis	Lodge	Sutherland
Burkett	Flint	Oliver	Warren
Burrows	Gallinger	Root	
Carter	Guggenheim	Scott	
Cullom	Kean	Smoot	

NOT VOTING—41.

Aldrich	Depew	Johnston, Ala.	Shively
Bankhead	Dillingham	Lorimer	Smith, Md.
Beveridge	Dixon	McCumber	Smith, Mich.
Bradley	Dolliver	McEnery	Stephenson
Briggs	du Pont	McLaurin	Taliaferro
Burnham	Elkins	Martin	Taylor
Burton	Frazier	Nixon	Tillman
Chamberlain	Frye	Paynter	Wetmore
Clarke, Ark.	Gore	Penrose	
Crane	Hale	Rayner	
Davis	Heyburn	Richardson	

So the motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, July 1, 1909, at 10 o'clock a. m.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *July 1, 1909.*

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. Browning, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 1033) to provide for the Thirteenth and subsequent decennial censuses, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice-President.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a petition of the Commercial Travelers' Protective Association of America, praying that Congress grant Dr. T. R. Timby, of Brooklyn, N. Y., a rehearing before the Court of Claims, which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also presented an address by the Colony of Persia in Egypt through its committee of award relating to the evacuation of Bushir, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. JONES presented a memorial of the Clearing House Association of Spokane, Wash., remonstrating against the adoption of the so-called "Bailey-Cummins income-tax amendment" to the pending tariff bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. SHIVELY presented a petition of sundry citizens of the United States, praying that an appropriation be made to reimburse them for losses sustained during the military operations at Samoa in March, April, and May, 1899, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. SHIVELY:

A bill (S. 2801) granting an increase of pension to Michael Collins;

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

A bill (S. 2802) granting an increase of pension to Adam Greenawalt;

A bill (S. 2803) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Bill; and

A bill (S. 2804) granting a pension to Mattie Shepard (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

AMENDMENT TO THE TARIFF BILL.

Mr. BURKETT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to section 4 of the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

PROTECTION'S FAVORS TO FOREIGNERS.

Mr. OWEN. On May 22 I asked to have printed as a document an article by Mr. James G. Parsons on "Protection's Favors to Foreigners," and known as "Senate Document No. 54." Upon examination, I find that some corrections are necessary, and I ask for a reprint of the document as corrected, with the illustrations.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, a reprint of the document will be ordered.

HENRY D. SAYRE.

The VICE-PRESIDENT 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 Pacific Islands and Porto Rico and ordered to be printed (S. Doc. No. 119):

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

In accordance with section 32 of the act of Congress approved April 12, 1900 (31 Stat., 84), entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenues and a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," I have the honor to transmit herewith for the consideration of the Congress certified copy of a franchise granted by the executive council of Porto Rico, June 10, 1909, entitled "An ordinance amending an ordinance entitled 'An ordinance repealing an ordinance entitled "An ordinance granting to Henry D. Sayre, his heirs, successors or assigns, the right to use the waters of the Mavilla Creek for the generation of electric energy," approved April 3, 1905,' and granting to Henry D. Sayre and his assign, the Mabilla Mining Company, the right to utilize the waters of the Mabilla Creek for mining purposes," approved by the acting governor of Porto Rico, June 15, 1909.

WM. H. TAFT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 25, 1909.*

THE TARIFF.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will announce the first bill on the calendar.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes.

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

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Bacon	Clapp	Foster	Page
Beveridge	Clark, Wyo.	Frye	Perkins
Borah	Clay	Gallinger	Root
Brandegee	Crawford	Guggenheim	Scott
Briggs	Cullom	Heyburn	Shively
Bristow	Cummins	Hughes	Simmons
Brown	Curtis	Johnson, N. Dak.	Smoot
Bulkeley	Davis	Jones	Stone
Burkett	Dick	Kean	Sutherland
Burnham	Dillingham	Lodge	Taliaferro
Burrows	du Pont	McCumber	Tillman
Burton	Fletcher	McLaurin	Warner
Carter	Flint	Nelson	Warren

Mr. JONES. My colleague [Mr. PILES] is temporarily detained from the Chamber this morning.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Fifty-two Senators have answered to the roll call. A quorum of the Senate is present.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I regret that I have perhaps been the cause of discommoding the committee in its desire of hastening this bill—of discommoding my colleagues, who are also desirous of hastening the bill. With a view of compensating something for the delay last evening, I shall shorten my remarks to-day to some extent.

I observe that the morning press referred to me as having been bitter in my attitude last evening. It reminds me to say again that I am attempting to discuss this subject without questioning the motives of any one who may differ from me in opinion, and I am seeking to discuss it from the standpoint of principle. I have not been long in this Chamber, but long enough to learn to be tolerant as to men's motives, though somewhat intolerant, possibly, as to opinions.

I called attention last evening to the fact that during the period of 1898 there was a proposed amendment to the war-revenue act which provided for an excise tax with relation to the business of refining sugar and petroleum, and I called attention to the attitude of some of the leaders of the party as to that tax. I had practically passed from the discussion of that subject, but I want to quote just one more eminent authority as to the effect of the tax, and then I will close my remarks upon that feature of the discussion.

Senator Gray was not a radical nor a man who spoke without consideration. He has long been regarded as one of the safe and wise and eminent counselors in our public affairs, and has served his country upon one or two occasions when his exceptional ability and his judgment were proven by his service to a remarkable degree.

In discussing this matter he said:

> All taxes of this character, however they may be directed at what is called "the wealth of the country," in some fashion and in some way sift down to consumption.

He was speaking with reference to the corporation tax.

Now, Mr. President, prior to the introduction of the amendment which I have been discussing there was introduced by someone, I have forgotten now the Senator, a broader and more comprehensive amendment, covering a tax upon the gross income of all corporations. This was a separate and distinct measure from the amendment which I have been discussing. It brought to the discussion the wisdom and the judgment and the views of all the leaders of my party. I quote from those leaders this morning, not with any view to criticising either expressly or impliedly their position then with reference to their position now, or in any other way, but for the sole purpose of bringing before the Senate the fact that this measure has once undergone the test of reason and judgment of the leaders of this body upon the majority side, and was rejected, not from expediency, not because the revenue was not necessary, but rejected upon principle.

It seems to me that if we ascertain that the tax has once been subjected to the test, both in argument and in part in experience, and has failed to meet the test, not as a matter of a mere revenue-producing proposition, but has proven to be wrong in principle, it is well worth our while to stop and consider, because we are certainly entering a new field of legislation and gathering to ourselves a jurisdiction with reference to the taxing power of this Government which, to say the least, is extraordinary.

When the late distinguished and vigilant Senator from Iowa, Senator Allison, brought in the report of the majority, he referred to this proposed amendment. I shall not take the time to read his view, but there are men in the Senate Chamber who served long years with that veteran statesman, who relied upon his judgment, believed in his wisdom, were guided by his counsel, who regarded him in matters of this kind as one of the safest men who ever served in public life. I invite the friends of this measure, who have brought it in here, as they say, for the purpose of defeating another measure——

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. BORAH. Certainly.

Mr. McCUMBER. Will the Senator right here allow me to protest against that statement? Not only the Senator from Idaho, but the Senator from Iowa, have in the debate several times asserted that the committee amendment was reported by the committee for the purpose of destroying some other amendment. I for one wish to state that that is not correct, so far as I am concerned; and I do not understand that in the colloquy between the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] and some other Senator on this floor, in which that Senator gave his own personal reasons for supporting this tax amendment, he intended to give the reasons which actuated the committee in any respect. He gave them as his own personal reasons, and did not attempt to place those reasons to the credit or discredit of any member of the committee. I do not know that a single other member of that committee agrees with him upon that proposition. I shall probably vote for this amendment, but it will certainly not be for that reason, because I believe if we could have a valid income-tax law it certainly would be preferable and more equitable than this one.

Mr. BORAH. I am very glad to have the suggestion of the Senator from North Dakota. I accept his personal view with reference to his personal reasons and motives. I wish the confessions would become more numerous.

Mr. CLAPP. Will the Senator pardon me an interruption?

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Mr. BORAH. Certainly.

Mr. CLAPP. I wish to ask the Senator if he would not practically insist that the committee be polled before he would accept the statement of the Senator from North Dakota as voicing the sentiment of the entire committee?

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator from North Dakota has not attempted to voice the sentiment of the entire committee. The Senator from North Dakota has voiced his own sentiment. All that he has stated is that the Senator from Rhode Island in his colloquy did not pretend to voice the sentiment of each separate member of the committee, but only his own.

Now, I do not know absolutely the view of a single other member of the committee upon the question as to whether an income tax would be preferable to this tax if it could be made constitutional. I have my own views on the subject, and I do not wish in those views to be understood as representing the view of a single one of the members. All I wish to say is that it is unjust to say that the particular personal view of the chairman necessarily represents the views of each separate member of the committee.

Mr. CLAPP. I did not say anything from which it could be implied that I meant to intimate that the Senator from North Dakota intended to voice any sentiment but his own. I simply suggested that I for one would want a poll of the committee before I take his attitude as the attitude of a majority of the committee.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I am perfectly willing, so far as I am individually concerned, to accept the statement of the Senator from North Dakota, made, as I have no doubt, in perfect good faith. I have no doubt his statement represents his individual view; and having the regard I have for him in all his public service, I do not for a moment challenge it. I am going later, however, to show—not alone from the statement of the chairman of the committee, but from the circumstances which surround this transaction—that it is proven beyond peradventure of doubt that this measure had its origin in the desire to defeat the income tax. As to what might have been the individual view of any man who, fortunately or unfortunately, was connected with the committee, I am not going to take issue with anyone; but the great, controlling, overwhelming proposition, supported by the unquestionable facts surrounding us, is the fact that it is here as a measure to defeat the income tax, and when it shall have served its purpose it will die, as the great leader of this Chamber said, an ignominious death.

I was referring to the statement made by Senator Allison when he brought in the committee report in 1898. It is worth our while, when we have time and the curiosity, to go back and read his argument. It covers the entire range and the entire field, and it would perhaps be much better, if I had the time, to read his argument than to undertake to make an original argument myself, because of his commanding position for long years in this Chamber. But every reason advanced against this measure by Senator Allison, of Iowa, is just as effective to-day as it was then, because he argued it upon principle. We were then meeting the proposition of raising revenue for the expenses of the war. We needed the revenue. It was not for that reason that he rejected it, but for the reason, as he said, that it was unjust, unfair, discriminative, and that it visited the burden where it ought not to be visited in laying these extra taxes.

If that be true, I appeal to those who insist upon passing this measure in the late days of this debate to go back and reconsider for a moment. Possibly, in the great anxiety to kill a good measure, some serious mistake has been made. Possibly the clear and commanding judgments of some of our leaders here have been clouded through fear and through intense dislike for a just measure, but a measure which would reach interests which there is always a great desire in certain quarters to protect.

I will not read his address. I am simply calling attention to it, as the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] said he would put it in his speech. During that debate a colloquy took place between Senator Platt, of Connecticut, and Senator DANIEL, of Virginia, which I desire to quote briefly:

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Yes; it is denominated an excise tax and something else, a special excise tax, something that was never heard of in the history of taxation in the United States.

Mr. SPOONER. Will one of those distinguished lawyers, members of the Committee on Finance, be kind enough to explain the constitutional distinction between an excise tax and a special excise tax?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I can not for the life of me understand, Mr. President, how the taxation of gross receipts does not come within the doctrine of the court laid down in the income-tax cases.

Mr. DANIEL. On personal property?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. If it be a tax on gross receipts, if it be a tax on corporations as such, because they are corporations, I think it was never attempted before in this country, and I do not believe the United States can put a tax upon the corporations chartered by a State. I do not understand that any of those authorities go to the length of holding that the Congress of the United States can impose a tax upon a corporation chartered by a State because it is a corporation.

During that discussion the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts——

Mr. OVERMAN. Will the Senator pardon me? Who was he reading from? This is a matter of interest.

Mr. BORAH. Senator Platt, of Connecticut.

Mr. OVERMAN. I am very much interested in the argument, and I wanted to know from whom he is reading.

Mr. BORAH. The late Senator Platt.

Mr. BULKELEY. A very wise man.

Mr. HEYBURN. Was it Senator Platt who raised the question as to whether Congress had the power to impose a tax upon corporations created by a State, or was that Senator DANIEL?

Mr. BORAH. It was Senator Platt, of Connecticut, and he was joined in that view by Senator Spooner.

During the debate upon this amendment the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] discussed the matter plainly. With his usual power of statement and argument he covered the subject, and I want to call attention somewhat at length to his statement. You will be patient with me when I do so, because I am not trespassing upon the patience of the Senate with my views, but with the argument and the views of a man who has been a leader in public political thought as a partisan for years. The Senator said:

The object, as I take it, of the proposed tax on banks and corporations is to place a tax upon those wicked persons—

Observe the fine satire and the polished irony of that remark, a combination of Juvenal and Junius. I will read it again:

The object, as I take it, of the proposed tax on banks and corporations is to place a tax upon those wicked persons who have made or saved money and who are popularly supposed to be gathered together in corporations. * * * The States and municipalities must get their money somewhere. If the National Government takes from them one field of taxation after another, they are forced back more and more to the comparatively narrow ground of real estate, and it seems to me that this is a very serious, to my mind, objection to the whole scheme of taxing banks and corporations. There is another point about this amendment, and that is the extreme injustice, as it appears to me, with which taxes are imposed. We tax corporations, but we do not tax a partnership. * * * We propose to tax men for privileges which we do not confer and relieve other men doing, perhaps, the same business and with a larger profit because they do business in the name of a partnership and not a corporation. The corporation, as a rule, is made up of many persons with small interests, whereas the great partnerships are made up, as a rule, of one or two or three persons, and yet by this amendment the partnerships are exempted and the corporations are taxed. * * *

A Daniel come to judgment!

The States can not tax privileges or franchises that were given; and we are entering in with the taxing power which, as the Senator from Wisconsin has pointed out, involves the power to destroy, to tax the privilege granted by the State.

Mr. ALLEN of Nebraska——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. BORAH. Certainly.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I did not understand exactly. Is it possible that the Senator was quoting from the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]?

Mr. BORAH. I was quoting from the address of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Will the Senator from Idaho state exactly what the question pending at that time was?

Mr. BORAH. The question pending was a tax upon the gross incomes or receipts of corporations, proposed by the minority members of the committee, opposed by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, together with all the other Republican Senators who were then in the Senate Chamber.

I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that the opposition was based upon broad and far-reaching and fundamental principles. No man said we do not need this revenue; this is not the time for this action. They said it was unequal, unjust, discriminating, violative of the fundamental principles of taxation. Those were the points.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. BORAH. Certainly.

Mr. CARTER. The Senator from Idaho accounts for the change of view of the Senator from Massachusetts and those Republicans who acted with him at that time by the suggestion that this tax is offered now as a substitute in order to defeat the income tax. The change of position is therefore merely yielding to expediency. How does the Senator account for the change of position on the part of the minority, seeming now to stand on the exact opposite side of this question?

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

He directly and positively proceeded to except savings banks and building and loan associations; and yet this measure, which we are told is the measure of the President of the United States, comes in here and makes both of those kinds of associations or corporations the subject of taxation.

But, Mr. President, that would be a minor matter. For several weeks now we have been debating a tariff bill here; we have been fighting over the question of schedules; and yet the schedules in this tariff bill have been but the mere skirmish line of the battle that lies behind and the struggle that is yet to come. I want to call attention to the fact that this amendment, as introduced by the Committee on Finance, can not possibly bear the approval of the President of the United States if we are to recognize that for which he has stood upon the stump in public speech and in his messages to Congress. I do not see how it can be claimed he approves its details when we come to analyze them. We now come to the important detail.

The Senator from New York—and I was glad to hear him do it—went on to explain why it was that a corporation might be taxed, because the men who took stock in corporations secured certain immunity; and, consequently, one rule of taxation might be applied to a corporation, while different rules would apply to individuals and copartnerships; and he emphasized that fact as being the very purpose and language of this amendment; but while it purports to be an excise tax upon corporations, it fails at the very point where it ought to apply and applies at the very point where it ought not to apply. The little corporations, scattered all over the country, under the provisions of this amendment will have to pay the tax. Here the distinguished Senator from New York fell into another dilemma. He condemned an income tax, because an income tax is a direct tax and a corporation tax is not a direct tax, except where it can be shifted; and if it can not be shifted, it is a direct tax, and consequently void.

Then, so far as that amendment relates to corporations dealing on the street of a western town or an eastern city in competition with a partnership on the other side of the street, having no monopoly and obliged to take this tax out of their gross income, it becomes a tax which can not be shifted upon the consumer, and would be subject to the very criticism imposed by the Senator from New York upon the income-tax proposition upon that ground.

But we go a step further in this thing. I was greatly entertained the other day when the Senator from California [Mr. FLINT] presented this amendment, and a little colloquy took place between the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] and the Senator from California. The Senator from New Hampshire suggested that the information had come to him that this amendment would be the means of searching into the inwardness of corporations, and amounted to a sort of inquisitory visitation upon corporations. I felt very much like getting up then and suggesting that all controversy becomes plainer the more we free it from those matters which are not controverted, and that no one would seriously claim that this amendment would embarrass anyone on the ground complained of; but it was not necessary to do that, because the concluding language of the Senator from California was that such investigations can only be made of the affairs of corporations as are necessary to make the returns. Returns for what? For secret contracts, for rebates, for watered stock? No; but to make a return of the amount of their earnings upon which a tax may be based; and this is really all there is as the amendment now stands.

Mr. President, there are three things for which the public may have warrant for going into the affairs of a corporation. I very much question, I do not yet believe that it is the province of government to give a sort of quasi assurance to the value of stocks that men want to invest in by placing the approval of the Government upon the question of whether those stocks have been issued within the limit of a fair investment. I am inclined to believe, if a man wants to invest in stocks, he should do it at his own risk, just as he takes his chances of buying a horse, whether the horse might be spavined or not, but when it comes to the banking—a great function of modern civilization—we have a right to know whether they are safe and solvent. When it comes to corporations dealing with the public in the shape of public utilities, or combinations dealing in the necessaries of life, we have a right to know, first, whether there are, in fact, combinations, whether there are secret agreements, whether there are rebates, and whether there is charged into their stock a matter that never came there as the result of fair investment upon which to measure the question of what is a reasonable return for their investment.

Now, Senators, those are the things that Theodore Roosevelt dealt with for seven long years in his struggle for publicity. Those are the objects which we have sought and which the friends of this measure before it came into the Senate believed—that in some way it would reach those facts, make them public, and lay them where the citizen and the public generally could ascertain and investigate them. I undertake to say that under this amendment as it now stands the return required by it does not and would not develop those facts, and I believe a corporation could successfully contest an examination that involved those three questions. The only return which is required and the only investigation which is necessary under this proposed amendment is the investigation which relates to the question of whether the corporations have made an honest return for taxation. Beyond that, the secret contract, the mystic power which one great corporation may hold over others, not only as a threat unuttered, but as a menace of conditions, the relation which one great corporation may hold to others by reason of the inward relations of the members of those corporations—there is not, I undertake to say, one line in that amendment which requires publicity along those lines. If there was ever a myth born from the fertile brain of legislators, it is that that amendment will give the publicity for which Theodore Roosevelt and the people of this country for seven long years battled and struggled. And I say that in this respect, as to this vital detail, it does not, it can not, reflect the intention of the President.

There is another point in this measure, and I am going to be very plain about these matters. For seven years the American people have aligned themselves under the leadership of that man who was extolled to-day by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. BOURNE], in a speech commenting on this amendment, which, in fact, is the first marked reactionary step against the policies of Theodore Roosevelt that has ever been brought into this body. That man Roosevelt for seven long years was battling against that spirit in this country which for brevity and popular acceptation we may term "a trust," and, Senators, before you vote for this amendment read this amendment and ask yourselves if you are prepared to go home and tell your people that you voted for the first piece of legislation ever offered in the American Congress which recognized, not the legality, to be sure, but which recognized the existence of the trust-holding and trust proposition, and that is what I believe this amendment does.

A great deal has been said in this debate about bonds. This amendment is probably badly defective in that respect. A great deal has been said about inquisition, as if inquisition were something we ought to shun. I hold in my hand a list of names submitted by the Senator from Montana [Mr. DIXON] the other day, in which it appears that Mr. Carnegie's personal property was returned for $5,000,000, and that Russell Sage's property was returned for $2,000,000.

So long as those conditions remain, I do not think we need go into hysteria over the possible inquisitorial means of collecting taxes in this country. What this inquisition means, if it goes absolutely to the last analysis, as it must go, is that we are trying to get a just tax from a man by one process or another, but as between the two amendments, the income tax and the proposed so-called "corporation tax," there is nothing to be gained by comparison for the corporation tax in that respect. This amendment proceeds upon the theory—and the Senator from New York emphasized the fact—that this right to tax rests upon the fact that these men are associated together as a corporation; that they are distinct; and the right rests upon a different principle than the taxation of property and of individuals ordinarily. Let us examine the terms of the amendment.

The proposed corporation tax is called an "excise tax." What is it based upon? It is based upon the fact that a number of men seeking the immunity of a corporation, as against the liability of individual action and the copartnership relation, form themselves into a corporation; and it is proposed to tax that corporation for that privilege. I can not, and will not, attempt to review the masterly analysis showing the fallacy of that made by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], but I want to emphasize one point beyond what either of them has brought forth here, so far as I heard while I happened to be in the Chamber during their speeches, and that is that this amendment expressly exempts a holding company from any federal tax if its capital is invested, and to the extent to which it is invested, in the stock of other corporations which are as corporations subject to an excise tax. In other words, after a half dozen corporations have been organized, another lot of men—not the same men, necessarily, but another lot of men—may form a corporation to go into the business of running the corporations already formed and the holding company go untaxed.

Their total may be made up of the holdings of the first formed corporations; there is not a dollar of their capital invested in anything else. They may hold some stock in one corporation and some stock in another corporation. They have organized upon the same principle and are subject to the same

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

rule of taxation that the men who organized the first corporation are subject to, and yet under the amendment they pay not one cent for that privilege.

It is said that it would be double taxation. Mr. President, this is not an income-tax provision; this is a provision to tax for the privilege of doing business—an excise tax; and if that business brings a profit to the men who conduct it, they ought to pay a tax for the privilege, whether they hold stock in other corporations or not. Take the case of $100,000 worth of whisky upon which one tax has already been paid. A corporation handles that whisky and makes $100,000 more upon it. Would any man say for one moment that they should be exempt from a tax upon what they have made because the men who handled the whisky in the first instance, before it came to them, had paid a tax upon the whisky? Yet that would be double tax, just as much as it could be said to be double taxation to tax the earnings of a corporation whose capital is invested in dividend-paying stocks of other corporations already taxed for the privilege of owning that stock and of dealing in that stock.

The proposed tax is not a tax upon incomes; it is a tax upon the privilege of doing business. And if such a tax is imposed, surely it should be imposed upon a corporation organized for doing the business of controlling other corporations.

Mr. President, I listened with a great deal of interest the other day to the Senator from Montana [Mr. DIXON] while he discussed the inheritance tax, wherein he discussed the passing of the old feudal system. I want to say there is something in this amendment, whether it was planned or not, the effect of which is to restore to personal-property holdings the feudal conditions that once obtained in Europe as to landed estates, and the overthrow of which has cost so much of blood and treasure. Here it is calmly proposed that a number of men may organize a corporation with a capital, we will say, of a billion dollars, doing no business except dealing in and holding and receiving the profits of stock in other corporations without paying one dollar of tax. You talk about the gathering together and holding intact of the great fortunes of this country as a menace. Here is the dead man's hand of mortmain reaching out through this legislation upon generations yet unborn. Here is a policy and a plan that, for the first time in the history of the Senate, so far as I know since I have been here, is a recognition and an encouragement of that very policy.

You talk about the power of great aggregations of capital; you talk about the crushing out of the life and of the rights and of the opportunities of the individual—the policy against which we have struggled for seven long years—and here is the first step of a reactionary character; here is a step which, as I have said, does not legalize, yet holds out an invitation to men to do that very thing; and it is the first legislative recognition of the fact of that condition in this country.

What will be next step? Senators, I will tell you. I do not fear the next step. Logically the next step would be legislation recognizing still further this condition against which the American people have struggled for the last seven years. The next step will be the arousing of a storm of indignation that will reach from one ocean to the other. Whoever was behind all this might have perhaps dreamed that, making it seem like an attack upon corporations, it would be an inviting and a picturesque proposition to the American people; but when the American people come to learn that this is simply a shifting of a tax in most cases upon the consumer, when they come to learn that millions of dollars can be invested in a corporation which will not pay one dollar of tax, when they come to learn that this is a plain invitation to go on and enlarge a system which we have battled against these seven years, there is no danger of this or any other Congress taking the second step. The American people will attend to that in their own behalf. Do not tell me that the President approves any such detail as the one found in this amendment.

Mr. President, it is not my purpose to speak at length. I believe that this thing is so iniquitous that all that is necessary for its overthrow is for the American people to see just what it is and what it means. Based upon the theory that it is an excise tax, it exempts from that excise the very corporations that in all human probability are the best able to pay that tax. It exempts the great bondholders, the great accumulated fortunes of this country.

For one I would very much prefer to try the income tax. I can see none of the dangers pointed out by the Senator from New York to come from such a tax. It is the right of the Government as well as the humblest citizen to appeal to a court to reverse its decision. And I want to say here, in the presence of the Senate, that all the progress that has been made in Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence has been made either in reversing previous decisions or in going a step beyond any precedent. If it is a fact that a decision is forever to prevent any attempt to advance against that decision, then we may well prepare to have no progress and no advance in our jurisprudence. Every lawyer, with one exception, I think, in this Chamber has practically admitted that, in his opinion, the decision of the Supreme Court, made by a divided court, in the Pollock case was unsound; and, with but few exceptions, they have stated their belief that that decision would be reversed.

We can better afford to take our chances of not getting that decision reversed than we can afford to go to the American people with a proposition that imposes a tax which, in the main, is shifted upon the consumer and exempts the man with the great fortune who has invested his millions in bonds, and which encourages the organization of holding companies by absolutely exempting them from one dollar of assessment or taxation upon the stock of other corporations they invest in.

Mr. President, that is the issue that to-day is before the Senate. It is not so much a question of what should be done with this particular item or that particular item, but it is a question of whether or not the American Senate is going to enter upon this, the first step—reversing the policy of seven years. I want to say to you—I charge no one with the purpose—but I want to say to you that the plain invitation, the plain effect of this provision is to encourage the organization of the very kind of corporations, great, powerful, overshadowing, absorbing industries, absorbing industrial life and industrial affairs, by holding out to them immunity from taxation. When the American people come to know that and to understand that, I have no fear of this legislation getting beyond this body.

Mr. FLINT. Mr. President, if no other Senator desires to speak, I ask for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] to the substitute proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I do not desire to have action taken on the question, if I can help it, until the Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] returns. I am not sure whether he intends to speak, but he has just been called from the Chamber, and I should like a moment until we can ascertain his wishes.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, if the observations I had the honor to submit to the Senate on May 7, 1909, were well founded, the submission of the income tax to the Supreme Court at this time is justified, in addition to the reasons given by other Senators, because that argument was not before the Supreme Court when it passed upon this question.

The Supreme Court passed adversely upon the income tax in the Pollock case by the narrow majority of one vote, and determined the income tax to be a direct tax, which could not be levied on the citizen *because of the inhibition of section 9, Article I.*

Those who defended the income tax did so on the theory that it was an indirect tax, and therefore constitutional, and very nearly succeeded even on this theory. No advocate argued that it was justified as a direct tax and this consideration was not submitted to the court, although, in my judgment, the reasons for this view are very persuasive, if not controlling.

If there is reason to believe that the consideration which I shall now present might persuade one or more members of that court to a change of view, it would justify the resubmission of this question to the court without in anywise suggesting any imputation which could in the least affect the dignity of that great tribunal nor the honor and respect in which they are held by the American people.

Mr. President, the clauses of the Constitution relating to this matter are as follows:

Article I, section 8, clause 1: The Congress shall have power *to lay and collect taxes*, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and the general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Article I, section 9, clause 5: No tax or duty shall be laid on articles exported from any State.

Article I, section 9, paragraph 4: No capitation or other direct tax shall be laid, unless in proportion to the census or enumeration hereinbefore directed to be taken.

The enumeration referred to is found in Article I, section 2, clause 3, to wit:

Representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union according to their respective numbers, which shall be determined by the adding to the whole number of free persons, including those bound to service for a term of years and excluding Indians not taxed, three-fifths of all other persons. The actual enumeration shall be made within three years after the first meeting of the Congress of the United States, and within every subsequent term of ten years, in such manner as they shall by law direct.

Section 8, clause 1, gives Congress the widest possible power "*to lay and collect taxes*" as well as "duties, imposts, and excises." This broad power is limited only as appears in the

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

clauses quoted; that is, that exports shall not be taxed (sec. 9, clause 5); that "direct taxes" shall be apportioned among the several States in accordance with the census (sec. 2, clause 3); and that "no capitation or other direct tax" shall be laid unless it be apportioned "to the census or enumeration hereinbefore directed to be taken" (sec. 9, clause 4).

The entire controversy turns upon the interpretation of the meaning of the words "direct tax" (sec. 9, clause 4), or "direct taxes" (sec. 2, clause 3).

Both the opponents and the defendants of the income tax have proceeded upon the theory that the term "direct tax" broadly means a direct tax on the citizen instead of the narrow and true interpretation of a "direct tax" on the States.

I respectfully submit that this has been a dangerous error, utterly unjustified by the language of the Constitution, by its history, or by the debates in the Constitutional Convention.

In the first case, Mr. President, no capitation or other direct tax required to be laid "in proportion to the census or enumeration hereinbefore directed to be taken" can possibly mean a direct tax upon the citizen, and must mean that which the history of this paragraph shows it did mean, a direct tax upon the several States as independent municipalities.

The capitation tax laid in proportion to the census and constitutional enumeration can only mean a direct tax to be laid directly upon the State as a State in accordance with its population, counting five slaves as three persons.

This capitation tax is a direct tax on the State; it is an indirect tax on the citizen, and must be paid by a separate levy on the citizen.

Any other "direct tax" laid in proportion to the census, within the meaning of section 9, paragraph 4, must necessarily mean a direct tax on the State, for the simple and controlling reason that only a direct tax on the State is capable of being laid in proportion to the census enumeration, as required by section 2, Article I, and this "direct tax," as a logical consequence, being exclusively a "direct tax" *upon the State*, is an indirect tax on the citizen.

The general taxing power, established by section 8, is only restrained and limited by the proviso of section 9, paragraph 4, which directs "no capitation or other direct tax" to be laid unless in proportion to the census. The limitation, therefore, of the broad power to "lay and collect taxes" *is a limitation relating exclusively to a direct tax on the State* as such, and not a limitation of the right to lay a direct tax on the citizen. Congress is therefore first given the broad right to lay and collect taxes both on the citizen and on the States as municipalities (section 8) and is only thereafter *restrained from levying direct taxes on the States* by the provision that such direct taxes shall, if levied, be laid in proportion to the census enumeration as provided in section 2, clause 3.

The term "direct taxes" as used in Article I, section 2, clause 3, is obviously, as its face implies, "direct taxes" on the States, to be apportioned among the several States just as the Representatives in Congress are to be apportioned, and no one will contend or should contend that the direct taxes referred to in section 2, clause 3, are anything but direct taxes on the States as such.

I understand, sir, that the term "direct tax," as used in our vernacular, has more than one meaning. It may mean a direct tax by the United States Government upon one of its constituent members or States, as I have above explained; it may mean a direct tax imposed by the United States upon one of its citizens as an income tax, if the Supreme Court is right in the Pollock case; it may mean a direct tax upon the citizen by the Federal Government imposed as a duty on his personal apparel brought through the custom-house, and so forth.

It may mean a direct tax on the citizen by his State, by his city, or by his county; and the citizen may be taxed directly and coincidentally by the United States, by the State, the county, the town. The term "direct tax" therefore has various meanings, meaning one thing in one place and another thing in another place, and the meaning of the term "direct tax" must be determined by the time, place, and manner in which it is used.

I perfectly well understand that throughout the debates this term was used with greater or less confusion; but, sir, in interpreting the language of the Constitution itself, the terms "direct tax" and "direct taxes," as used in section 9 and in section 2, as a limitation upon the mode of its imposition, refers exclusively to "direct taxes" *imposed upon the States* as such.

It was a mere accident that the term "or other direct tax" was inserted in the Constitution at all.

Mr. President, when section 9, paragraph 4, was first drawn it read that "no capital shall be laid unless," and so forth, and it was only because Mr. Read feared that the States might be saddled with a readjustment of past requisitions of Congress that it was amended to include the words "or other direct taxes." This clearly appears from the debates, as follows:

Article 1, section 9: "No capitation tax shall be laid, unless," and so forth.

Mr. Read moved to insert, after the word "capitation," the words "or other direct tax." He was afraid that some liberty *might otherwise be taken to saddle the States with a readjustment*, by this rule, *of past requisitions of Congress;* and that his amendment, by giving another cast to the meaning, would take away the pretext.

Mr. Williamson seconded the motion, which was agreed to. On motion of Colonel Mason, the words "or enumeration" were inserted after, as explanatory of, "census"—Connecticut and South Carolina only, no. (Vol. 5, Ell. Deb. on the Fed. Const., p. 545, Sept. 14, 1787.)

Undoubtedly the Constitutional Convention believed that the Congress should have the power of assessing and levying *direct taxes on the States* and to apportion such taxes according to the rule of population.

Mr. King said:

It is a principle of this Constitution that representation and taxation should go hand in hand. * * * By this rule are *representation and taxation to be apportioned.* (2 Ell. Deb., 36.)

Representation of what? Of the States. Taxation of what? Of the States. Why was there a diminished tax placed upon the population of the slaveholding States, and what was its purpose? It was to apportion it among the several States, and the direct tax and the capitation tax were to be diminished to three-fifths of the number of slaves by the operation of this constitutional rule.

Mr. Dawes said:

The rule laid down in the paragraph is the best that can be obtained *for the apportionment of the little direct taxes* which Congress will want. (Ibid., 42.)

Mr. Pendleton said:

The *apportionment of representation and taxation* by the same scale is just. (3 Ell. Deb., 41.)

Representation of what? Of the States. Taxation of what? Of the States.

Mr. Nicholas said:

The amount of the sums to be raised of the people is the same *whether the state legislatures lay the taxes for themselves or for the General Government.* (3 Ell. Deb., 99.)

Did not this mean that the direct tax on the State should be collected by the State?

Mr. Nicholas said:

The proportion of taxes are fixed by the number of inhabitants. Each State will know from its population *its proportion of any general tax.* (3 Ell. Deb., 243.)

Does not this mean that the *tax levied on the State* by a general tax on the States would be known to the State under the rule?

Mr. Randolph said:

When *any sum is necessary* for the General Government, every State will immediately *know its exact proportion of it* from the number of the people and Representatives. (3 Ell. Deb., 122.)

The phrase:

No capitation tax shall be laid *unless in proportion to the census* hereinbefore directed to be taken—

And this necessarily meant laid *on the States* by Congress and *not on the citizen*, because to levy a capitation tax on the citizen under the apportionment rule is unreasonable, while to apportion a capitation tax on the States under the apportionment rule is reasonable—

was amended, on the motion of Mr. Read, to insert after "capitation" the words "or other direct taxes." (5 Ell. Deb., 545.)

Mr. King asked, August 20, 1787 (5 Ell. Deb., 451), what was meant by direct taxation. And he was not answered, but he might well have been answered, as far as clause 4, section 9, was concerned. It is a direct taxation on the United States, to be laid upon them severally in proportion to the rule of population by which the right of representation is fixed.

Mr. Gerry (5 Ell. Deb., 451) moved that—

From the first meeting of the Legislature of the United States, until a census shall be taken, all moneys for supplying the Public Treasury *by direct taxation shall be raised from the several States* according to the number of Representatives, respectively, in the first branch.

Does not this mean direct taxation on the States as such?

In the Secret Proceedings and Debates of the Convention, Charles Pinckney submitted a draft (S. Doc. 728, 60th Cong., 2d sess., p. 146), and provided that in fixing the power of the Congress, that:

The proportion of *direct taxation* shall be regulated by the whole number of the inhabitants of every description, etc.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

And Mr. Patterson, June 15, 1787 (ibid., 150), proposed a resolution, as follows:

3. *Resolved*, That whenever requisitions shall be necessary, instead of the present rule, *the United States in Congress be authorized to make such requisitions* in proportion to the whole number of white and other free citizens, etc.

That *if such requisitions be not complied with in the time to be specified therein, to direct collection thereof in the noncomplying States;* and for that purpose to devise and pass acts directing and authorizing the same, etc.

Does not this mean a "direct tax" on the States, and not on the citizen, to be proportioned to population?

Mr. Luther Martin, in his report to the legislature of Maryland, said (ibid., 39) that he did not think the General Government ought to have been given the right to lay "*direct taxes*" in any case, and by this expression he meant "*direct taxes on the citizen*," and that he introduced the following proposition:

And whenever the Legislature of the United States shall find it necessary that revenue should be raised by direct taxation, having apportioned the same by the above rule—

Here by "direct taxation" he means taxation of the States—

requisitions shall be made of the respective States to pay into the Continental Treasury their respective quotas, within a time in the said requisition to be specified, and in case of any of the States failing to comply with such requisition then, and then only, to have power to devise and pass acts directing the mode and authorizing the collection of the same [by direct levy on the citizen, is the alternate].

He said:

Had this proposition been acceded to, the dangerous and oppressive power in the General Government of imposing direct *taxes on inhabitants which it now enjoys in all cases*, would have been only vested in it, in case of noncompliance of a State, as a punishment for its delinquency, and would have ceased the moment that the State complied with the requisition.

Previous to adoption of the Constitution of the United States the Confederated States had made levies in the form of direct requisitions upon the several States, which was in the nature of a direct tax on the State itself, apportioning the same according to a fixed ratio, as is shown by the resolution of April 18, 1783 (1 Ell. Deb., p. 94), which was an apportionment based upon the population as nearly as they could arrive at it.

Chief Justice Fuller well said:

Under the Articles of Confederation the Government of the United States was limited in the exercise of this power *to requisitions upon the States*, while *the whole power of direct or indirect* taxation of persons and property, whether by taxes on polls or duties on imports, or duties on internal production, manufacture, or use, was acknowledged to belong exclusively to the States, without any other limitation than that of noninterference with certain treaties made by Congress. (157 U. S., 561.)

The practice of Congress prior to the Constitution was to make requisition on the States and thus impose *a direct levy or requisition* on the *United States* of the Confederation.

On the 12th of July, 1777, a draft of the Articles of the Confederation was submitted to Congress: Article 2 provides as follows:

All charges of war and all other expenses which shall be incurred for the common defense or general welfare, and allowed by the United States assembled, shall be defrayed out of a common treasury, *which shall be supplied by the several colonies in proportion to the number of inhabitants* of every age, sex, and quality, except Indians not paying taxes, in each colony. (1 Ell. Deb., 70–73.)

Article 8 of the Articles of Confederation sets this up very plainly and was first based upon the proportionment to the value of all land within the States, including buildings and improvements, but this was struck out and the census enumeration substituted. Article 8 is as follows:

ART. 8. All charges of war, and all other expenses that shall be incurred for the common defense or general welfare, and allowed by the United States in Congress assembled, shall be defrayed out of a common treasury, which shall be supplied by the several States, in proportion to the value of all land, within each State, granted to or surveyed for any person, as such land, and the buildings and improvements thereon, shall be estimated, according to such mode as the United States in Congress assembled shall, from time to time, direct and appoint.

The taxes for paying that proportion shall be laid and levied by the authority and direction of the legislatures of the several States, within the time agreed upon by the United States in Congress assembled. (Articles of Confederation.)

The words "to the value of all land, within each State," and so forth, including "buildings and improvements thereon," were struck out (1 Ell. Deb., 95) April 18, 1783, and the rule of enumeration of inhabitants, counting three-fifths of the slaves, substituted therefor.

Congress itself immediately afterwards recognized the fact that the direct tax requiring apportionment was a direct tax upon the United States as States in the act of July 14, 1798 (1 Stat., 597), using the following language:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That *a direct tax* of $2,000,000 shall be, and *is hereby, laid* upon the United States and apportioned to the States, respectively, in the manner following:

State of New Hampshire	$77,705,362
State of Massachusetts	260,435,312

And so forth.

The same language was followed in the acts of 1813 and of 1861, showing clearly that Congress itself interpreted the direct tax referred to in section 9, clause 4, requiring apportionment, to be a "direct tax on the States," and *not a direct tax on the citizen;* and since the tax requiring constitutional apportionment *is a direct tax on the States* and *not a direct tax on the citizen*, the limitation by section 9, clause 4, of the broad right of Congress to lay taxes granted in section 8 does not reach *direct taxes on the citizen at all* and *therefore does not reach the income tax.* It follows the income tax is constitutional. The Supreme Court not having considered this argument should do so now, and Congress is justified in resubmitting to the court the income tax in order that this view of the case may be now considered by that court.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] to the substitute of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

Mr. BAILEY obtained the floor.

Mr. FLINT rose.

Mr. BAILEY. Does the Senator from California desire to submit any remarks or any request to the Senate?

Mr. FLINT. I think the Senator from Montana desires to address the Senate. He is not here just at this moment.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. BAILEY. I will yield the floor to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, it was my intention to submit at an appropriate time some remarks in regard to this measure. I should not like to be forced into the position of either doing that to-day or having the matter come to a vote. I do not believe it is the desire of anyone that the debate upon this question shall now close. It is rather a large question, and I think that, in the interest of the future, it ought not as yet to be closed. If Senators are not prepared to speak at this time, I think we might very appropriately take cognizance of that fact, and defer the consideration of the question for the present. I could occupy the time of the Senate for a short time upon it, but I had not anticipated doing so to-day, and unless the question is going to be foreclosed I shall not do so; but if the question is going to come to a vote now, of course I should feel compelled to make such remarks as I have at this time.

I do not understand that the Senator from Texas desires to speak at this time. Perhaps he is in the position I have suggested, and would only do so for the purpose of preventing the foreclosure of the question at this time.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

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

Mr. HEYBURN. I will yield to the Senator. I do not know what his purpose is.

Mr. GALLINGER. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator. I thought the Senator had concluded.

Mr. HEYBURN. I will yield; but should the question of a vote become imminent, I shall submit what remarks I have to make.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I have not interfered much with the consideration of this bill. I have taken very little time, and propose to take no additional time. As I understand the matter—and the Senator from California will correct me if I am mistaken—no other Senator seems to be ready to proceed this afternoon.

Mr. FLINT. I am unable to find any Senator who desires to do so; but several Senators have advised me that they desire to address the Senate on the subject.

Mr. GALLINGER. In that event, of course no hasty action should be taken, although we are all anxious to get through with the bill. I rose more particularly to venture to suggest to the Senator from California, in charge of the bill, that possibly he can get to-day, if he asks it, an agreement for a vote on the bill at a proper time—not immediately, but in the near future—so that we may get this controverted question out of the way. I have no suggestion to make myself, because I have no relation to the bill that would warrant me in making any.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President——

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

Mr. CUMMINS. I simply wish to ask a question of the Senator from New Hampshire. He used the word "bill." Did he use it advisedly, or did he mean the word "amendment?"

Mr. GALLINGER. I meant to say "amendment." It was a mistake. I meant to say "a vote on the amendment."

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *July 7, 1909.*

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

FINDINGS OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of Mrs. Maria M. Harris, Frank N. Harris, Henry W. Harris, George W. Harris, Alla V. Harris, Annie E. Harris, John W. Harris, William Harris, and Thomas B. Harris, heirs and representatives of Henry N. Harris, deceased, *v.* United States (S. Doc. No. 123), which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. KEAN presented a petition of the Guarantee Building and Loan Association, of Camden, N. J., praying for the adoption of a certain amendment to the so-called "corporation-tax amendment" to the pending tariff bill exempting building and loan associations from the provisions contained therein, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented memorials of sundry members of the composing room chapel of the Jersey City Herald, of Jersey City; of sundry members of the composing room chapel of the Evening News, of Newark; of sundry members of the stereotypers' chapel of the Observer, of Hudson County; of sundry employees of the John L. Compton chapel of the Printing Pressmen and Assistants' Union, No. 183, of Hudson County; and of sundry employees of the Public Printer chapel of the Printing Pressmen and Assistants' Union, No. 183, of Hudson County, all in the State of New Jersey, remonstrating against the adoption of the proposed duty on print paper and wood pulp in the pending tariff bill, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BURTON presented a petition of sundry employees of the Novelty Cutlery Company, of Canton, Ohio, praying for the adoption of the proposed Senate substitute for paragraph 151 in the pending tariff bill relative to the duty on imported knives and erasers, which was ordered to lie on the table.

THIRD COLORADO VOLUNTEER CAVALRY.

Mr. WARREN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the joint resolution (S. J. R. 20) to restore the status of the Third Colorado Volunteer Cavalry, who served during the late civil war, asked to be discharged from its further consideration, and that it be referred to the Committee on Pensions, which was agreed to.

EMILY PERKINS HALE.

Mr. KEAN, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred Senate resolution No. 66, submitted yesterday by Mr. LODGE, reported it without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Senate resolution 66.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Emily Perkins Hale, widow of Rev. Edward Everett Hale, late Chaplain of the United States Senate, a sum equal to six months' salary at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his demise, said sum to be considered as including funeral expenses and all other allowances.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. GALLINGER:

A bill (S. 2843) granting an increase of pension to Edward Baker (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2844) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Riddle (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2845) granting an increase of pension to James F. Marshall (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McCUMBER:

A bill (S. 2846) to prevent the sale of intoxicating liquors in buildings, ships, navy-yards, and parks and other premises owned or used by the United States Government; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BURTON:

A bill (S. 2847) for the relief of Emma Morris; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2848) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John H. Lettrell; and

A bill (S. 2849) to correct the military record of Timothy Sullivan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2850) granting a pension to Henry Roberts;

A bill (S. 2851) granting an increase of pension to John Welch;

A bill (S. 2852) granting an increase of pension to Jacob M. Zartman;

A bill (S. 2853) granting an increase of pension to William A. Sturgeon;

A bill (S. 2854) granting an increase of pension to Peter Spears;

A bill (S. 2855) granting a pension to Peter Lunsford;

A bill (S. 2856) granting an increase of pension to Abram McCoy;

A bill (S. 2857) granting an increase of pension to Anthony Barleon;

A bill (S. 2858) granting an increase of pension to William A. Brown;

A bill (S. 2859) granting an increase of pension to George Richards;

A bill (S. 2860) granting a pension to John Carnes;

A bill (S. 2861) granting an increase of pension to Robert M. Work; and

A bill (S. 2862) granting a pension to Phoebe E. Davis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DU PONT (by request):

A bill (S. 2863) to provide for payment of the claims of certain religious orders of the Roman Catholic Church in the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on the Philippines.

By Mr. GUGGENHEIM:

A bill (S. 2864) granting an increase of pension to John Barthel (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OWEN:

A joint resolution (S. J. R. 41) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS—ROYE E. KNIGHT.

On motion of Mr. McCUMBER, it was

Ordered, That leave be granted to withdraw from the files of the Senate the papers in the case of Roye E. Knight (S. 3965, 60th Cong., 1st sess.), there having been no adverse report thereon.

THE TARIFF.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed and the first bill on the calendar is in order.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on concurring in the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BACON. I do not know what the method of procedure will be——

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that the amendments made as in the Committee of the Whole may be concurred in in gross with the exception of such as may be reserved by individual Senators; and I ask that the reservations may be made now.

Mr. BAILEY. I want to reserve——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request that the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole be concurred in except where Senators announce amendments which they desire to have considered separately? The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. I wish to reserve the amendment beginning with section 6, on page 371, known as the "corporation-tax amendment."

Mr. BACON. I understand that a reservation——

Mr. ALDRICH. Must be submitted to a separate vote.

Mr. BACON. Includes all there is as well as the particular amendment. It is not necessary to reserve each——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Certainly not.

Mr. BAILEY. I reserve the whole amendment.

Mr. BACON. There is another point I desire to ask, if I may have the attention of the Senator from Rhode Island; I desire to know whether I am correct in this understanding. The adoption of the amendments en bloc will not prevent the adoption of other amendments which do not change those amendments?

Mr. ALDRICH. Oh, no; not at all.

Mr. BACON. In other words, the bill is open in the fullest extent to amendment.

Mr. ALDRICH. Undoubtedly.

Mr. BACON. Only after the adoption of those amendments they themselves can not be changed.

Mr. ALDRICH. Unquestionably the Senator is right.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *July 7, 1909.*

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

FINDINGS OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of Mrs. Maria M. Harris, Frank N. Harris, Henry W. Harris, George W. Harris, Alla V. Harris, Annie E. Harris, John W. Harris, William Harris, and Thomas B. Harris, heirs and representatives of Henry N. Harris, deceased, *v.* United States (S. Doc. No. 123), which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. KEAN presented a petition of the Guarantee Building and Loan Association, of Camden, N. J., praying for the adoption of a certain amendment to the so-called "corporation-tax amendment" to the pending tariff bill exempting building and loan associations from the provisions contained therein, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented memorials of sundry members of the composing room chapel of the Jersey City Herald, of Jersey City; of sundry members of the composing room chapel of the Evening News, of Newark; of sundry members of the stereotypers' chapel of the Observer, of Hudson County; of sundry employees of the John L. Compton chapel of the Printing Pressmen and Assistants' Union, No. 183, of Hudson County; and of sundry employees of the Public Printer chapel of the Printing Pressmen and Assistants' Union, No. 183, of Hudson County, all in the State of New Jersey, remonstrating against the adoption of the proposed duty on print paper and wood pulp in the pending tariff bill, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BURTON presented a petition of sundry employees of the Novelty Cutlery Company, of Canton, Ohio, praying for the adoption of the proposed Senate substitute for paragraph 151 in the pending tariff bill relative to the duty on imported knives and erasers, which was ordered to lie on the table.

THIRD COLORADO VOLUNTEER CAVALRY.

Mr. WARREN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the joint resolution (S. J. R. 20) to restore the status of the Third Colorado Volunteer Cavalry, who served during the late civil war, asked to be discharged from its further consideration, and that it be referred to the Committee on Pensions, which was agreed to.

EMILY PERKINS HALE.

Mr. KEAN, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred Senate resolution No. 66, submitted yesterday by Mr. LODGE, reported it without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Senate resolution 66.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Emily Perkins Hale, widow of Rev. Edward Everett Hale, late Chaplain of the United States Senate, a sum equal to six months' salary at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his demise, said sum to be considered as including funeral expenses and all other allowances.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. GALLINGER:

A bill (S. 2843) granting an increase of pension to Edward Baker (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2844) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Riddle (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2845) granting an increase of pension to James F. Marshall (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McCUMBER:

A bill (S. 2846) to prevent the sale of intoxicating liquors in buildings, ships, navy-yards, and parks and other premises owned or used by the United States Government; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BURTON:

A bill (S. 2847) for the relief of Emma Morris; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2848) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John H. Lettrell; and

A bill (S. 2849) to correct the military record of Timothy Sullivan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2850) granting a pension to Henry Roberts;

A bill (S. 2851) granting an increase of pension to John Welch;

A bill (S. 2852) granting an increase of pension to Jacob M. Zartman;

A bill (S. 2853) granting an increase of pension to William A. Sturgeon;

A bill (S. 2854) granting an increase of pension to Peter Spears;

A bill (S. 2855) granting a pension to Peter Lunsford;

A bill (S. 2856) granting an increase of pension to Abram McCoy;

A bill (S. 2857) granting an increase of pension to Anthony Barleon;

A bill (S. 2858) granting an increase of pension to William A. Brown;

A bill (S. 2859) granting an increase of pension to George Richards;

A bill (S. 2860) granting a pension to John Carnes;

A bill (S. 2861) granting an increase of pension to Robert M. Work; and

A bill (S. 2862) granting a pension to Phoebe E. Davis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DU PONT (by request):

A bill (S. 2863) to provide for payment of the claims of certain religious orders of the Roman Catholic Church in the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on the Philippines.

By Mr. GUGGENHEIM:

A bill (S. 2864) granting an increase of pension to John Barthel (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OWEN:

A joint resolution (S. J. R. 41) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS—ROYE E. KNIGHT.

On motion of Mr. McCUMBER, it was

Ordered, That leave be granted to withdraw from the files of the Senate the papers in the case of Roye E. Knight (S. 3965, 60th Cong., 1st sess.), there having been no adverse report thereon.

THE TARIFF.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed and the first bill on the calendar is in order.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on concurring in the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BACON. I do not know what the method of procedure will be——

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that the amendments made as in the Committee of the Whole may be concurred in in gross with the exception of such as may be reserved by individual Senators; and I ask that the reservations may be made now.

Mr. BAILEY. I want to reserve——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request that the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole be concurred in except where Senators announce amendments which they desire to have considered separately? The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. I wish to reserve the amendment beginning with section 6, on page 371, known as the "corporation-tax amendment."

Mr. BACON. I understand that a reservation——

Mr. ALDRICH. Must be submitted to a separate vote.

Mr. BACON. Includes all there is as well as the particular amendment. It is not necessary to reserve each——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Certainly not.

Mr. BAILEY. I reserve the whole amendment.

Mr. BACON. There is another point I desire to ask, if I may have the attention of the Senator from Rhode Island; I desire to know whether I am correct in this understanding. The adoption of the amendments en bloc will not prevent the adoption of other amendments which do not change those amendments?

Mr. ALDRICH. Oh, no; not at all.

Mr. BACON. In other words, the bill is open in the fullest extent to amendment.

Mr. ALDRICH. Undoubtedly.

Mr. BACON. Only after the adoption of those amendments they themselves can not be changed.

Mr. ALDRICH. Unquestionably the Senator is right.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Mr. BEVERIDGE. An amendment may be offered to any other part of the bill, I understand.

Mr. ALDRICH. Undoubtedly.

Mr. BACON. I understand that it can be offered to some part of the bill, if it does not change the amendment.

Mr. ALDRICH. That is right.

Mr. HEYBURN. I wish to make an inquiry. When these amendments are adopted together, they become a part of the bill in the Senate?

Mr. ALDRICH. That is right.

Mr. HEYBURN. Including those reserved——

Mr. ALDRICH. Not including those amendments—aside from those. The amendments are not open to a continuous order.

Mr. HEYBURN. I want to reserve for consideration the zinc schedule.

Mr. ALDRICH. That is all right. The Senator can do that.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Idaho state what paragraph he desires to have reserved?

Mr. HEYBURN. I desire to reserve paragraph 190.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will make a note of that reservation.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I reserve paragraph 189. I will say in advance that I think the Senator from Massachusetts and I will probably agree upon the matter, but I reserve it so that it may be open.

Mr. STONE. I reserve paragraph 148½.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I reserve tentatively paragraph 194—that is, if it does not appear that paragraph 124 is a committee amendment. I mean the drawback provision. I intend to offer an amendment to the drawback provision, and if there is not a committee amendment to the drawback provision I do not wish to be shut out.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. No amendment has been made to paragraph 124.

Mr. WARREN. I suggest that we have some information as to what the paragraphs are that are being reserved.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill is before Senators on their desks, and they can readily follow it if they will be good enough so to do.

Mr. BROWN. I wish to reserve paragraph 425.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska reserves paragraph 425.

Mr. PENROSE. I wish to give notice of my intention to offer an amendment to paragraph 100 and paragraph 101. These are the same in the Senate bill as in the House bill, so I suppose it is unnecessary to make the reservation.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is not necessary to reserve those paragraphs.

Mr. PENROSE. I say I suppose it is not necessary, but it can do no harm.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It can do no harm.

Mr. McLAURIN. I do not suppose it is necessary to reserve this point, but I wish to give notice that I will again introduce the amendment I proposed, to put farming implements, carpenters' tools, and blacksmiths' tools on the free list.

Mr. ALDRICH. That is not a reservation.

Mr. BURTON. I should like to ask what paragraph was reserved by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE]?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. He gave notice that he would offer an amendment to paragraphs 100 and 101. There was no amendment, and it was not necessary to reserve it.

Mr. BACON. I wish to give notice that I desire to reserve paragraph 123, on page 38, and also——

Mr. ALDRICH. There is no amendment to paragraph 123, as I recollect.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. There is no amendment to paragraph 123.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is not necessary to make that reservation.

Mr. BACON. I should like to give notice of it in order to avoid any possibility of question.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. No harm can be done.

Mr. BACON. I desire to give notice also on page 92, of paragraphs 280 and 281, and paragraph 284, on page 93. There are other amendments, which I think are covered by the notice given by the Senator from Texas.

I wish to give notice also for my colleague [Mr. CLAY], who is necessarily absent, as to two amendments. If he should not return in time, I will offer them for him. I do not know exactly at what point he would desire to introduce one of them. One of them, however, is paragraph 213. I do not know that that is an amendment either, but I give the notice.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Paragraph 213 has not been amended.

Mr. BACON. His amendment is to strike out the paragraph and insert a substitute.

Mr. ALDRICH. That will be in order in any event.

Mr. BACON. I understand; but I desire to be absolutely safe about it.

There is another amendment which he would offer. The particular point is not designated. I think, however, it would be possibly an amendment to the corporation tax. It is an amendment taken, I think, practically from the Spanish-war law with reference to stock transactions and things of that kind. I can not more particularly designate it than that.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I desire to reserve paragraphs 368, 369, and 371.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Very good.

Mr. BRISTOW. I wish to inquire what the effect would be if an amendment should be offered to the bill that would affect in any way an amendment already adopted. Suppose, in amending paragraph 213 it should have some influence on an amendment which was concurred in in this general concurrence, would that be out of order?

Mr. ALDRICH. I think it would, for the reason that the other paragraph would have to be modified. I think it will not be possible indirectly to amend an amendment already concurred in. That is my judgment.

Mr. JONES. I desire to have paragraph 171 reserved, and also paragraph 488.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I should like to reserve paragraph 471d.

Mr. GUGGENHEIM. I give notice that I wish to reserve paragraph 524, which is in the free list.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry. In the case of a reservation by an individual Senator of a paragraph, does that leave the whole paragraph open to amendment by each Senator?

Mr. ALDRICH. Oh, no; it only opens the amendment which was made as in Committee of the Whole. It refers only to the amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole and action upon it.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Then the amendment would be subject to amendment?

Mr. ALDRICH. Undoubtedly.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Oh, yes.

Mr. CUMMINS. I desire to reserve section 2. It relates to the maximum and minimum tariff. I also desire to reserve section 12. There seems to be no continuity in these sections.

Mr. ALDRICH. What is the substance of it?

Mr. CUMMINS. I reserve section 12, which relates to the Board of General Appraisers, that part of it especially which authorizes the appointment by the President of the board.

Mr. BAILEY. If the Senator from Iowa will excuse me, section 12 is the tonnage.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is subsection 12.

Mr. CUMMINS. It is subsection 12.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. On page 343.

Mr. ALDRICH. Subsection 12 of section 3.

Mr. CUMMINS. I also desire to reserve sections 29 and 30, which relate to the establishment of a customs court of appeals. I also reserve section 7.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The clerks at the desk did not get what the Senator just said he desires to reserve.

Mr. CUMMINS. Subsections 29 and 30, which relate to the establishment of a customs court of appeals.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. On page 362.

Mr. CUMMINS. Also section 7. I think it properly should be section 7. It relates to countervailing duties on export duties and bounties offered by a foreign country.

While I am on my feet I desire to give notice of an amendment which I may as well offer now, so that it may be printed. It is an independent paragraph or section which I will call "section 6½." It proposes the levy of an income tax upon individual incomes, and is entirely independent of the corporation income tax which has already been adopted. I will ask that it be printed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be printed, and it will lie on the table until called up by the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I should like to reserve the section which relates to the appointment of experts by the President.

Mr. ALDRICH. That has already been reserved.

Mr. NEWLANDS. What section is it?

Mr. ALDRICH. Section 2.

Mr. LORIMER. I should like to reserve paragraph 17 and paragraph 466.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Paragraph 17 and paragraph 466 are reserved by the junior Senator from Illinois.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

the Senator from Iowa, oil can be shipped in tank cars to Canada or by steamer to Hongkong or to any one of a great number of ports and put in tin cans, thereby depriving the American workmen. But these other products can not be treated in that way. It seems to me very strange that the Senate should be asked, for the benefit of one concern, to hamper or place burdens upon the export business of the United States.

I move to lay the amendment on the table.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I hope the Senator will withhold that for a moment until I can make one or two remarks in answer to what the Senator said, because it is just.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Rhode Island withdraw his motion?

Mr. ALDRICH. Very well.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. First, the Senator says this would affect $75,000,000. I wish to say——

Mr. ALDRICH. Of exports.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes; of exports of oil.

Mr. ALDRICH. Not of oil, but of everything.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. How much oil?

Mr. ALDRICH. I do not remember; somewhere in the neighborhood of $50,000,000; not by the Standard Oil Company, but by the great railroad companies.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Well, whatever they are, the answer to that is that the Senator would not claim that if they had canned their oil in American-made tins, they would stop their exports.

Mr. ALDRICH. No; but they would put the oil in some other form.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Would they stop their exports if they were put in some other form?

Mr. ALDRICH. Of course not, because they will have to export it.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That was the question asked by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] which I tried to answer. It is certain that they would not stop their exports. It is certain that they would export it in some other way. It is certain that they would not make quite so much profit.

Now, the Senator has said that means only one concern that would be benefited, and that was the Steel Corporation. The Senator knows that it would not benefit one dollar, for the reason that the drawback does not now harm it in any way. It must export its tin if it is the tin producer, and I did not know it was the only tin producer until the Senator said so, and I do not believe it now.

Mr. ALDRICH rose.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. In a moment. Concede that it now supplies our home market and makes a surplus which it must export, and as our Republican campaign text-book shows—and I do not want to take the time to read it, but will if the Senator desires—makes arrangements with these men to work for reduced wages in order to keep fully employed making this excess tin which they have to export.

If the drawback was taken off, if the Standard Oil Company or any other company or concern had to buy American-made tin plate, this concern would get no benefit, because it would all go to these wages which now by agreement are good for the purpose of making this extra supply of tin plate for export.

I do not know that all Senators know, but I am sure the Senator from Rhode Island knows, that it is the case in the tin-plate industry that the tin-plate workers are not all paid at the same scale of wages. No matter what kind of tin plate they make or for what purpose, they are paid full wages for that sold in this country, and cut wages, to which they agree, for that which is exported.

Now, if that condition did not exist, if there was a market which——

Mr. McLAURIN. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. In just a second—which absorbed all of their product, they would not work at cut wages for the excess which they manufactured to export abroad, but would work for full wages, as they do now on all tin made for American consumption.

Mr. McLAURIN. I was just going to ask the Senator from Indiana why they are paid less wages for that which is exported than for that which is consumed in this country?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. They agree to it; they must. That is why I put in the amendment.

Mr. McLAURIN. Upon what basis is that agreement made?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The basis of the agreement and the reason why the agreement becomes necessary is, as they have told me themselves, that we now make in this country enough for our own domestic supply and more; and in order to keep the men at work and the mills running, we manufacture an excess for export; but it can not be exported at the wages we pay here for the production of American tin used in this country.

Therefore the company and the men agree to a cut in the wages which will cover that difference. So with this drawback, the tin-plate company would not get the benefit, but the laborers would get the benefit to the extent I have indicated.

Mr. ALDRICH rose.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Just one word more, and I shall sit down, and the Senator from Rhode Island may make his motion to lay on the table.

Then, Mr. President, about fruits. There is a duty on most of these fruits. They are protected. Why can they not be shipped abroad in protected American-made tins? If they enjoy protection, why should they not patronize protection? It seems to me, as I stated in the beginning, that this amendment is based upon strict protective principles, emphasized peculiarly by justice.

Mr. SCOTT. Why does not the Senator offer an increase of duty on tin plate and protect the workmen?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I am surprised that the Senator from West Virginia should ask that question, because the Senator will see that that would not prevent these companies, especially the Standard, from getting its tin in Wales. It would be a still greater inducement for it to do so. There is no need of increasing the duty on tin plate, because, under the present duty, we are making all we can use in this country, and more, and must export it; and the portion which we must export we can profitably export only by having the workingmen, who agree to the arrangement, work at reduced wages, which enables the company to export, thus keeping them employed all the time. That is the reason.

In the case of fruit and all of those things that must be shipped abroad in tins, I think most of them are afforded protection. I do not see now—I am perfectly aware that others are better informed and can enlighten me—why those who are protected should not also patronize industries that need their patronage. I can not understand——

Mr. BAILEY rose.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Just a moment.

I can not understand why they should not be shipped abroad in our own tin.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Certainly.

Mr. BAILEY. Waiving the question of sending this surplus abroad and selling it to foreign people cheaper than to our own people, I want to inquire of the Senator from Indiana how it happens, under this protective tariff, if we are making more than we consume and are thus compelled to ship this surplus to other nations, that an enormous amount of it is imported into this country?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The reason is that it is imported, of course, on account of the existence of this drawback provision, which enables the importers of the tin to purchase it in Wales cheaper than they can purchase it here, make their tin into cans, ship it abroad, and get the benefit of the drawback, and thus pay no tariff.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, that answer is not sufficient, because, if they can sell this tin abroad, and sell it in competition with Wales, after paying ocean freight and insurance in carrying it to those markets, certainly they could compete against Welsh tin after it had paid ocean freights and insurance in coming here. So that explanation will not suffice.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The answer to that is, that the tin exported is not made at American wages, but at reduced wages. However, these are the facts as I understand them. This, as I understand, is the request of these thousands of American laborers.

Mr. BAILEY. These benevolent tin-plate manufacturers and these American laborers, if they have to take lower wages, ought certainly to be willing to give their fellow-citizens in this country the benefit of them, and they ought to save ocean freight and insurance both ways. That would tend very much to correct inequalities of wages.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. If the Senator will permit me, if they did that, if there were no tariff on at all, if they reduced their wages all along the line, as they do for that portion of the tin which they export, then they would have to compete on a labor basis with Welch laborers, which is something that the protective system does not admit of. The Senator from Texas does not mean to say that he would have the tin-plate workers of this country paid Welch wages.

Mr. BAILEY. I would pay every man exactly what he is worth, and I would not tax any other man to pay him more than he is worth. But that still does not explain, because they have a protective tariff intended to protect American laborers

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

against this Welsh competition, and I am only trying to emphasize the fact that the protective tariff fails at this point, according to all the arguments.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, my only answer to that is that I am, by excepting tins from this drawback provision, showing that the protective system does work. It does work perfectly, except where this drawback provision excepts it——

Mr. BAILEY. That is equivalent to saying that it works, except where it does not work.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Except where the drawback makes an exception.

Mr. BAILEY. I want to ask the Senator, furthermore, if it is true that the steel trust is the only producer of tin plate in this country?

Mr. ALDRICH. That is unquestionably true.

Mr. BAILEY. Then, it looks as if the American Congress is reduced——

Mr. ALDRICH. It is inconceivable to me that the Senator from Indiana did not know that fact.

Mr. BAILEY. That is not surprising to me.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I do not know it; but I do know what the workingman in the tin-plate industry in this country complains of and demands.

Mr. ALDRICH. I move to lay the amendment on the table.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I do know the chief beneficiary of the drawback is the Standard Oil Company.

Mr. BAILEY. I only want to observe that the American Congress is compelled to choose in this matter between the two greatest trusts in the United States—whether we will compel the oil trust to patronize the steel trust.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is not the oil trust alone; it is the meat producers of Texas.

Mr. BAILEY. The packers are also in a trust.

Mr. ALDRICH. I move to lay the amendment on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from Indiana.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. GUGGENHEIM. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 61, after line 18, it is proposed to insert the following paragraph:

173½. Chromate of iron or chromic-bearing ores of all kinds, 20 per cent ad valorem on the metallic value of the chrome contained therein.

Mr. ALDRICH. I am willing to let that go in, so that it may be considered in conference.

Mr. KEAN. I hope it will go out.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I do not like to leave it in that way. There is an intimation that it may be thrown out in conference; but it seems to me the amendment ought not to be accepted. The article has heretofore come in free; it is a very useful article in many lines of industry, and the benefits which will be conferred by the amendment will be very slight in comparison with the greater expense to a very large number of users.

Mr. ALDRICH. I am extremely anxious to pass this bill to-day, and I am willing to have a vote on the proposition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. GUGGENHEIM].

The amendment was rejected.

The SECRETARY. Also strike out paragraph——

Mr. ALDRICH. The rejection of the last amendment, Mr. President, obviates the necessity of voting on the other amendment.

The SECRETARY. Strike out paragraph 524, which reads:

524. Chromate of iron or chromic ore.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. BURTON. The rejection of the other amendment leaves that paragraph as it is.

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

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. OWEN. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk to come in after line 25, on page 211.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 211, after line 25, it is proposed to insert as a new paragraph the following:

471½. That the rate fixed on all articles enumerated in section 1 of this act, in Schedules A, B, C, D, E, F, G, I, J, K, L, M, N, shall be reduced 5 per cent per annum of the rate fixed in this act, annually on June 30, for each of the next ensuing five fiscal years: *Provided*, That such rate shall not hereunder be reduced or fixed below the point at which it would produce an amount equal to the difference in the cost of the production of any such article in the United States and abroad. The difference in the cost of the production of any such article in the United States and abroad shall be determined, upon proper evidence duly recorded, by a nonpartisan commission of five experts, to be appointed by the President of the United States and confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. ALDRICH. I move to lay the amendment on the table.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island to lay on the table the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN].

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HEYBURN. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 239, after the word "thereof," in line 4, it is proposed to insert the following:

Provided further, That on and after January 1, 1910, and until July 1, 1920, there shall be paid, from any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the producer of tea within the United States, a bounty of 10 cents per pound, under such rules and regulations as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, shall prescribe.

The producer of said tea to be entitled to said bounty shall have first filed prior to January 1 of each year with the Commissioner of Internal Revenue a notice of the place of production, with a general description of the lands and methods to be employed by him, with an estimate of the amount of tea proposed to be produced in the current or next ensuing year, including the number of acres to be cultivated, and an application for a license to so produce, to be accompanied by a bond in a penalty, and with sureties to be approved by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, conditioned that he will faithfully observe all rules and regulations that shall be prescribed for such growth and production of tea.

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue, upon receiving the application and bond hereinbefore provided for, shall issue to the applicant a license to produce tea within the United States, at the place and by the methods described in the application; but said license shall not extend beyond one year from the date thereof.

No bounty shall be paid to any person unless he shall have first been licensed as herein provided, and only upon tea produced by such persons within the United States. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, shall from time to time make all needful rules and regulations for the cultivation of tea within the United States under the provisions of this act, and shall, under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, exercise supervision and inspection of the production thereof.

And for the payment of these bounties the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to draw warrants on the Treasurer of the United States for such sums as shall be necessary, which sums shall be certified to him by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, by whom the bounties shall be disbursed, and no bounty shall be allowed or paid to any person licensed as aforesaid in any one year upon any quantity of tea less than 100 pounds.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, this amendment is offered on behalf of the consumers of tea in this country and on behalf of the interests of the country in the production of tea. We are paying out in cash from $13,000,000 to $18,000,000 per year for tea to a limited area of production. We can produce all the tea that we need in this country under as favorable circumstances and of better quality than it is produced in Asiatic countries. We have an area of more than 200,000,000 acres that the Agricultural Department of the United States has pronounced adapted to the growth of tea. This year the product of tea will equal 33,000 pounds, and in twenty years we can produce, and will produce under the encouragement proposed by this amendment, all and more than all the tea necessary for the people of this country. Why not do it? The industry has grown in ten years faster than any industry that ever was started in this country. It extends from the Atlantic Ocean to the Gulf coast of Texas and clear through to California.

I could go into this question with some particularity, and it would probably attract the attention of Senators who have not had occasion to inquire about it. Senators will be surprised to know the extent over which tea is now produced in this country. I have a statement here, that is responsible, showing that during this season 33,000 pounds of tea can be harvested in the United States, as follows: From the Summerville mill, 14,000 pounds—that is in South Carolina; from the American Tea Growing Company's farms, in the same State, 16,000 pounds; from the Greenville farm, 1,000 pounds; from the experimental station of the Government in Texas, 1,000 pounds; and there is another place where it is produced; making a total of 33,000 pounds. That is an infant industry, but the soil and the climate of this country are just as well adapted to growing tea as those of Asiatic countries.

Just one other item and I will not detain the Senate further. The land now being used for tea growing is producing an average crop of 535 pounds of dry tea per acre each year. The climate of the southern Gulf States is, in general, admirably adapted to the cultivation of the tea plant. The cultivation of tea can safely be risked where the temperature seldom falls below 24 and never goes below zero, and where the annual rainfall exceeds 30 inches or more.

I will submit the question upon those facts. Let us build up this great new industry as we have built up the great beet-

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

could not be any question but that would foreclose their being able to recover anything from the Government.

Now, upon the question of salaries, I only rose to make that clear. I voted in the Senate for the salaries as they went through, not for these high salaries. I indorse, however, the position of the Senator from Wyoming, who has spoken, that there is no reason why the judges of this particular court should have salaries paid to them higher than those of all the federal courts except the Supreme Court; and if this matter comes to a vote, I for one am going to support the proposition of the Senator from Idaho to reduce these salaries in accordance with what the Senate voted when we voted upon this proposition.

Mr. HALE. Without taking any more time, for I am very desirous of having the bill disposed of, I will ask a vote of the Senate upon this proposition.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I do not desire to detain the Senate, but it is well enough that the RECORD should show that the question was fairly before us and that we had the facts. It is a mistake to call the Board of Appraisers a court. They are not a court.

Mr. HALE. No; I said they were not.

Mr. HEYBURN. And it is not at all unusual for a court which reviews the action of officers of the Government to receive less salary than the officers whose action is reviewed. The mind of any Senator will immediately attach itself to a number of such instances. Take the courts which review the action of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Treasury. Each of those officers receives very much larger salary than does the judge who is called upon to review their action.

It is not at all probable that the number of appeals to this tribunal will exceed a hundred a year. I merely base my estimate upon the number of appeals to-day to the courts from the Board of Appraisers. We are merely substituting this tribunal for the United States circuit court, to which court an appeal now lies; and it seems to me that the judges of a court confined to a single subject—customs duties—should not receive a higher salary than the judges of a court of general jurisdiction.

Mr. President, if I am correct in my estimate of the number of cases that would go to this court—say not to exceed a hundred a year—then it certainly will not be overworked or overburdened. The appraisers handle thousands of cases, some of which are not subject to appeal under the provisions of the act. They are executive officers, administrative officers; and no just comparison can be drawn between the salaries meet for judicial officers and for officials who, by the very terms of the law, are required to be present every day. Three of the appraisers must be present every day in the year. The court will sit according to its own appointment, with perhaps not to exceed seven or eight cases in a month during the entire year.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the principal reason for the establishment of this court is the impossibility in the customs cases of having the Government's case properly presented in the great rush of business in the district attorney's offices. The cases are extremely difficult, requiring on the part of those who present them special training and special preparation, and it is very important in the interest of the Government to pay a salary sufficient to get a suitable man. And what is true of the attorney in charge of the cases is equally true of the court. I think there is nothing in the world so dear as a cheap court, and I believe, whatever may be done with other salaries, the salaries of these judges should be sufficient to permit men of the proper class, who, in most cases, would surrender a larger income in private life to take the places.

I think this compensation is essential to make this court what it is proposed in the other bill and in the appropriation bill it shall be. I think it is absolutely necessary in order that we may have the kind of court we ought to have and get the proper men for that court. I think it is the poorest economy in the world to cut down the salaries of judges. I entirely agree with the point made by the Senator from Wyoming, but I think it ought to be met by giving suitable salaries to the judges of the circuit and district courts, and not by exercising economy on the others.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, Congress within a twelvemonth has deliberately determined that it will not raise the salaries of the judges of the courts of appeals to $9,000. In my judgment there can be no justice in establishing a court of this kind and say by our action that it is superior to our circuit courts of appeals, which now rank and ought to rank next to the Supreme Court of the United States. I am in hearty accord with the Senator from Massachusetts as to the salaries to be paid to our judges. I believe the judges of the circuit courts should receive a higher salary than they now receive, but unfortunately I am in the minority in that opinion.

It seems to me the Senate would stultify itself, when the salaries of the circuit judges of appeals are but $7,000, to create another court with less jurisdiction, with less dignity, with less important matters coming before it, and make the salaries a third larger. For that reason I hope the amendment of the Senator from Idaho will carry, and if the time comes when we can raise the salaries of the circuit and district judges to a sum proportionate to their merit and to what they ought to have, then I shall not have any such deep-seated objection to increasing the salaries of the members of this court. I do not believe any judge in the federal service receives what he ought to receive, if he measures up to his office. I do not believe there is a judge upon the federal bench, who worthily fills the office, who could not make two or three or four times as much in the practice of the law. But there is a dignity attached to the bench which appeals to the bar. I hope the amendment will carry—both the amendment now before the Senate as to the salary of the Assistant Attorney-General, and so forth, and the coming amendment as to the salaries of the judges of this court.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, let us have a vote.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Idaho; and on that the Secretary will call the roll. *To reduce salaries of Attorney & Court of Customs Ap.*

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BOURNE (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN]. He being absent, I withhold my vote. Were he present I should vote "nay."

Mr. CULLOM (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. DAVIS]. I transfer the pair to my colleague [Mr. LORIMER] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. DILLINGHAM (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN], who is absent. I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. TAYLOR]. For that reason I withhold my vote.

Mr. JONES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. I transfer it to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. MARTIN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. NIXON]. In his absence, I withhold my vote. I would vote "yea," if he were present.

Mr. PERKINS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN].

Mr. SMITH of Maryland (when Mr. RAYNER's name was called). My colleague, the senior Senator from Maryland, is unavoidably absent, and is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT].

Mr. ROOT (when his name was called). I am paired for the day with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER].

Mr. SIMMONS (when his name was called). I desire to inquire whether the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] has voted.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Minnesota has not voted.

Mr. SIMMONS. I withhold my vote. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

While I am on my feet I desire to say that my colleague [Mr. OVERMAN] is detained from the Senate to-day on account of illness. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. WARREN (when his name was called). I have a standing pair with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. MONEY]. I therefore withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BAILEY. I desire to ask whether the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS] has voted.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from West Virginia has not voted.

Mr. SCOTT. My colleague is unavoidably away from the city this morning. He will not be back until Monday.

Mr. BAILEY. I have a general pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS]. If he were here, I should vote for this amendment.

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 14, as follows:

YEAS—37.

Bacon	Brown	Crawford	Dixon
Beveridge	Burkett	Culberson	Dolliver
Borah	Chamberlain	Cullom	Fletcher
Bradley	Clark, Wyo.	Daniel	Gamble
Bristow	Clay	Dick	Guggenheim

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Heyburn	McCumber	Scott	Sutherland
Hughes	Oliver	Shively	Taliaferro
Johnson, N. Dak.	Page	Smith, Md.	
Jones	Paynter	Smith, Mich.	
La Follette	Piles	Stone	

NAYS—14.

Brandegee	Crane	Hale	Stephenson
Burnham	Curtis	Kean	Wetmore
Burrows	Flint	Lodge	
Burton	Frye	Smoot	

NOT VOTING—41.

Aldrich	Depew	McLaurin	Richardson
Bailey	Dillingham	Martin	Root
Bankhead	du Pont	Money	Simmons
Bourne	Elkins	Nelson	Smith, S. C.
Briggs	Foster	Newlands	Taylor
Bulkeley	Frazier	Nixon	Tillman
Carter	Gallinger	Overman	Warner
Clapp	Gore	Owen	Warren
Clarke, Ark.	Johnston, Ala.	Penrose	
Cummins	Lorimer	Perkins	
Davis	McEnery	Rayner	

So Mr. BORAH's amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. If there be no objection, the Secretary will change the total to conform to the amendment just agreed to.

The SECRETARY. In line 15, strike out "forty-eight thousand one hundred and twenty-five" and insert "forty-two thousand two hundred and fifty."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. After the next item has been disposed of, I take it the Senator from Idaho proposes to move to reduce the salaries of the judges.

Mr. BORAH. I propose to offer an amendment.

Mr. HALE. An amendment. In view of the last vote of the Senate, I shall not on that question demand the yeas and nays, but will ask for a vote of the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. "Contingent expenses" was included in the last amendment. It was all voted on as one.

Mr. HALE. It was all voted on as one. Then let the Senator offer his amendment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will first report the next committee amendment.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 18, after line 20, to insert:

UNITED STATES COURT OF CUSTOMS APPEALS.

For the following for the United States court of customs appeals from August 1, 1909, to June 30, 1910, inclusive, namely:

Salaries: For salary of presiding judge and 4 associate judges, at the rate of $10,000 each per annum; 1 marshal of the court of customs appeals, at the rate of $3,000 per annum; 1 clerk of said court, at the rate of $4,000 per annum; 1 assistant clerk of said court, at the rate of $2,500 per annum; 5 stenographic clerks, at the rate of $2,400 each per annum; 1 stenographic reporter, at the rate of $2,500 per annum; and 1 messenger, at the rate of $900 per annum; in all $68,659.

Contingent expenses: For rent of necessary quarters in Washington, D. C., and elsewhere, and furnishing same for the United States court of customs appeals; for necessary traveling expenses of the court, its officials and employees; for books, periodicals, and stationery; for pay of bailiffs and all other necessary employees not otherwise specifically provided for; and for such other miscellaneous expenses as may be approved by the presiding judge, $36,667.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho desire to offer an amendment?

Mr. BORAH. I move to strike out the word "ten," in line 2, on page 19, and to insert "seven," so that it will read:

At the rate of $7,000 per annum.

The SECRETARY. On page 19, line 2, before the word "thousand," strike out "ten" and insert "seven."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the total in lines 11 and 12 will be changed to correspond.

Mr. HEYBURN. I think it is the intention to change the others in proportion. I ask my colleague, the Senator from Idaho, if that was the only amendment he desires to make.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator from Nebraska has an amendment which will cover the matter.

Mr. BURKETT. The senior Senator from Idaho refers, I think, to the other salaries. I have an amendment that the salaries shall be accepted in full payment.

Mr. LODGE. But the marshals in the ordinary districts get five or six thousand dollars. This is about half the salary.

Mr. HEYBURN. While I have the floor, I should like to call attention to one fact.

The preceding paragraph, providing for assistant attorneys-general, would be effective without regard to the passage of the tariff bill. That paragraph precedes the title "United States court of customs appeals," and we might find ourselves in the position of having largely increased the force of the Attorney-General's office, regardless of whether or not the tariff bill became a law. I call attention to that fact.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. BURKETT. I want to offer to this paragraph an amendment providing that the several amounts herein appropriated for salaries shall be accepted in full payment by the persons holding such positions. I suggest that it go in at the end of the first paragraph of the bill, in line 7, as a proviso.

Mr. HEYBURN. Page 18?

Mr. BURKETT. On the first page of the bill, at the end of the first paragraph, after line 7. I offer it, Mr. President, and if there is no objection to it——

Mr. HALE. Where would it come in?

Mr. BURKETT. Right on the first page of the bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the Senate will return to the consideration of the first paragraph of the bill, and the Secretary will report the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska to that provision.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add at the end of the paragraph the following:

Provided, That the several amounts herein appropriated for salaries shall be accepted in full payment by the persons holding such positions.

Mr. HALE. I make the point of order on that.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to returning to the paragraph?

Mr. HALE. I do not think we had better return to it. If it is to be inserted, it ought to go on, I think——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Objection is made to returning to the paragraph.

Mr. HALE. It ought to go on in connection with the salaries we have been debating.

Mr. BURKETT. That is very true. If it were put on here, it might cover other matters. I offer it to come in on page 18.

Mr. HALE. That is right. Now, let it be stated.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. On page 19?

Mr. BURKETT. On page 18, line 7, after the word "namely."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to insert the proviso on page 18, after the word "namely," in line 7.

Mr. HALE. I make the point of order.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. That it is legislation?

Mr. HALE. Yes.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It is clearly so. The Chair sustains the point of order. The Secretary will state the next committee amendment.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was under the head of "Department of Commerce and Labor," on page 19, after line 22, to strike out:

Until otherwise provided by law, no bond shall be accepted from any surety or bonding company for any officer or employee of the United States which shall cost in excess of the rate of premium charged for a like bond during the calendar year 1908, except that in any particular case or class of cases if the Secretary of the Treasury shall determine that the maximum rate of premium charged during the calendar year 1908 was less than a reasonable rate, he may, in his discretion, direct the acceptance of such bond or class of bonds, at premium rates exceeding not more than 50 per cent those charged during said calendar year: *Provided*, That hereafter the United States shall not pay any part of the premium or other cost of furnishing a bond required by law or otherwise of any officer or employee of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Legislative," on page 21, after line 18, to insert:

SENATE.

For compensation of the officers, clerks, messengers, and others in the service of the Senate for fiscal year 1910, namely:

Sixteen pages for the Senate Chamber, at the rate of $2.50 per day each during the first session of the Sixty-first Congress, $1,860.

For purchase of horses and carriage, or an automobile, including driving, maintenance, and care of the same, for use of the Vice-President, $6,000.

For miscellaneous items, exclusive of labor, $25,000.

The unexpended balance of the appropriation of $2,000 for repairs to Maltby Building for the fiscal year 1909 is reappropriated and made available for the fiscal year 1910.

To reimburse the official reporters of the proceedings and debates of the Senate for expenses incurred during the first session of the Sixty-first Congress, for clerk hire and other clerical services, $3,240.

For the following, on account of additional services to the Committee on Finance, namely: To pay Arthur B. Shelton, $2,500; C. E. Alden, $1,000; Herbert M. Lord, $1,000; Joseph Dierken, $600; R. H. Hillis, $500; J. A. Klingaman, $500; J. G. Thrall, $400; H. L. Stevenson, $300; Leo Rullman, $200; H. W. Kitzmiller, $200, and Edwin F. Ludwig, $200; in all, $7,400.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 2, to insert:

To enable the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives to pay to the officers and employees of the Senate and the House borne on the annual and session rolls on the 1st day of July, 1909, including the Capitol police, the official reporters of the

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

I should not be willing that my vote should be construed into any indisposition to extend anything in the way of courtesy or of advantage that the Government can properly extend to the President of the United States, and more particularly to the present Chief Executive. When this question was before the Senate three or four years ago, I made a speech endeavoring to demonstrate the proposition that the appropriation would be in violation of the Constitution of the United States. At that time I not only voted against it, but made an argument against it. I could not now vote for it without stultifying myself. I am firmly and decidedly of the opinion that it is a violation of the provision of the Constitution of the United States read by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON].

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON], upon which the Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. TAYLOR]. I transfer that pair to my colleague [Mr. BURNHAM], who is necessarily absent from the Senate, and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. MCCUMBER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. FOSTER]. That Senator being absent, I withhold my vote.

Mr. MARTIN (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. NIXON]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN], who is paired with the senior Senator from California [Mr. PERKINS], so that both the Senator from California and myself can vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. PERKINS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN]. Under the arrangement suggested by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN], that pair is transferred to the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. NIXON], leaving me at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. ROOT (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER], and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. STONE (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK]. I do not see him present, and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. WARREN (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. MONEY]. I will transfer that pair, so that the Senator from Mississippi will stand paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. WARNER], and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DEPEW (after having voted in the negative). I am paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE]. When I voted, I did not notice that the Senator was not present. I will, however, transfer my pair with the Senator from Oklahoma to the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BROWN] and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. BOURNE. I have a general pair with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT] and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I have a pair with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN], who is absent. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. BAILEY (after having voted in the affirmative). Unless my vote is necessary to make a quorum, I desire to withdraw it. I did not notice when I voted that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS], with whom I have a general pair, is not present. I presume he would vote "nay" if present. I withdraw my vote.

Mr. JONES. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. CULLOM. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. DAVIS]. I transfer that pair to my colleague [Mr. LORIMER] and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. GALLINGER. Before the announcement of the result of the vote is made, I desire to say that if my colleague [Mr. BURNHAM] were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. SCOTT. I desire to make the same announcement for my colleague [Mr. ELKINS].

The result was announced—yeas 11, nays 36, as follows:

YEAS—11.

Bacon	Culberson	Frazier	Shively
Chamberlain	Daniel	La Follette	Taliaferro
Clay	Fletcher	Martin	

NAYS—36.

Borah	Crawford	Gallinger	Page
Bourne	Cullom	Gamble	Perkins
Bradley	Curtis	Guggenheim	Piles
Brandegee	Depew	Hale	Scott
Bristow	Dick	Heyburn	Smoot
Burkett	Dillingham	Johnson, N. Dak.	Stephenson
Burrows	Dolliver	Kean	Sutherland
Burton	Flint	Lodge	Warren
Crane	Frye	Oliver	Wetmore

NOT VOTING—45.

Aldrich	Cummins	McEnery	Root
Bailey	Davis	McLaurin	Simmons
Bankhead	Dixon	Money	Smith, Md.
Beveridge	du Pont	Nelson	Smith, Mich.
Briggs	Elkins	Newlands	Smith, S. C.
Brown	Foster	Nixon	Stone
Bulkeley	Gore	Overman	Taylor
Burnham	Hughes	Owen	Tillman
Carter	Johnston, Ala.	Paynter	Warner
Clapp	Jones	Penrose	
Clark, Wyo.	Lorimer	Rayner	
Clarke, Ark.	McCumber	Richardson	

So Mr. CULBERSON's amendment was rejected.

Mr. MCCUMBER. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, to come in on line 2, on page 16, and will say that the amendment has been agreed to by the Committee on Appropriations.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 16, after line 2, it is proposed to insert the following:

For pay of Indian agent at Fort Berthold Agency, N. Dak., $1,800.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. BURKETT. Let me suggest to the Senator that there was an amendment inserted following line 2, and his amendment should follow the one inserted at that place.

Mr. MCCUMBER. The amendment I have offered would come in following the other amendment. I wish to say that this is simply to correct an error on the part of the Committee on Indian Affairs. There is an agency at Fort Berthold, in the State of North Dakota, which has existed since the creation of the State. For quite a number of years it was designated as an agency, and then it was changed for two or three years to a superintendency; but in the bill making appropriations for the Indian Service for the year ending June 30, 1909, it was again made an agency. In the appropriation bill for the year ending June 30, 1910, for some reason the item was left out. I had it voted upon in the Committee on Indian Affairs; it was accepted; and I supposed that it was inserted in the bill; but, through some error, it was left out, and the bill passed without its insertion. This is simply to correct that error.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BURTON. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, to be inserted at the end of the bill. I will say that the amendment is reported from the Committee on Commerce.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add at the end of the bill the following:

National Waterways Commission: Any officer or employee of the Government heretofore or hereafter employed by the National Waterways Commission may receive compensation for such employment from the money appropriated for said commission, notwithstanding the provisions of Revised Statutes, sections 1763, 1764, and 1765, and the act approved July 31, 1894, entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1905, and for other purposes," and any other law whatsoever relating to such employment and compensation; and, in addition to the traveling and other expenses of members of the commission and their employees, the actual necessary expenses of persons detailed by any department or bureau of the Government while accompanying said commission on any inspection trip in the United States or elsewhere may be paid from the money appropriated for said commission.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PILES. I offer an amendment to come in at the bottom of page 5.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. At the bottom of page 5, after the amendment already agreed to and inserted at that place, it is proposed to insert the following:

The Secretary of the Navy is hereby directed to transfer and turn over to the Secretary of the Treasury, for the use of the Revenue-Cutter Service, the storehouse and wharf at Ediz Hook, in the State of Washington; and of the unexpended balance of the appropriation made by the act approved May 27, 1908, for the construction of a wharf and storehouse at Waadah Island, Neah Bay, Washington, the sum of

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

$5,000 is hereby reappropriated and made available for the repair and completion of said storehouse and wharf; the unexpended balance of said appropriation to be covered into the Treasury.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. BURKETT. What appropriation is it that is now going to be switched around?

Mr. PILES. In May, 1908, Congress appropriated $24,000 for the purpose of constructing a storehouse and wharf at Waadah Island, in the State of Washington, for the use of the life-saving tug *Snohomish*. After some preliminary work it was discovered that the bottom was altogether too rocky to construct a safe wharf at that place. The Navy Department has a building near Port Angeles, which, by the expenditure of some $5,000 for improvements, can be put in suitable condition as a wharf and storehouse. If this amendment is adopted, the balance of the $24,000 appropriated in 1908 will be returned to the Treasury and, as a matter of fact, a saving to the Government of some $17,000 will be effected.

Mr. HALE. It is a good provision.

Mr. BURKETT. I am not going to oppose the provision, I will say to the Senator, for I take it that it is a wise one; and, as I understand, it is a matter of economy; but I raise this question now, just as I raised a similar one awhile ago. In this little bill, short as it is, there are half a dozen or a dozen places where funds are switched. We do not know where the money is going. We appropriate money, after some consideration, for a very laudable purpose. There happens to be a little left over which the department wants, or somebody else wants, to apply in a different manner, and we come in, and on the spur of the moment, without any consideration, switch a fund from one thing over to another, simply because it does not mean any additional appropriation. I am going to say now, publicly and just as loudly as I can, so that every department of the Government will hear it, and so that every Senator will hear it, that hereafter I am going to oppose, unless there is very good reason why I should not do so, every single attempt that is made to switch appropriations in this manner. If an item is good, it ought to stand on its own merits, and it ought to go in and be appropriated for after proper consideration; but it ought not to ride through in this easy sort of method simply because it does not carry any appropriation. It is a switching of money from one fund over into another.

For example, there is a place in this bill where we are doing a thing which I question whether we ought to do in connection with schoolhouses for the District of Columbia. I am not certain that it is wrong; I simply do not know. We have not given it very much consideration; but the best that can be said for it is that it is making no additional appropriation for this purpose. It may be a good item; but if it is, it ought to come in in the regular way and be appropriated for on its own merits, and not be provided for in this bill by a reappropriation.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am sorry the Senator has made that illustration. The only trouble about that was that in the last appropriation bill we used the words "the year 1908" instead of the words "the year 1909." We simply correct that clerical error.

Mr. BURKETT. I am referring to the item where we have switched a fund that we appropriated to care for temporary rooms for classes above the second grade, now on half time, to make it apply to portable schools.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is the very item. It was a clerical mistake.

Mr. BURKETT. As I have said, we did not at least give it very much consideration.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. PILES].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DEPEW. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 4, after line 16, it is proposed to insert:

New York appraisers' stores and custom-house: The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized, in expending the appropriation of $175,000 for the installation of pneumatic-tube service between the new custom-house and appraisers' stores in the city of New York, to accept the franchise as granted by the government of the city of New York, and to enter into a contract with said city to abide by its terms, conditions, and requirements.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SCOTT. I desire to offer the amendment I send to the desk.

The SECRETARY. On page 5, after the amendments heretofore inserted, it is proposed to insert the following:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and is hereby, directed, in making reports on bills for the erection of public buildings, to do so upon the report of an inspector who shall have personally visited said city where such building is proposed to be erected, and such report shall cover the needs and necessity for such building, with a view to future necessities. And any money necessary for the carrying out of these provisions is hereby appropriated out of any unexpended money in the Treasury.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. President, this is an urgent deficiency bill, and if this extra session of Congress had not been called not a single item in this bill would have been considered. I hope the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations will see to it that no items are included in it except deficiency items. Senators are offering on the floor of the Senate amendment after amendment which have not been considered by the Committee on Appropriations. It does strike me that we ought to keep within the rule and see that this bill contains nothing except appropriations which are absolutely necessary on account of conditions that have arisen since the Congress has been convened in extra session.

Mr. President, I make the point of order that the amendment proposes general legislation.

Mr. HALE. It is undoubtedly legislation.

Mr. SCOTT. The Senator from Georgia did not appear to "get onto the curves" of this bill until this particular amendment was offered.

Mr. CLAY. I did not know that the Senator from West Virginia——

Mr. SCOTT. I desire, as chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to say that if an amendment of this kind can be gotten through the Senate it will save from eight to ten million dollars; but if Senators do not want to practice economy in this direction I am perfectly willing that the amendment should go out. There is no appropriation——

Mr. CLAY. If it is going to save eight or ten million dollars, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. HALE. Let us have a vote.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia withdraws the point of order. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CURTIS. I offer the amendment I send to the desk.

The SECRETARY. On page 23, line 8, after the word "House," insert "Hershel Shaw, Eustace D. Smith, Harold S. G. Van Voorhis, elevator conductors."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DANIEL. After the word "dollars," in line 21, on page 22, I move to insert "Joseph S. McCoy, $1,000." The appropriations in this item are for certain employees of the Senate and its committees. Joseph S. McCoy is an actuary of the Treasury, in the office of the Secretary——

Mr. KEAN. I understand he was employed by the minority?

Mr. HALE. There is no objection to the amendment.

Mr. KEAN. Let it be put in.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreement to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended and the amendments were concurred in.

Mr. BURKETT. Mr. President, I now desire to offer formally the amendment to which I have referred. I will say to the chairman of the committee that whatever may be the wisdom or propriety of fixing these salaries, we do not want any question of doubt hanging over us in the future as to whether these officers have a right to recover the salaries. If one goes out, of course the other goes out; but if the conferees shall decide to leave in this matter of salaries, reduced as the Senate has reduced them, I have no doubt there ought to be a provision that they shall be accepted in full payment.

Mr. HALE. I will not object.

Mr. BURKETT. I am going to offer it to come in after the first paragraph. After thinking it over, I have come to the conclusion that that is the better place, and it will save the necessity of repeating it.

Mr. HALE. It will all go together.

Mr. BURKETT. It will all go in or all go out.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Nebraska will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 1, after the word "namely" in line 7, insert:

Provided, That the several amounts herein appropriated for salaries shall be accepted in full payment by the persons holding such positions.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments made as in Committee of the Whole were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

ject can be practically disposed of, to point out what was done in the conference committee and just what the striking out of the anticoupon provision means. I think all Senators understand it now.

Furthermore, I see that under section 34 of the bill as it comes from the conference committee the provisions of that particular law do not go into effect for a year yet; that is, not until the 1st of next July. So by a separate resolution at the next session there will be ample time for a reenactment of the anticoupon provision, and more extensively I hope I shall be able to make it than I made it here. At that time I shall state just what the conferees did.

I was going to ask the Senator from Rhode Island why it was that the anticoupon provision, which is a reenactment of the Dingley anticoupon provision, and which passed this body, was stricken out in conference. I am advised that the House conferees seriously objected to it. I can not imagine what the objection could possibly have been, but I shall not take the time of the Senate now to go into it.

For both these reasons I shall now offer to the resolution the anticoupon amendment, because I am convinced, as I said before, that it is necessary for this resolution to go through if we are going to have a reduction in the leather schedule.

Mr. ALDRICH. I move to lay the amendment proposed by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] on the table, and upon that I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. CULBERSON. I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Rhode Island first asked for the yeas and nays. Is the demand seconded?

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

Mr. BOURNE (when his name was called). I again announce that I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. NIXON], and I vote "yea."

Mr. BRIGGS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. JOHNSTON], who is necessarily absent from the city. I therefore withhold my vote. I make this announcement to cover this and the succeeding votes during the day.

Mr. CLAY (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND], who was called away on account of sickness. If he were present, he would vote "yea" and I should vote "nay."

Mr. CULLOM (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. DAVIS], and I withhold my vote. If permitted, I would vote "yea."

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. TAYLOR]. If I were privileged to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

Mr. BANKHEAD (when the name of Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama was called). My colleague [Mr. JOHNSTON] is paired with the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BRIGGS]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. MARTIN (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. NIXON]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN], and vote "nay."

Mr. WARREN (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. MONEY].

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. PAGE. My colleague [Mr. DILLINGHAM] is unavoidably absent. He is paired with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. MCLAURIN. My colleague [Mr. MONEY] is unavoidably absent. He is paired, as announced by the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN], with that Senator. If my colleague were present, he would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 26, as follows:

YEAS—43.

Aldrich	Burton	Gamble	Penrose
Beveridge	Carter	Guggenheim	Perkins
Borah	Clark, Wyo.	Hale	Piles
Bourne	Crane	Heyburn	Root
Bradley	Crawford	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Brandegee	Curtis	Jones	Smith, Mich.
Brown	Depew	Kean	Smoot
Bulkeley	Dick	Lodge	Stephenson
Burkett	du Pont	Lorimer	Warner
Burnham	Flint	Oliver	Wetmore
Burrows	Frye	Page	

NAYS—26.

Bacon	Chamberlain	Daniel	Frazier
Bankhead	Clapp	Fletcher	Gore
Bristow	Culberson	Foster	Hughes
La Follette	Newlands	Shively	Stone
McCumber	Overman	Simmons	Taliaferro
McLaurin	Paynter	Smith, Md.	
Martin	Rayner	Smith, S. C.	

NOT VOTING—23.

Bailey	Davis	Johnston, Ala.	Richardson
Briggs	Dillingham	McEnery	Sutherland
Clarke, Ark.	Dixon	Money	Taylor
Clay	Dolliver	Nelson	Tillman
Cullom	Elkins	Nixon	Warren
Cummins	Gallinger	Owen	

So Mr. CULBERSON'S amendment was laid on the table.

Mr. ALDRICH. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP].

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, when the so-called "corporation-tax amendment" was before the Senate, I moved an amendment striking out the exemption of what we might, for brevity's sake, call the holding corporation. The Senate adopted that amendment and struck out that exemption. The conferees put that exemption back again in conference, and I believe if there is any one thing that will hang like a dead weight about the neck of our party it will be the attempt to tax corporations, and yet exempt the great holding corporations of this country.

I had prepared an amendment to the resolution of the Senator from Rhode Island, but the last amendment offered by the Senator from Texas, which was as fair a proposition as was ever [illegible] been defeated, and

Mr. ALDRICH. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate concurrent resolution No. 8.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of concurrent resolution No. 8, which was read, as follows:

Senate concurrent resolution 8.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Committees on Enrolled Bills of the two Houses be authorized to correct the enrolled bill of the House (H. R. 1438) entitled "An act to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes," by striking out the word "general" wherever it occurs in section 2 of said bill and inserting in lieu thereof the word "maximum," and they are further authorized to enroll paragraph 450 as follows:

"450. Hides of cattle, raw or uncured, whether dry salted or pickled, shall be admitted free of duty: *Provided*, That on and after October 1, 1909, grain, buff, and split leather shall pay a duty of 7½ per cent ad valorem; that all boots and shoes, made wholly or in chief value of leather made from cattle hides and cattle skins of whatever weight, of cattle of the bovine species, including calfskins, shall pay a duty of 10 per cent ad valorem; that harness, saddles, and saddlery, in sets or in parts, finished or unfinished, composed wholly or in chief value of leather, shall pay a duty of 20 per cent ad valorem."

Mr. ALDRICH. I should like to make a brief statement of position, I refrain from pressing the amendment at this time.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

Mr. ALDRICH. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment to the resolution. I submit it. It is not my intention to discuss it. I have neither the strength nor the disposition to do that. It is a matter which was very thoroughly discussed during the consideration of the measure in the Senate. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri will be read.

The SECRETARY. After the numerals "450," in line 10, it is proposed to strike out the remainder of the resolution and in lieu thereof to insert:

Hides of cattle, raw or cured, whether dry, salted, or pickled; grain, buff, and split leather; all boots and shoes made wholly or in chief value of leather made from cattle hides and cattle skins of whatever weight, of cattle of the bovine species, including calfskins; harness, saddles, and saddlery, in sets or in parts, finished or unfinished, composed wholly or in chief value of leather; all the foregoing shall be admitted free of duty.

Mr. ALDRICH. I move to lay the amendment on the table.

Mr. STONE. Upon that motion I ask for the yeas and nays.

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

Mr. BOURNE (when his name was called). I again announce that I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. NIXON] and vote "yea."

Mr. CLAY (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND]. If he were present, he would vote "yea" and I would vote "nay."

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). I will again announce my pair with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. TAYLOR]. If I were unpaired, I would vote "yea."

Mr. MARTIN (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. NIXON] to the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] and vote "nay."

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Mr. WARREN (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. MONEY].

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CULLOM (after having voted in the affirmative). I voted by mistake while I was engaged. I withdraw my vote. I am paired with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. CLAY. I was requested to state that the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS] on this vote, and the previous motion to table the amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON]. He would have voted "nay" if he had been present and not paired.

Mr. GORE. I desire to announce that if my colleague [Mr. OWENS] were present and not paired, he would vote "nay."

Mr. ELKINS. I announce my pair with the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY]. The Senator from Texas is not in the Chamber and I withhold my vote.

Mr. PAGE. I announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. DILLINGHAM] from the Chamber. He is paired with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 23, as follows:

YEAS—43.

Aldrich	Carter	Guggenheim	Penrose
Borah	Clark, Wyo.	Hale	Perkins
Bourne	Crane	Heyburn	Piles
Bradley	Crawford	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Brandegee	Curtis	Jones	Scott
Brown	Depew	Kean	Smith, Mich.
Bulkeley	Dick	Lodge	Smoot
Burkett	du Pont	Lorimer	Stephenson
Burnham	Flint	McCumber	Warner
Burrows	Frye	Oliver	Wetmore
Burton	Gamble	Page	

NAYS—23.

Bacon	Daniel	McLaurin	Shively
Bankhead	Fletcher	Martin	Simmons
Bristow	Foster	Newlands	Smith, Md.
Chamberlain	Frazier	Overman	Stone
Clapp	Gore	Paynter	Taliaferro
Culberson	La Follette	Rayner	

NOT VOTING—26.

Bailey	Davis	Johnston, Ala.	Smith, S. C.
Beveridge	Dillingham	McEnery	Sutherland
Briggs	Dixon	Money	Taylor
Clarke, Ark.	Dolliver	Nelson	Tillman
Clay	Elkins	Nixon	Warren
Cullom	Gallinger	Owen	
Cummins	Hughes	Richardson	

So Mr. STONE'S amendment was laid on the table.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution offered by the Senator from Rhode Island, on which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask leave to have printed as a Senate document a table prepared by the Bureau of Manufactures, showing a comparison of the Payne tariff bill as agreed to by the committee of conference with the present tariff law, and showing the respective rates and percentages of increase or decrease on articles classified differently in the prepared bill and the existing law. This table supplies the rates which do not appear in the volume termed "Estimated Revenues," prepared by the Finance Committee. It shows some 286 increases of duty and 38 decreases of duty which have never appeared in any table furnished by the Finance Committee. I ask to have the table printed as a Senate document.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none, and the order to print is entered.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Now, Mr. President, I ask to have printed as a Senate document a table prepared by the Bureau of Statistics upon the estimated revenues as furnished by the Finance Committee. It has been prepared with a great deal of care. It brings down a table which was printed as a Senate document when the Senate passed the bill. I had at that time an understanding with the chairman of the Committee on Finance that when the conference report was made that table would be presented either by the chairman or by myself to show all the changes made in conference in the bill as passed by the Senate. Shortly after the conference report was presented to the other House a proof of that table was handed to me by the clerk of the Committee on Finance, with a message from the chairman of the committee that I could either present the table myself or he would present it.

I concluded, before offering it, to have it carefully examined by the Bureau of Statistics. I did so. The result of the examination disclosed that it contained a number of errors. These were corrected by the bureau. It has also been carefully compared by the bureau with the last reprint of "Estimated Revenues" issued by the Committee on Finance, in which a number of errors were also discovered.

Mr. President, with this explanation, I ask to have the correct table printed as a Senate document.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none, and the order to print is entered.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I had anticipated that the opportunity might come to me to submit some remarks upon the conference committee report on the tariff bill before its adoption. I had on yesterday caused my name to be placed upon the list by the then presiding officer, the Vice-President not being in the chair at the time. I took the precaution to take a copy of that list. I found my name to-day farther down on the list than it was placed at the time. The change in my position on that list and the time consumed by other Senators prevented my name being reached before the time arrived for voting on the conference report to-day. Consequently I did not have the opportunity to make the remarks which I wished to submit on the bill before its final passage. I make this explanation that it may go into the RECORD. As I shall have occasion many times to state my views with respect to this tariff legislation between now and the convening of Congress in December next, I forego the opportunity to have spoken here with less disappointment.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I beg leave to submit a request that the statistics prepared by the experts who assisted the Democratic minority of the Senate conferees on the tariff bill may be printed as a document.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Virginia? The Chair hears none, and the order to print is entered.

Upon agreeing to the concurrent resolution submitted by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH], the Secretary will now call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CULLOM (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. DAVIS], and so I withhold my vote.

Mr. ELKINS (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY], and withhold my vote.

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. JONES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], who, I understand, has left the Chamber, and therefore I withhold my vote. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. GORE (when Mr. OWEN'S name was called). I will state again that my colleague [Mr. OWEN] is absent. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. WARREN (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. MONEY].

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CLAY. I have a pair with the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND], but I am informed that if he were present he would vote "yea." I therefore vote "yea."

Mr. JONES. I have announced my pair with the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], but I understand that if he were present he would very likely vote "yea." Therefore I shall vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. PAGE. I again announce the necessary absence of my colleague [Mr. DILLINGHAM]. He is paired with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN]. If my colleague were present and allowed to vote, he would vote "yea."

Mr. BANKHEAD. My colleague [Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama] is necessarily absent. If present, he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 70, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—70.

Aldrich	Clay	Hale	Perkins
Bacon	Crane	Heyburn	Piles
Bankhead	Crawford	Hughes	Rayner
Beveridge	Culberson	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Borah	Curtis	Jones	Scott
Bourne	Daniel	Kean	Shively
Bradley	Depew	La Follette	Simmons
Brandegee	Dick	Lodge	Smith, Md.
Bristow	Dixon	Lorimer	Smith, Mich.
Brown	du Pont	McCumber	Smoot
Bulkeley	Fletcher	McLaurin	Stephenson
Burkett	Flint	Martin	Stone
Burnham	Foster	Newlands	Sutherland
Burrows	Frazier	Oliver	Taliaferro
Carter	Frye	Overman	Warner
Chamberlain	Gamble	Page	Wetmore
Clapp	Gore	Paynter	
Clark, Wyo.	Guggenheim	Penrose	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

61ST CONGRESS, 1st Session. | SENATE. | DOCUMENT No. 153.

VOTES ON TARIFF BILL.

Mr. BACON presented

THE RECORD OF EVERY YEA-AND-NAY VOTE IN THE SENATE ON THE TARIFF BILL FROM MAY 5, TO JULY 8, 1909, INCLUSIVE.

In the following votes, the names of all Republican Senators are printed in roman text; while the names of all Democratic Senators are printed in italics.

AUGUST 4, 1909.—Ordered to be printed.

Paragraph 46 of the tariff bill as it came from the House, imposing a duty on orange mineral—which is a lead product, entering as a principal constituent in the composition of house paint—was as follows:

46. Orange mineral, 2⅞ cents per pound.

The Finance Committee of the Senate proposed to amend the paragraph and increase the duty by striking out the words "*two and seven-eighths*" and inserting the words "*three and three-eighths*" in lieu thereof.

Upon the call of the yeas and nays upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 1795, May 5):

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 35, as follows:

YEAS—41.

Aldrich	Cullom	Jones	Scott
Borah	Dillingham	Lodge	Smith, Mich.
Bradley	Dixon	McCumber	Smoot
Brandegee	du Pont	Nixon	Stephenson
Briggs	Elkins	Oliver	Sutherland
Bulkeley	Flint	Page	Warner
Burnham	Frye	Penrose	Warren
Burrows	Gallinger	Perkins	Wetmore
Burton	Guggenheim	Piles	
Carter	Hale	Richardson	
Crane	Heyburn	Root	

NAYS—35.

Bacon	Crawford	*Hughes*	*Paynter*
Bailey	*Culberson*	Johnson, N. Dak.	*Rayner*
Bankhead	Cummins	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Simmons*
Bristow	Curtis	La Follette	*Smith, Md.*
Brown	Dolliver	*McEnery*	*Smith, S. C.*
Burkett	*Fletcher*	*McLaurin*	*Stone*
Chamberlain	*Foster*	*Money*	*Taliaferro*
Clarke, Ark.	*Frazier*	Nelson	*Tillman*
Clay	*Gore*	*Overman*	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NOT VOTING—15.

Beveridge	*Daniel*	Gamble	*Owen*
Bourne	*Davis*	Kean	*Shively*
Clapp	Depew	*Martin*	*Taylor*
Clark, Wyo.	Dick	*Newlands*	

So the amendment was agreed to.

Paragraph 179 contained the following provision:

179. Lead dross, including all dross containing lead, lead bullion, or base bullion, lead in pigs in bars, old refuse lead run into blocks or bars, and old scrap lead fit only to be remanufactured, lead in any form not specially provided for in sections 1 and 2 of this act, and the lead contents contained in lead-bearing ores of all kinds; all the foregoing 1½ cents per pound.

The committee, through its chairman [Mr. Aldrich], proposed to strike out the foregoing and insert the following in lieu thereof:

Lead-bearing ore of all kinds, one and one-half cents per pound on the lead contained therein.

The purpose, as stated by the chairman of the Finance Committee, was, in the succeeding section (180), to raise the duty on all the articles named therein except the lead-bearing ore, some of the increases to be 2⅛ cents per pound and the remainder of the increase to be 2½ cents per pound.

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment to thus strike out and insert, the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 1890, May 7):

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 19, as follows:

YEAS—53.

Aldrich	Clapp	Gallinger	Page
Beveridge	Clark, Wyo.	Guggenheim	Penrose
Borah	Crane	Hale	Perkins
Bradley	Crawford	Heyburn	Piles
Brandegee	Cummins	*Hughes*	Root
Briggs	Curtis	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Bristow	Depew	Jones	Smith, Mich.
Brown	Dick	Kean	Stephenson
Bulkeley	Dillingham	Lodge	Sutherland
Burkett	Dixon	McCumber	Warner
Burnham	Dolliver	*McEnery*	Wetmore
Burrows	du Pont	Nelson	
Burton	Flint	Nixon	
Carter	Frye	Oliver	

NAYS—19.

Bacon	*Foster*	*Newlands*	*Smith, S. C.*
Bankhead	*Frazier*	*Overman*	*Stone*
Culberson	*Gore*	*Shively*	*Taliaferro*
Daniel	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Simmons*	*Tillman*
Fletcher	*McLaurin*	*Smith, Md.*	

NOT VOTING—19.

Bailey	Cullom	*Martin*	Richardson
Bourne	*Davis*	*Money*	Smoot
Chamberlain	Elkins	*Owen*	*Taylor*
Clarke, Ark.	Gamble	*Paynter*	Warren
Clay	La Follette	*Rayner*	

So the amendment was agreed to.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Pursuant to a statement made by the Senator from Rhode Island when paragraph 179 was under consideration, the committee moved to strike out paragraph 180, which was as follows:

180. Lead in sheets, pipe, shot, glaziers' lead, and lead wire, 1⅞ cents per pound.

And insert in lieu thereof the following:

180. *Lead dross, lead bullion, or base bullion, lead in pigs and bars, lead in any form not specially provided for in this section, old refuse lead run into blocks and bars, and old scrap lead fit only to be remanufactured; all the foregoing, two and one-eighth cents per pound: lead in sheets, pipe, shot, glaziers' lead, and lead wire, two and one-half cents per pound.*

To the foregoing amendment Mr. Cummins, of Iowa, offered an amendment striking out the words "*two and one-eighth*" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "*one and seven-eighths,*" so that if omitted it will read:

All the foregoing, one and seven-eighths cents per pound.

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment to thus strike out and insert, the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 1955, May 10):

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 44, as follows:

YEAS—35.

Bacon	*Clay*	*Gore*	*Shively*
Bankhead	Crawford	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Simmons*
Beveridge	*Culberson*	La Follette	*Smith, Md.*
Bristow	Cummins	*McLaurin*	*Smith, S. C.*
Brown	*Daniel*	Nelson	*Stone*
Burkett	Dolliver	*Newlands*	*Taliaferro*
Chamberlain	*Fletcher*	*Overman*	*Taylor*
Clapp	*Frazier*	*Paynter*	*Tillman*
Clarke, Ark.	Gamble	*Rayner*	

NAYS—44.

Aldrich	Crane	Heyburn	Perkins
Borah	Curtis	*Hughes*	Piles
Bradley	Depew	Johnson, N. Dak.	Richardson
Brandegee	Dick	Jones	Root
Briggs	Dixon	Kean	Scott
Bulkeley	du Pont	Lodge	Smith, Mich.
Burnham	Flint	*McEnery*	Smoot
Burrows	Frye	Nixon	Stephenson
Burton	Gallinger	Oliver	Sutherland
Carter	Guggenheim	Page	Warner
Clark, Wyo.	Hale	Penrose	Wetmore

NOT VOTING—12.

Bailey	*Davis*	*Foster*	*Money*
Bourne	Dillingham	McCumber	*Owen*
Cullom	Elkins	*Martin*	Warren

So Mr. Cummins's amendment to the amendment of the committee was rejected.

Thereupon Mr. Beveridge, of Indiana, offered an amendment to the amendment by striking out the word "*one-eighth,*" so that the same proposed duty would read, "*All the foregoing, 2 cents per pound.*"

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment to the amendment to thus strike out and insert, the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 1960, May 10):

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 45, as follows:

YEAS—37.

Bacon	Crawford	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Simmons*
Bankhead	*Culberson*	La Follette	*Smith, Md.*
Beveridge	Cummins	*McLaurin*	*Smith, S. C.*
Bristow	*Daniel*	Nelson	*Stone*
Brown	Dolliver	*Newlands*	*Taliaferro*
Burkett	*Fletcher*	*Overman*	*Taylor*
Chamberlain	*Foster*	*Owen*	*Tillman*
Clapp	*Frazier*	*Paynter*	
Clarke, Ark.	Gamble	*Rayner*	
Clay	*Gore*	*Shively*	

NAYS—45.

Aldrich	Curtis	*Hughes*	Richardson
Borah	Depew	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Bradley	Dick	Jones	Scott
Brandegee	Dillingham	Kean	Smith, Mich.
Briggs	Dixon	Lodge	Smoot
Bulkeley	du Pont	McCumber	Stephenson
Burnham	Flint	Nixon	Sutherland
Burrows	Frye	Oliver	Warner
Burton	Gallinger	Page	Wetmore
Carter	Guggenheim	Penrose	
Clark, Wyo.	Hale	Perkins	
Crane	Heyburn	Piles	

NOT VOTING—9.

Bailey	*Davis*	*McEnery*	*Money*
Bourne	Elkins	*Martin*	Warren
Cullom			

So Mr. Beveridge's amendment to the amendment of the committee was rejected.

Paragraph 91 in the House bill was as follows:

China, porcelain, parian, bisque, earthen, stone, and crockery ware, ornamented, decorated, painted, colored, tinted, stained, enameled, gilded, brown, white lined, or printed, and clock cases, with or without movements, pill tiles, plaques, ornaments, toys, charms, vases, statues, statuettes, mugs, cups, steins, and lamps, wholly or in part of such ware; and manufactures in chief value of such ware not specially provided for in sections 1 or 2 of this act, 60 per cent ad valorem.

To the foregoing paragraph Mr. Bacon, of Georgia, offered the following proviso as an amendment to the same reducing the duty:

Provided, That none of the foregoing articles composed of earthen or stone ware shall pay a higher rate of duty than 35 per cent ad valorem.

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment adding this proviso the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 1981, May 11):

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 54, as follows:

YEAS—25.

Bacon	*Frazier*	*Newlands*	*Stone*
Bankhead	*Gore*	*Overman*	*Taliaferro*
Clarke, Ark.	*Hughes*	*Paynter*	*Taylor*
Clay	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Rayner*	*Tillman*
Culberson	La Follette	*Simmons*	
Fletcher	*McLaurin*	*Smith, Md.*	
Foster	*Martin*	*Smith, S. C.*	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—54.

Aldrich	*Chamberlain*	Gamble	Perkins
Beveridge	Crane	Guggenheim	Piles
Borah	Crawford	Hale	Richardson
Bradley	Cullom	Heyburn	Root
Brandegee	Cummins	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Briggs	Curtis	Jones	Smith, Mich.
Bristow	Depew	Kean	Smoot
Brown	Dick	Lodge	Stephenson
Bulkeley	Dillingham	McCumber	Sutherland
Burkett	Dixon	Nelson	Warner
Burnham	Dolliver	Nixon	Warren
Burrows	du Pont	Oliver	Wetmore
Burton	Flint	Page	
Carter	Gallinger	Penrose	

NOT VOTING—12.

Bailey	Clark, Wyo.	Elkins	*Money*
Bourne	*Daniel*	Frye	*Owen*
Clapp	*Davis*	*McEnery*	*Shively*

So Mr. Bacon's amendment was rejected.

Paragraph 92 of the bill as amended upon motion of the committee was as follows:

China, porcelain, parian, bisque, earthen, stone, and crockery ware, plain white, plain brown, including clock cases with or without movements, pill tiles, plaques, ornaments, toys, charms, vases, statues, statuettes, mugs, cups, steins, and lamps, all the foregoing wholly or in chief value of such ware, not painted, colored, tinted, stained, enameled, gilded, printed, or ornamented or decorated in any manner; and manufactures in chief value of such ware not specially provided for in this section, 55 per cent ad valorem.

To the foregoing paragraph as amended, Mr. Bacon, of Georgia, offered an amendment proposing to reduce the duty specified in the same *by striking out the word "fifty-five" and inserting the word "forty" in lieu thereof, so that the rate of duty would be 40 per cent ad valorem.* Upon the question of the adoption of this amendment, thus to strike out and insert, the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 1984, May 11):

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 50, as follows:

YEAS—27.

Bacon	*Fletcher*	*McLaurin*	*Smith, Md.*
Bankhead	*Foster*	*Martin*	*Smith, S. C.*
Bristow	*Frazier*	*Newlands*	*Stone*
Chamberlain	*Gore*	*Overman*	*Taliaferro*
Clarke, Ark.	*Hughes*	*Paynter*	*Taylor*
Crawford	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Rayner*	*Tillman*
Culberson	La Follette	*Simmons*	

NAYS—50.

Beveridge	Cullom	Hale	Piles
Borah	Cummins	Heyburn	Richardson
Bradley	Curtis	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Brandegee	Depew	Jones	Scott
Briggs	Dick	Kean	Smith, Mich.
Brown	Dillingham	Lodge	Smoot
Bulkeley	Dixon	McCumber	Stephenson
Burkett	Dolliver	Nelson	Sutherland
Burnham	du Pont	Nixon	Warner
Burrows	Flint	Oliver	Warren
Burton	Gallinger	Page	Wetmore
Carter	Gamble	Penrose	
Crane	Guggenheim	Perkins	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NOT VOTING—14.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Elkins	*Owen*
Bailey	*Clay*	Frye	*Shively*
Bourne	*Daniel*	*McEnery*	
Clapp	*Davis*	*Money*	

So Mr. Bacon's amendment was rejected.

The committee proposed an amendment to be known as "115½," imposing a duty *of 25 cents a ton on iron ore*, the equivalent of which was estimated to be 10 per cent ad valorem. Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2082, May 13, 1909):

The result was announced—yeas 61, nays 24, as follows:

YEAS—61.

Aldrich	Cullom	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Bacon	*Daniel*	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Simmons*
Bailey	Depew	Jones	Smith, Mich.
Bankhead	Dick	Kean	Smoot
Bradley	Dillingham	Lodge	Stephenson
Brandegee	Dixon	McCumber	*Stone*
Briggs	Elkins	*McEnery*	Sutherland
Bulkeley	*Fletcher*	*Martin*	*Taliaferro*
Burnham	Flint	Nixon	*Taylor*
Burrows	*Foster*	Oliver	*Tillman*
Burton	*Frazier*	Page	Warner
Carter	Frye	*Paynter*	Warren
Chamberlain	Gallinger	Penrose	Wetmore
Clark, Wyo.	Guggenheim	Perkins	
Clay	Hale	Piles	
Crane	Heyburn	Root	

NAYS—24.

Beveridge	*Clarke, Ark.*	du Pont	*Newlands*
Borah	Crawford	Gamble	*Overman*
Bristow	*Culberson*	*Gore*	*Rayner*
Brown	Cummins	*Hughes*	*Shively*
Burkett	Curtis	La Follette	*Smith, Md.*
Clapp	Dolliver	Nelson	*Smith, S. C.*

NOT VOTING—6.

Bourne	*McLaurin*	*Owen*	Richardson
Davis	*Money*		

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

In paragraph 118 as amended are the following provisions:

Round iron, in coils or rods, less than seven-sixteenths of 1 inch in diameter, and bars or shapes of rolled or hammered iron, not specially provided for in this section, six-tenths of 1 cent per pound: *Provided*, That all iron in slabs, blooms, loops, or other forms less finished than iron in bars, and more advanced than pig iron, except castings, shall be subject to duty of four-tenths of 1 cent per pound.

To the paragraph as thus amended Mr. Cummins, of Iowa, offered an amendment to reduce the proposed duty *by striking out the word "six-tenths" and inserting the word "five-tenths" in lieu thereof, and by striking out the word "four-tenths" and inserting "three-tenths" in lieu thereof.*

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2128, May 14):

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays, 42, as follows:

YEAS—35.

Bacon	Clapp	*Gore*	*Paynter*
Bailey	*Clarke, Ark.*	*Hughes*	*Simmons*
Bankhead	*Clay*	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Smith, Md.*
Beveridge	Crawford	La Follette	*Smith, S. C.*
Borah	Cummins	*McLaurin*	*Stone*
Bristow	*Daniel*	*Martin*	*Taliaferro*
Brown	Dolliver	Nelson	*Taylor*
Burkett	*Fletcher*	*Newlands*	*Tillman*
Chamberlain	*Frazier*	*Overman*	

NAYS—42.

Aldrich	Dick	Heyburn	Piles
Bradley	Dillingham	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Brandegee	Dixon	Jones	Scott
Briggs	du Pont	Kean	Smith, Mich.
Bulkeley	Elkins	Lodge	Smoot
Burnham	Flint	*McEnery*	Stephenson
Burrows	Frye	Nixon	Sutherland
Burton	Gallinger	Oliver	Warner
Carter	Gamble	Page	Wetmore
Cullom	Guggenheim	Penrose	
Depew	Hale	Perkins	

NOT VOTING—14.

Bourne	Curtis	*Money*	*Shively*
Clark, Wyo.	*Davis*	*Owen*	Warren
Crane	*Foster*	*Rayner*	
Culberson	McCumber	Richardson	

So Mr. Cummins's amendment was rejected.

Thereupon Mr. McLaurin, of Mississippi, offered to the said paragraph 118 the following amendment:

Notwithstanding anything in this bill contained, trace chains, log chains, lock chains, plows, plow stocks, plow handles, plow beams, colters, singletrees, doubletrees, clevises, clevis pins, lap rings, backbands, bellybands, hames, hame strings, bridles, halters, plow lines, hooks and cuffs for singletrees or doubletrees, axes, ax helves, hoes, hoe helves, hatchets, hatchet helves, hammers, hammer handles, horseshoes, horseshoe nails, spades, shovels, saws, squares, rakes, nails, tacks, staples, staple rings, door hinges and screws, window hinges and screws, and all other kinds or character of farming implements or tools, and all carpenters' tools and blacksmiths' tools, when imported into this country shall be exempt from the payment of a duty.

Upon the question of the adoption of the proposed amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2129, May 14):

The result was announced—yeas 22, nays 52, as follows:

YEAS—22.

Bacon	*Daniel*	*Martin*	*Stone*
Bailey	*Frazier*	*Newlands*	*Taliaferro*
Bankhead	*Gore*	*Overman*	*Taylor*
Chamberlain	*Hughes*	*Paynter*	*Tillman*
Clarke, Ark.	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Simmons*	
Clay	*McLaurin*	*Smith, S. C.*	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—52.

Aldrich	Clapp	Gallinger	Oliver
Borah	Crawford	Gamble	Page
Bradley	Cullom	Guggenheim	Penrose
Brandegee	Cummins	Hale	Perkins
Briggs	Depew	Heyburn	Piles
Bristow	Dick	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Brown	Dillingham	Jones	Scott
Bulkeley	Dixon	Kean	Smith, Mich.
Burkett	Dolliver	La Follette	Smoot
Burnham	du Pont	Lodge	Stephenson
Burrows	Elkins	*McEnery*	Sutherland
Burton	Flint	Nelson	Warren
Carter	Frye	Nixon	Wetmore

NOT VOTING—17.

Beveridge	Curtis	*Money*	*Smith, Md.*
Bourne	*Davis*	*Owen*	Warren
Clark, Wyo.	*Fletcher*	*Rayner*	
Crane	*Foster*	Richardson	
Culberson	McCumber	*Shively*	

So Mr. McLaurin's amendment was rejected.

On the 18th of May there was under consideration by the Senate the following resolution, offered by Mr. Gore, of Oklahoma:

Whereas it has been repeatedly asserted and generally admitted in the Senate during the debate on the pending tariff bill that current prices in the United States are unreasonable and exorbitant; and

Whereas there is a radical and irreconcilable division of opinion as to who is responsible for these extortionate prices; and

Whereas there are those who believe that the manufacturers are primarily responsible and others who believe that the wholesale and retail dealers are responsible; and

Whereas it is important that the truth should be known, that the innocent should be vindicated and the guilty alone charged with the blame and responsibility: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Finance or any subcommittee thereof, consisting of representatives of both political parties, are hereby instructed to investigate and report to the Senate at the earliest possible date—

First. The import prices of various articles of general and ordinary consumption.

Second. The wholesale prices of said articles.

Third. The retail prices of said articles.

Fourth. The prices of similar articles of domestic production as fixed, charged, and received by the manufacturers thereof and the wholesale and retail dealers therein.

On the motion to refer these resolutions to the Finance Committee the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, May 18, p. 2220):

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 29, as follows:

YEAS—50.

Aldrich	Cullom	Gamble	Perkins
Borah	Cummins	Guggenheim	Piles
Brandegee	Curtis	Hale	Root
Briggs	Depew	Heyburn	Scott
Brown	Dick	Johnson, N. Dak.	Smith, Mich.
Bulkeley	Dillingham	Jones	Smoot
Burkett	Dixon	Kean	Stephenson
Burnham	Dolliver	Lodge	Sutherland
Burrows	du Pont	McCumber	Warner
Burton	Elkins	Nelson	Warren
Carter	Flint	Oliver	Wetmore
Clark, Wyo.	Frye	Page	
Crane	Gallinger	Penrose	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—29.

Bacon	*Daniel*	*McLaurin*	*Smith, S. C.*
Bailey	*Fletcher*	*Martin*	*Stone*
Bankhead	*Foster*	*Money*	*Taliaferro*
Bristow	*Frazier*	*Overman*	*Taylor*
Chamberlain	*Gore*	*Owen*	*Tillman*
Clay	*Hughes*	*Paynter*	
Crawford	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Rayner*	
Culberson	La Follette	*Smith, Md.*	

NOT VOTING—12.

Beveridge	Clapp	*McEnery*	Richardson
Bourne	*Clarke, Ark.*	*Newlands*	*Shively*
Bradley	*Davis*	Nixon	*Simmons*

So Mr. Gore's resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Paragraph 151, with the amendments proposed by the committee, is as follows:

Penknives, pocketknives, clasp knives, pruning knives, budding knives, erasers, manicure knives, and all knives by whatever name known, including such as are denominatively mentioned in this section, valued at not more than 40 cents per dozen, 40 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than 40 cents per dozen and not exceeding 50 cents per dozen, 1 cent per piece and 40 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than 50 cents per dozen and not exceeding $1.25 per dozen, 5 cents per piece and 40 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than $1.25 per dozen and not exceeding $3 per dozen, 10 cents per piece and 40 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than $3 per dozen, 20 cents per piece and 40 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That any of the foregoing knives or erasers, if imported in the condition of assembled, but not finished, shall be dutiable at not less than the rate of duty herein imposed upon finished knives and erasers valued at more than $3 per dozen: *Provided further*, That blades, handles, or other parts of any of the foregoing knives or erasers shall be dutiable at not less than the rate herein imposed upon knives and erasers valued at more than 50 cents per dozen and not exceeding $1.25 per dozen. Razors, finished, valued at less than $1 per dozen, 45 per cent ad valorem; valued at $1 and less than $1.50 per dozen, 6 cents each and 40 per cent ad valorem; valued at $1.50 and less than $2 per dozen, 10 cents each and 40 per cent ad valorem; valued at $2 or more per dozen, 12 cents each and 50 per cent ad valorem:

Provided, That blades, handles, and unfinished razors shall pay no less duty than that imposed on finished razors valued at $2 per dozen: *Provided further*, That on and after October 1, 1909, all the articles specified in this paragraph shall, when imported, have the name of the maker or purchaser, and beneath the same the name of the country of origin die sunk conspicuously and indelibly on the shank or tang of at least one or, if practicable, each and every blade thereof. Scissors and shears and blades for the same, finished or unfinished, valued at not more than 50 cents per dozen, 15 cents per dozen and 15 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than 50 cents and not more than $1.75 per dozen, 50 cents per dozen and 15 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than $1.75 per dozen, 75 cents per dozen and 25 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. Stone, of Missouri, moved to strike out from the foregoing paragraph the provision for the duty on razors and to insert the following in lieu thereof, reducing the duty:

Razors and razor blades, finished or unfinished, valued at less than $1.50 per dozen, 50 cents per dozen and 15 per cent ad valorem; valued at $1.50 per dozen and less than $3 per dozen, $1 per dozen and 15 per cent ad valorem; valued at $3 per dozen or more, $1.75 per dozen and 20 per cent ad valorem.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment to thus strike out and insert the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2227, May 18):

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—36.

Bacon	*Culberson*	*Hughes*	*Paynter*
Bailey	Cummins	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Rayner*
Beveridge	*Daniel*	La Follette	*Simmons*
Bristow	Dolliver	*McLaurin*	*Smith, Md.*
Brown	*Fletcher*	*Martin*	*Smith, S. C.*
Chamberlain	*Foster*	*Money*	*Stone*
Clapp	*Frazier*	Nelson	*Taliaferro*
Clay	Gamble	*Overman*	*Taylor*
Crawford	*Gore*	*Owen*	*Tillman*

NAYS—43.

Aldrich	Cullom	Hale	Piles
Brandegee	Curtis	Heyburn	Root
Briggs	Dick	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Bulkeley	Dillingham	Jones	Smith, Mich.
Burkett	Dixon	Kean	Smoot
Burnham	du Pont	Lodge	Stephenson
Burrows	Elkins	McCumber	Sutherland
Burton	Flint	Oliver	Warner
Carter	Frye	Page	Warren
Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Penrose	Wetmore
Crane	Guggenheim	Perkins	

NOT VOTING—12.

Bankhead	Bradley	Depew	Nixon
Borah	*Clarke, Ark.*	*McEnery*	Richardson
Bourne	*Davis*	*Newlands*	*Shively*

So Mr. Stone's amendment was rejected.

Thereupon Mr. Bacon, of Georgia, moved to amend by striking out all of the foregoing paragraph 151 and inserting the following in lieu thereof, reducing the duty:

Penknives, pocketknives, clasp knives, pruning knives, budding knives, erasers, and all knives by whatever name known, including such as are denominatively mentioned in this section, or parts thereof, wholly or partly manufactured, razors and razor blades, finished or unfinished, 40 per cent ad valorem.

Scissors and shears, and blades for the same, finished or unfinished, 30 per cent ad valorem.

Upon the adoption of the question of the amendment to thus strike out and insert, the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2228, May 18):

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 51, as follows:

YEAS—28.

Bacon	*Fletcher*	*McLaurin*	*Simmons*
Bailey	*Foster*	*Martin*	*Smith, Md.*
Chamberlain	*Frazier*	*Money*	*Smith, S. C.*
Clapp	*Gore*	*Overman*	*Stone*
Clay	*Hughes*	*Owen*	*Taliaferro*
Culberson	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Paynter*	*Taylor*
Daniel	La Follette	*Rayner*	*Tillman*

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—51.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Penrose
Beveridge	Crane	Gamble	Perkins
Borah	Crawford	Guggenheim	Piles
Brandegee	Cullom	Hale	Root
Briggs	Cummins	Heyburn	Scott
Bristow	Curtis	Johnson, N. Dak.	Smith, Mich.
Brown	Dick	Jones	Smoot
Bulkeley	Dillingham	Kean	Stephenson
Burkett	Dolliver	Lodge	Sutherland
Burnham	du Pont	McCumber	Warner
Burrows	Elkins	Nelson	Warren
Burton	Flint	Oliver	Wetmore
Carter	Frye	Page	

NOT VOTING—12.

Bankhead	*Clarke, Ark.*	Dixon	Nixon
Bourne	*Davis*	*McEnery*	Richardson
Bradley	Depew	Newlands	*Shively*

So Mr. Bacon's amendment was rejected.

Paragraph 153 as amended is as follows:

153. Table, butchers', carving, cooks', hunting, kitchen, bread, butter, vegetable, fruit, cheese, carpenters' bench, curriers', drawing, farriers', fleshing, hay, tanners', plumbers', painters', palette, artists', and shoe knives, forks, and steels, finished or unfinished; if imported with handles of mother-of-pearl, shell, ivory, silver, nickeled silver, or other metal than iron or steel, 14 cents each; with handles of deer-horn, 10 cents each; with handles of hard rubber, solid bone, celluloid, or any pyroxyline material, 4 cents each; with handles of any other material than those above mentioned, 1 cent each, and in addition, on all the above articles, 15 per cent ad valorem; any of the knives, forks, or steels, enumerated in this paragraph, if imported without handles, 40 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That none of the above-named articles shall pay a less rate of duty than 40 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That all the articles specified in this paragraph when imported on and after October 1, 1909, shall have the name of the maker or purchaser and beneath the same the name of the country of origin indelibly stamped or branded thereon in a place that shall not be covered thereafter.

Mr. Bacon, of Georgia, proposed to reduce the duty by striking out all of the foregoing paragraph, 153, and by inserting the following in lieu thereof:

Table, butchers', carving, cooks', hunting, kitchen, bread, butter, vegetable, fruit, cheese, carpenters' bench, curriers', drawing, farriers', fleshing, hay, tanners', plumbers', painters', pallette, artists', and shoe knives, forks, and steels, finished or unfinished, 30 per cent ad valorem.

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment to thus strike out and insert, the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2229, May 18):

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 53, as follows:

YEAS—23.

Bacon	*Fletcher*	*Money*	*Smith, Md.*
Bailey	*Foster*	*Overman*	*Smith, S. C.*
Chamberlain	*Frazier*	*Owen*	*Taliaferro*
Clay	*Hughes*	*Paynter*	*Taylor*
Culberson	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Rayner*	*Tillman*
Daniel	*McLaurin*	*Simmons*	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—53.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Penrose
Beveridge	Crane	Gamble	Perkins
Borah	Crawford	Guggenheim	Piles
Brandegee	Cullom	Hale	Root
Briggs	Cummins	Heyburn	Scott
Bristow	Curtis	Johnson, N. Dak.	Smith, Mich.
Brown	Dick	Jones	Smoot
Bulkeley	Dillingham	Kean	Stephenson
Burkett	Dixon	La Follette	Sutherland
Burnham	Dolliver	Lodge	Warren
Burrows	du Pont	McCumber	Wetmore
Burton	Elkins	Nelson	
Carter	Flint	Oliver	
Clapp	Frye	Page	

NOT VOTING—15.

Bankhead	*Davis*	*Martin*	*Shively*
Bourne	Depew	*Newlands*	*Stone*
Bradley	*Gore*	Nixon	Warner
Clarke, Ark.	*McEnery*	Richardson	

So Mr. Bacon's amendment was rejected.

To paragraph 168, imposing a duty on umbrella and parasol ribs and stretchers, Mr. Penrose, of Pennsylvania, moved to *strike out the duty of 35 per cent ad valorem, as proposed in the paragraph, and to insert 50 per cent ad valorem in lieu thereof.*

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment to thus strike out and insert the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2232, May 18):

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 37, as follows:

YEAS—44.

Aldrich	Cullom	Hale	Perkins
Borah	Depew	Heyburn	Piles
Brandegee	Dick	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Briggs	Dillingham	Jones	Scott
Bulkeley	Dixon	Kean	Smith, Mich.
Burkett	du Pont	Lodge	Smoot
Burnham	Elkins	McCumber	Stephenson
Burrows	Flint	Nixon	Sutherland
Carter	Frye	Oliver	Warner
Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Page	Warren
Crane	Guggenheim	Penrose	Wetmore

NAYS—37.

Bacon	Crawford	*Hughes*	*Simmons*
Bailey	*Culberson*	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Smith, Md.*
Bankhead	Cummins	La Follette	*Smith, S. C.*
Beveridge	*Daniel*	*McLaurin*	*Stone*
Bristow	Dolliver	*Money*	*Taliaferro*
Brown	*Fletcher*	Nelson	*Taylor*
Burton	*Foster*	*Overman*	*Tillman*
Chamberlain	*Frazier*	*Owen*	
Clapp	Gamble	*Paynter*	
Clay	*Gore*	*Rayner*	

NOT VOTING—10.

Bourne	Curtis	*Martin*	*Shively*
Bradley	*Davis*	*Newlands*	
Clarke, Ark.	*McEnery*	Richardson	

So the amendment was agreed to.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

To paragraph 194, imposing a duty of 30 per cent on linotype and all typesetting machines, Mr. Paynter, of Kentucky, proposed to reduce the said proposed duty by adding to said paragraph the following proviso:

Provided, On linotype and all typesetting machines, 10 per cent ad valorem.

On the question of the adoption of the proposed amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2270, May 19):

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—35.

Bacon	*Culberson*	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Rayner*
Bailey	Cummins	La Follette	*Simmons*
Borah	*Daniel*	*McLaurin*	*Smith, Md.*
Bristow	Dolliver	*Martin*	*Smith, S. C.*
Brown	*Fletcher*	Nelson	*Stone*
Burkett	*Foster*	*Newlands*	*Taliaferro*
Chamberlain	*Frazier*	*Overman*	*Taylor*
Clapp	*Gore*	*Owen*	*Tillman*
Clay	*Hughes*	*Paynter*	

NAYS—43.

Aldrich	Curtis	Hale	Perkins
Brandegee	Dick	Heyburn	Piles
Briggs	Dillingham	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Bulkeley	Dixon	Jones	Scott
Burnham	du Pont	Kean	Smith, Mich.
Burrows	Elkins	Lodge	Smoot
Burton	Flint	McCumber	Stephenson
Carter	Frye	Nixon	Sutherland
Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Oliver	Warner
Crane	Gamble	Page	Wetmore
Cullom	Guggenheim	Penrose	

NOT VOTING—13.

Bankhead	*Clarke, Ark.*	*McEnery*	Warren
Beveridge	Crawford	*Money*	
Bourne	*Davis*	Richardson	
Bradley	Depew	*Shively*	

So Mr. Paynter's amendment was rejected.

To the same paragraph 194 Mr. McLaurin, of Mississippi, offered an amendment to strike out the words "printing presses, sewing machines, and typewriters," and to add at the end of the paragraph the following:

Notwithstanding anything in this bill contained, printing presses, sewing machines, and typewriters, when imported into this country, shall be exempt from the payment of duty.

Upon the question of the adoption of this proposed amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2274, May 19):

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 53, as follows:

YEAS—23.

Bacon	*Gore*	*Money*	*Smith, Md.*
Bailey	*Hughes*	*Newlands*	*Smith, S. C.*
Chamberlain	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Overman*	*Taliaferro*
Culberson	La Follette	*Paynter*	*Taylor*
Fletcher	*McLaurin*	*Rayner*	*Tillman*
Frazier	*Martin*	*Simmons*	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—53.

Aldrich	*Clay*	Gallinger	Perkins
Beveridge	Crane	Gamble	Piles
Borah	Crawford	Guggenheim	Root
Brandegee	Cullom	Hale	Scott
Briggs	Cummins	Heyburn	Smith, Mich.
Bristow	Curtis	Johnson, N. Dak.	Smoot
Brown	Dick	Jones	Stephenson
Bulkeley	Dillingham	Kean	Sutherland
Burkett	Dixon	Lodge	Warner
Burnham	Dolliver	Nelson	Warren
Burrows	du Pont	Nixon	Wetmore
Burton	Elkins	Oliver	
Carter	Flint	Page	
Clapp	Frye	Penrose	

NOT VOTING—15.

Bankhead	*Clarke, Ark.*	*Foster*	Richardson
Bourne	*Daniel*	McCumber	*Shively*
Bradley	*Davis*	*McEnery*	*Stone*
Clark, Wyo.	Depew	*Owen*	

So Mr. McLaurin's amendment was rejected.

To the said paragraph 194 Mr. Newlands proposed an amendment to reduce the duty on linotype and all typesetting machines, machine tools, printing presses, sewing machines, typewriters, and all steam engines, *by striking out "30 per cent ad valorem" and inserting "20 per cent ad valorem" in lieu thereof.*

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment to thus strike out and insert the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2286, May 19):

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—29.

Bacon	Cummins	La Follette	*Smith, Md.*
Bailey	*Daniel*	*McLaurin*	*Smith, S. C.*
Beveridge	Dolliver	*Money*	*Stone*
Bristow	*Fletcher*	Nelson	*Taylor*
Brown	*Frazier*	*Newlands*	*Tillman*
Chamberlain	*Gore*	*Overman*	
Clapp	*Hughes*	*Rayner*	
Clay	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Simmons*	

NAYS—43.

Aldrich	Crane	Gallinger	Penrose
Borah	Crawford	Gamble	Perkins
Brandegee	Cullom	Hale	Piles
Briggs	Curtis	Heyburn	Root
Bulkeley	Dick	Johnson, N. Dak.	Smoot.
Burkett	Dillingham	Jones	Stephenson
Burnham	Dixon	Kean	Sutherland
Burrows	du Pont	Lodge	Warner
Burton	Elkins	Nixon	Warren
Carter	Flint	Oliver	Wetmore
Clark, Wyo.	Frye	Page	

NOT VOTING—19.

Bankhead	*Davis*	*McEnery*	Scott
Bourne	Depew	*Martin*	*Shively*
Bradley	*Foster*	*Owen*	Smith, Mich.
Clarke, Ark.	Guggenheim	*Paynter*	*Taliaferro*
Culberson	McCumber	Richardson	

So Mr. Newlands's amendment was rejected.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

To paragraph 195, proposing a duty of 45 per cent ad valorem on—

195. Articles or wares not specially provided for in *this section*, composed wholly or in part of iron, steel, lead, copper, nickel, pewter, zinc, gold, silver, platinum, aluminum, or other metal, and whether partly or wholly manufactured.

Mr. Dolliver, to *strike out the words "in part," and insert the words "in chief value" in lieu thereof.* Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment to thus strike out and insert the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2288, May 19):

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 40, as follows:

YEAS—30.

Bacon	*Clay*	*Hughes*	*Simmons*
Bailey	Crawford	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Smith, Md.*
Beveridge	Cummins	La Follette	*Smith, S. C.*
Bristow	*Daniel*	*McLaurin*	*Stone*
Brown	Dolliver	Nelson	*Taylor*
Burkett	*Fletcher*	*Newlands*	*Tillman*
Chamberlain	*Frazier*	*Overman*	
Clapp	*Gore*	*Rayner*	

NAYS—40.

Aldrich	Crane	Gallinger	Page
Borah	Cullom	Gamble	Penrose
Brandegee	Curtis	Hale	Perkins
Briggs	Dick	Heyburn	Piles
Bulkeley	Dillingham	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Burnham	Dixon	Jones	Smoot
Burrows	du Pont	Kean	Stephenson
Burton	Elkins	Lodge	Sutherland
Carter	Flint	Nixon	Warner
Clark, Wyo.	Frye	Oliver	Wetmore

NOT VOTING—21.

Bankhead	Depew	*Money*	Smith, Mich.
Bourne	*Foster*	*Owen*	*Taliaferro*
Bradley	Guggenheim	*Paynter*	Warren
Clarke, Ark.	McCumber	Richardson	
Culberson	*McEnery*	Scott	
Davis	*Martin*	*Shively*	

So Mr. Dolliver's amendment was rejected.

To paragraph 21 of the bill imposing a duty of one-half of 1 cent per pound on extracts of quebacho (for tanning), Mr. La Follette offered an amendment *reducing the proposed duty to one-fourth of 1 cent per pound.*

Upon the question of the adoption of this proposed amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2305, May 20):

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 38, as follows:

YEAS—29.

Bacon	*Chamberlain*	Gamble	*Rayner*
Bailey	Clapp	*Gore*	Smith Mich
Bankhead	*Clay*	*Hughes*	*Smith, S. C.*
Beveridge	*Culberson*	La Follette	Stephenson
Borah	Cummins	McCumber	*Tillman*
Bristow	Dolliver	*McLaurin*	
Brown	*Fletcher*	Nelson	
Burkett	*Frazier*	*Paynter*	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—38.

Aldrich	Depew	Hale	Penrose
Bourne	Dick	Heyburn	Piles
Brandegee	Dixon	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Bulkeley	du Pont	Jones	*Simmons*
Burnham	Elkins	Kean	*Smith, Md.*
Burrows	Flint	Lodge	Smoot
Burton	*Foster*	*Martin*	Warner
Crane	Frye	Nixon	Wetmore
Cullom	Gallinger	Oliver	
Daniel	Guggenheim	Page	

NOT VOTING—24.

Bradley	Curtis	*Newlands*	*Shively*
Briggs	*Davis*	*Overman*	*Stone*
Carter	Dillingham	*Owen*	Sutherland
Clark, Wyo.	*Johnston, Ala.*	Perkins	*Taliaferro*
Clarke, Ark.	*McEnery*	Richardson	*Taylor*
Crawford	*Money*	Scott	Warren

So Mr. La Follette's amendment was rejected.

To paragraph 51 of the bill as it came from the House, imposing a duty of 2⅜ cents per pound upon white lead, and white pigment containing lead, dried or in pulp, or ground or mixed with oil, the Finance Committee of the Senate offered an amendment *to increase the duty from two and three-eighths cents per pound to two and three-fourths cents per pound.*

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment thus proposed by the Finance Committee the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2322, May 20):

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 32, as follows:

YEAS—41.

Aldrich	Depew	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Borah	Dick	Jones	Scott
Bourne	Dillingham	Kean	Smith, Mich.
Brandegee	Dixon	Lodge	Smoot
Bulkeley	du Pont	McCumber	Stephenson
Burrows	Elkins	*McEnery*	Warner
Burton	Frye	Nixon	Warren
Carter	Gallinger	Oliver	Wetmore
Clark, Wyo.	Guggenheim	Page	
Crane	Hale	Penrose	
Cullom	Heyburn	Piles	

NAYS—32.

Bacon	Clapp	*Frazier*	Nelson
Bailey	*Clay*	Gamble	*Newlands*
Bankhead	Crawford	*Gore*	*Paynter*
Beveridge	Cummins	*Hughes*	*Rayner*
Bristow	*Daniel*	La Follette	*Simmons*
Brown	Dolliver	*McLaurin*	*Stone*
Burkett	*Fletcher*	*Martin*	*Taliaferro*
Chamberlain	*Foster*	*Money*	*Tillman*

NOT VOTING—18.

Bradley	Curtis	*Owen*	*Smith, S. C.*
Briggs	*Davis*	Perkins	Sutherland
Burnham	Flint	Richardson	*Taylor*
Clarke, Ark.	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Shively*	
Culberson	*Overman*	*Smith, Md.*	

So the amendment of the committee was agreed to.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

To paragraph 58 of the bill, imposing a duty of 1½ cents per pound on bichromate and chromate of potash, the Finance Committee offered an amendment *increasing the duty from one and one-half cents per pound to two and one-fourth cents per pound.*

Upon the question of the adoption of the proposed amendment to thus increase the duty the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2325, May 20):

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 20, as follows:

YEAS—40.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Penrose
Beveridge	Crane	Gamble	Piles
Bourne	Cullom	Guggenheim	Root
Brandegee	Depew	Hale	Scott
Brown	Dick	Heyburn	Smith, Mich.
Bulkeley	Dillingham	Johnson, N. Dak.	Smoot
Burkett	Dixon	Kean	Stephenson
Burrows	du Pont	Lodge	Warner
Burton	Elkins	Nixon	Warren
Carter	Frye	Page	Wetmore

NAYS—20.

Bacon	Cummins	Jones	*Newlands*
Bailey	Dolliver	La Follette	*Paynter*
Bristow	*Fletcher*	*McLaurin*	*Rayner*
Clay	*Gore*	*Martin*	*Stone*
Crawford	*Hughes*	Nelson	*Taliaferro*

NOT VOTING—31.

Bankhead	*Culberson*	McCumber	*Shively*
Borah	Curtis	*McEnery*	*Simmons*
Bradley	*Daniel*	*Money*	*Smith, Md.*
Briggs	*Davis*	Oliver	*Smith, S. C.*
Burnham	Flint	*Overman*	Sutherland
Chamberlain	*Foster*	*Owen*	*Taylor*
Clapp	*Frazier*	Perkins	*Tillman*
Clarke, Ark.	*Johnston, Ala.*	Richardson	

So the amendment of the committee was agreed to.

Paragraph 94 of the bill contained the following provision:

Carbons for electric lighting, 35 per cent ad valorem.

The chairman of the Finance Committee, Mr. Aldrich, proposed to insert the following in lieu thereof:

Carbons, for electric lighting, made entirely from petroleum coke, 35 cents per hundred feet; if composed chiefly of lampblack or retort carbon, 65 cents per hundred feet.

The specific duty proposed in this amendment was, as stated in the debate, the ad valorem equivalent of 45 per cent increase over the existing rate.

Upon the question of the adoption of this amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2350, May 21):

YEAS—43.

Aldrich	Cullom	Guggenheim	Penrose
Bourne	Depew	Hale	Root
Brandegee	Dick	Heyburn	Scott
Briggs	Dillingham	Johnson, N. Dak.	Smith, Mich.
Bulkeley	Dixon	Jones	Smoot
Burnham	du Pont	Kean	Stephenson
Burrows	Elkins	Lodge	Sutherland
Burton	Flint	McCumber	Warner
Carter	Frye	Nixon	Warren
Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Oliver	Wetmore
Crane	Gamble	Page	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—36.

Bacon	*Clay*	*Gore*	*Owen*
Bailey	Crawford	*Hughes*	*Paynter*
Bankhead	Cummins	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Rayner*
Beveridge	Curtis	La Follette	*Simmons*
Bristow	*Daniel*	*McLaurin*	*Smith, Md.*
Brown	Dolliver	*Martin*	*Stone*
Burkett	*Fletcher*	*Money*	*Taliaferro*
Chamberlain	*Foster*	Nelson	*Taylor*
Clapp	*Frazier*	*Newlands*	*Tillman*

NOT VOTING—12.

Borah	*Culberson*	*Overman*	Richardson
Bradley	*Davis*	Perkins	*Shively*
Clarke, Ark.	*McEnery*	Piles	*Smith, S. C.*

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

May 24, the Senate having under consideration the lumber schedule of the bill, Mr. Johnston, of Alabama, proposed the following amendment:

Nothing contained in this act shall prevent the admission free of duty of the following articles: Lumber of all kinds, laths, shingles, doors, and door locks and hinges, window frames, window sashes, bricks, lime, cement, slate roofing, nails, carpenters' tools, common window glass not exceeding 16 by 24 inches, tin plate for roofs, linseed oil, and white lead

Upon the question of the proposed amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2435, May 24):

The result was announced—yeas 13, nays 64, as follows:

YEAS—13.

Bacon	*Frazier*	*Overman*	*Tillman*
Bankhead	*Gore*	*Paynter*	
Clay	*Hughes*	*Rayner*	
Culberson	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Taylor*	

NAYS—64.

Aldrich	Crane	Frye	Nixon
Beveridge	Crawford	Gallinger	Oliver
Borah	Cullom	Gamble	Page
Bradley	Cummins	Guggenheim	Penrose
Brandegee	Curtis	Hale	Perkins
Briggs	*Daniel*	Heyburn	Piles
Bristow	Depew	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Brown	Dick	Jones	Scott
Burkett	Dillingham	Kean	*Shively*
Burnham	Dixon	La Follette	*Simmons*
Burrows	Dolliver	Lodge	*Smith, Md.*
Burton	du Pont	McCumber	Smoot
Carter	Elkins	*McEnery*	Stephenson
Chamberlain	*Fletcher*	*Martin*	Sutherland
Clapp	Flint	*Money*	Warner
Clark, Wyo.	*Foster*	Nelson	Wetmore

NOT VOTING—14.

Bailey	*Davis*	Richardson	*Taliaferro*
Bourne	*McLaurin*	Smith, Mich.	Warren
Bulkeley	*Newlands*	*Smith, S. C.*	
Clarke, Ark.	*Owen*	*Stone*	

So the amendment of Mr. Johnston, of Alabama, to the amendment was rejected.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

To the same schedule, on May 24, Mr. McCumber proposed the following amendment:

Sawed lumber, not specially provided for in this section, $1 per 1,000 feet board measure; but when lumber of any sort is planed or finished, in addition to the rates herein provided there shall be levied and paid for each side so planed or finished, 50 cents per 1,000 feet board measure; and if planed on one side and tongued and grooved, $1 per 1,000 feet board measure; and if planed on two sides and tongued and grooved, $1.50 per 1,000 feet board measure; and in estimating board measure under this schedule no deduction shall be made on board measure on account of planing, tonguing, and grooving.

Upon the question of the adoption of the proposed amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2435, May 24):

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 56, as follows:

YEAS—25.

Beveridge	Crawford	*Gore*	*Paynter*
Bristow	*Culberson*	*Hughes*	*Rayner*
Brown	Cummins	Johnson, N. Dak.	*Shively*
Burkett	Curtis	La Follette	*Stone*
Burton	du Pont	McCumber	
Clapp	*Frazier*	Nelson	
Clay	Gamble	*Newlands*	

NAYS—56.

Aldrich	Cullom	Hale	Perkins
Bacon	*Daniel*	Heyburn	Piles
Bailey	Depew	*Johnston, Ala.*	Root
Bankhead	Dick	Jones	Scott
Borah	Dillingham	Kean	*Simmons*
Bradley	Dixon	Lodge	*Smith, Md.*
Brandegee	Dolliver	*McEnery*	Smoot
Briggs	Elkins	*Martin*	Stephenson
Burnham	*Fletcher*	*Money*	Sutherland
Burrows	Flint	Nixon	*Taliaferro*
Carter	*Foster*	Oliver	*Taylor*
Chamberlain	Frye	*Overman*	*Tillman*
Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Page	Warner
Crane	Guggenheim	Penrose	Wetmore

NOT VOTING—10.

Bourne	*Davis*	Richardson	Warren
Bulkeley	*McLaurin*	Smith, Mich.	
Clarke, Ark.	*Owen*	*Smith, S. C.*	

So Mr. McCumber's amendment was rejected.

May 27, the Senate having under consideration the sugar schedule, Mr. Bristow offered an amendment to paragraph 213 of the bill *striking out the words "not above No. 16 Dutch standard in color"* and also the words *"and on sugar above No. 16 Dutch standard in color."*

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2504, May 27):

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 47, as follows:

YEAS—36.

Bacon	Crawford	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Paynter*
Bailey	*Culberson*	Jones	*Rayner*
Bankhead	Cummins	La Follette	*Shively*
Beveridge	*Daniel*	*Martin*	*Simmons*
Bristow	Dolliver	*Money*	*Smith, Md.*
Brown	*Fletcher*	Nelson	*Smith, S. C.*
Chamberlain	*Frazier*	*Newlands*	*Taliaferro*
Clapp	*Gore*	*Overman*	*Taylor*
Clay	Johnson, N. Dak.	*Owen*	*Tillman*

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—47.

Aldrich	Crane	Gallinger	Penrose
Borah	Cullom	Gamble	Perkins
Bourne	Curtis	Guggenheim	Piles
Bradley	Depew	Hale	Root
Brandegee	Dick	Heyburn	Scott
Briggs	Dillingham	Kean	Smoot
Bulkeley	Dixon	Lodge	Stephenson
Burkett	du Pont	McCumber	Sutherland
Burnham	Elkins	*McEnery*	Warner
Burrows	Flint	Nixon	Warren
Burton	*Foster*	Oliver	Wetmore
Carter	Frye	Page	

NOT VOTING—8.

Clark, Wyo.	*Davis*	*McLaurin*	Smith, Mich.
Clarke, Ark.	*Hughes*	Richardson	*Stone*

So Mr. Bristow's amendment was rejected.

Thereupon Mr. Bristow proposed an amendment to paragraph 213 to lower the duty on sugar by *striking out the word "ninety" and inserting "eighty-two and one-half"* in lieu thereof, so that the paragraph if amended would read *"one cent and eighty-two and one-half one-hundredths of one cent per pound."*

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2505, May 27):

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 53, as follows:

YEAS—32.

Bacon	Crawford	*Martin*	*Shively*
Bailey	*Culberson*	*Money*	*Simmons*
Bankhead	*Daniel*	Nelson	*Smith, Md.*
Beveridge	*Fletcher*	*Newlands*	*Smith, S. C.*
Bristow	*Frazier*	*Overman*	*Stone*
Chamberlain	*Gore*	*Owen*	*Taliaferro*
Clapp	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Paynter*	*Taylor*
Clay	La Follette	*Rayner*	*Tillman*

NAYS—53.

Aldrich	Crane	Gallinger	Penrose
Borah	Cullom	Gamble	Perkins
Bourne	Cummins	Guggenheim	Piles
Bradley	Curtis	Hale	Root
Brandegee	Depew	Heyburn	Scott
Briggs	Dick	*Hughes*	Smoot
Brown	Dillingham	Johnson, N. Dak.	Stephenson
Bulkeley	Dixon	Jones	Sutherland
Burkett	Dolliver	Kean	Warner
Burnham	du Pont	Lodge	Warren
Burrows	Elkins	McCumber	Wetmore
Burton	Flint	*McEnery*	
Carter	*Foster*	Oliver	
Clark, Wyo.	Frye	Page	

NOT VOTING—6.

Clarke, Ark.	*McLaurin*	Richardson	Smith, Mich.
Davis	Nixon		

So Mr. Bristow's amendment was rejected.

May 27, the Senate having under consideration the amendment proposed by Mr. Bailey, imposing a general income tax, Mr. Aldrich moved to postpone the consideration of the amendment until June 10.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Upon the question of agreeing to that motion the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2519, May 27):

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 33, as follows:

YEAS—50.

Aldrich	Crane	Gamble	Penrose
Beveridge	Crawford	Guggenheim	Perkins
Bradley	Cullom	Hale	Piles
Brandegee	Curtis	Heyburn	Root
Briggs	Depew	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Brown	Dick	Jones	Smoot
Bulkeley	Dillingham	Kean	Stephenson
Burkett	Dixon	Lodge	Sutherland
Burnham	du Pont	McCumber	Warner
Burrows	Elkins	*McEnery*	Warren
Burton	Flint	Nelson	Wetmore
Carter	Frye	Oliver	
Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Page	

NAYS—33.

Bacon	Cummins	La Follette	*Smith, Md.*
Bailey	*Daniel*	*Money*	*Smith, S. C.*
Bankhead	Dolliver	*Newlands*	*Stone*
Borah	*Fletcher*	*Overman*	*Taliaferro*
Bristow	*Foster*	*Owen*	*Taylor*
Chamberlain	*Frazier*	*Paynter*	*Tillman*
Clapp	*Gore*	*Rayner*	
Clay	*Hughes*	*Shively*	
Culberson	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Simmons*	

NOT VOTING—8.

Bourne	*Davis*	*Martin*	Richardson
Clarke, Ark.	*McLaurin*	Nixon	Smith, Mich.

So Mr. Aldrich's motion was agreed to.

Paragraph 227 of the bill imposed a duty on barley of 24 cents per bushel. The Finance Committee offered an amendment *increasing the proposed duty from 24 to 30 cents per bushel.* Upon the question of the adoption of this amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2645, May 29):

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 28, as follows:

YEAS—48.

Aldrich	Clapp	Frye	Nelson
Borah	Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Oliver
Bourne	Crane	Gamble	Page
Brandegee	Crawford	Guggenheim	Penrose
Briggs	Cullom	Hale	Perkins
Bristow	Dick	Heyburn	Piles
Brown	Dillingham	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Bulkeley	Dixon	Jones	Smoot
Burkett	du Pont	Kean	Stephenson
Burnham	Elkins	La Follette	Warner
Burrows	Flint	Lodge	Warren
Carter	*Foster*	McCumber	Wetmore

NAYS—28.

Bacon	*Daniel*	*Johnston, Ala.*	Root
Bankhead	Depew	*Martin*	*Simmons*
Beveridge	Dolliver	*Money*	*Smith, Md.*
Burton	*Fletcher*	*Newlands*	*Smith, S. C.*
Clay	*Frazier*	*Overman*	*Stone*
Culberson	*Gore*	*Paynter*	*Taliaferro*
Cummins	*Hughes*	*Rayner*	*Tillman*

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NOT VOTING—15.

Bailey	Curtis	Nixon	Smith, Mich.
Bradley	*Davis*	*Owen*	Sutherland
Chamberlain	*McEnery*	Richardson	*Taylor*
Clarke, Ark.	*McLaurin*	*Shively*	

So the amendment of the committee was agreed to.

Paragraph 273 of the bill imposed a duty on lemons of 1¼ cents per pound. The Finance Committee proposed an amendment *increasing the duty to one and one-half cents per pound.* Upon the question of the adoption of this amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2670, May 31):

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 28, as follows:

YEAS—44.

Aldrich	Carter	*Foster*	Nixon
Borah	Clark, Wyo.	Frye	Page
Bourne	Crane	Gallinger	Penrose
Bradley	Cullom	Gamble	Perkins
Brandegee	Dick	Hale	Piles
Briggs	Dillingham	Heyburn	Scott
Brown	Dolliver	Johnson, N. Dak.	Smoot
Bulkeley	du Pont	Jones	Sutherland
Burnham	Elkins	Kean	Warner
Burrows	*Fletcher*	Lodge	Warren
Burton	Flint	Nelson	Wetmore

NAYS—28.

Bacon	*Clay*	*Gore*	*Rayner*
Bailey	Crawford	*Hughes*	Root
Bankhead	*Culberson*	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Smith, Md.*
Beveridge	Cummins	La Follette	*Smith, S. C.*
Bristow	Curtis	*Martin*	*Stone*
Burkett	*Daniel*	*Money*	*Taylor*
Clarke, Ark.	*Frazier*	*Overman*	*Tillman*

NOT VOTING—19.

Chamberlain	Guggenheim	Oliver	*Simmons*
Clapp	McCumber	*Owen*	Smith, Mich.
Davis	*McEnery*	*Paynter*	Stephenson
Depew	*McLaurin*	Richardson	*Taliaferro*
Dixon	*Newlands*	*Shively*	

So the amendment of the committee was agreed to.

Paragraph 281 of the bill as it came from the House imposed a duty of 1½ cents per pound upon fresh beef and other fresh meats.

Upon an amendment offered by the Finance Committee, this duty was increased to 2 cents per pound.

Mr. Bacon, of Georgia, moved to reconsider the action of the Senate in adopting this amendment, stating that the purpose of the motion to reconsider was, if such motion prevailed, to offer an amendment *reducing the rate of duty on fresh beef and other fresh meats to a point below the one and one-half cents per pound as found in the bill as it came from the House.*

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Upon the question of agreeing to the motion to reconsider for the purpose stated, the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2688, May 31, 1909):

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 40, as follows:

YEAS—32.

Bacon	*Clay*	Gamble	*Overman*
Bailey	*Culberson*	*Gore*	*Rayner*
Bankhead	Cummins	*Hughes*	*Shively*
Beveridge	*Daniel*	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Simmons*
Bristow	Dolliver	*Martin*	*Smith, Md.*
Brown	*Fletcher*	*Money*	*Smith, S. C.*
Burton	*Frazier*	Nelson	*Taliaferro*
Clarke, Ark.	Gallinger	*Newlands*	*Tillman*

NAYS—40.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Elkins	Penrose
Borah	Crane	Flint	Perkins
Bradley	Crawford	Frye	Piles
Brandegee	Cullom	Hale	Root
Briggs	Curtis	Heyburn	Scott
Bulkeley	Depew	Johnson, N. Dak.	Smoot
Burkett	Dick	Kean	Stephenson
Burnham	Dillingham	Lodge	Warner
Burrows	Dixon	*McEnery*	Warren
Carter	du Pont	Page	Wetmore

NOT VOTING—19.

Bourne	Guggenheim	Nixon	Smith, Mich.
Chamberlain	Jones	Oliver	*Stone*
Clapp	La Follette	*Owen*	Sutherland
Davis	McCumber	*Paynter*	*Taylor*
Foster	*McLaurin*	Richardson	

So the motion to reconsider was rejected.

The cotton schedule being under consideration, the Finance Committee proposed an amendment to paragraph 313 increasing the duty by inserting the following words:

313. Cotton cloth, valued at not over 7 cents per square yard, and bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, and not exceeding 50 threads to the square inch, counting the warp and filling, 1 cent per square yard; if bleached, and valued at not over 9 cents per square yard, one and one-fourth cents per square yard; if dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, and valued at not over 12 cents per square yard, 2 cents per square yard.

Upon the question of the adoption of this amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2837, June 5):

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 30, as follows:

YEAS—41.

Aldrich	Crane	Guggenheim	Perkins
Borah	Cullom	Hale	Piles
Bradley	Curtis	Heyburn	Root
Brandegee	Dick	Johnson, N. Dak.	Smoot
Briggs	Dillingham	Jones	Stephenson
Bulkeley	du Pont	Kean	Sutherland
Burnham	Elkins	Lodge	Warner
Burrows	Flint	McCumber	Wetmore
Burton	*Foster*	*McEnery*	
Carter	Gallinger	Page	
Clark, Wyo.	Gamble	Penrose	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—30.

Bacon	Crawford	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Paynter*
Bailey	*Culberson*	La Follette	*Shively*
Beveridge	Cummins	*Martin*	*Simmons*
Bristow	Dolliver	*Money*	*Smith, Md.*
Brown	*Fletcher*	Nelson	*Stone*
Burkett	*Frazier*	*Newlands*	*Tillman*
Clapp	*Gore*	*Overman*	
Clay	*Hughes*	*Owen*	

NOT VOTING—20.

Bankhead	*Davis*	Nixon	Smith, Mich.
Bourne	Depew	Oliver	*Smith, S. C.*
Chamberlain	Dixon	*Rayner*	*Taliaferro*
Clarke, Ark.	Frye	Richardson	*Taylor*
Daniel	*McLaurin*	Scott	Warren

So the amendment of the committee was agreed to.

The Finance Committee proposed a further amendment to said paragraph 313 increasing the duty by inserting the following words in said paragraph:

Valued at over 7 and not over 9 cents per square yard, 2¼ cents per square yard; valued at over 9 and not over 10 cents per square yard, 3 cents per square yard; valued at over 10 and not over 12½ cents per square yard, 4⅜ cents per square yard; valued at over 12½ and not over 14 cents per square yard, 5½ cents per square yard; valued at over 14 cents per square yard, 7 cents per square yard, but not less than 25 per cent ad valorem.

On the question of the adoption of this amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2844, June 5):

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 28, as follows:

YEAS—39.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Guggenheim	Penrose
Borah	Crane	Hale	Perkins
Bradley	Cullom	Heyburn	Piles
Brandegee	Curtis	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Briggs	Dick	Jones	Smoot
Bulkeley	Dillingham	Kean	Stephenson
Burnham	du Pont	Lodge	Sutherland
Burrows	Elkins	McCumber	Warner
Burton	*Foster*	*McEnery*	Wetmore
Carter	Gallinger	Page	

NAYS—28.

Bacon	Crawford	*Gore*	*Overman*
Bailey	*Culberson*	*Hughes*	*Owen*
Bristow	Cummins	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Paynter*
Brown	Dolliver	La Follette	*Shively*
Burkett	*Fletcher*	*Money*	*Smith, Md.*
Clapp	*Frazier*	Nelson	*Stone*
Clay	Gamble	*Newlands*	*Tillman*

NOT VOTING—24.

Bankhead	*Davis*	*Martin*	*Simmons*
Beveridge	Depew	Nixon	Smith, Mich.
Bourne	Dixon	Oliver	*Smith, S. C.*
Chamberlain	Flint	*Rayner*	*Taliaferro*
Clarke, Ark.	Frye	Richardson	*Taylor*
Daniel	*McLaurin*	Scott	Warren

So the amendment of the committee was agreed to.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

The Finance Committee proposed a further amendment to said paragraph 313 increasing the duty by inserting the following words in said paragraph:

Valued at over 9 and not over 11 cents per square yard, two and three-fourths cents per square yard; valued at over 11 and not over 12 cents per square yard, four and one-quarter cents per square yard; valued at over 12 and not over 15 cents per square yard, five and one-fourth cents per square yard; valued at over 15 and not over 16 cents per square yard, six and one-half cents per square yard; valued at over 16 cents per square yard, 8 cents per square yard, but not less than 25 per cent ad valorem.

On the question of the adoption of this amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2845, June 5):

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 29, as follows:

YEAS—39.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Guggenheim	Penrose
Borah	Crane	Hale	Perkins
Bradley	Cullom	Heyburn	Piles
Brandegee	Curtis	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Briggs	Dick	Jones	Smoot
Bulkeley	Dillingham	Kean	Stephenson
Burnham	du Pont	Lodge	Sutherland
Burrows	Elkins	McCumber	Warner
Burton	*Foster*	*McEnery*	Wetmore
Carter	Gallinger	Page	

NAYS—29.

Bacon	*Culberson*	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Shively*
Bailey	Cummins	La Follette	*Simmons*
Bristow	Dolliver	*Money*	*Smith, Md.*
Brown	*Fletcher*	Nelson	*Stone*
Burkett	*Frazier*	*Newlands*	*Tillman*
Clapp	Gamble	*Overman*	
Clay	*Gore*	*Owen*	
Crawford	*Hughes*	*Paynter*	

NOT VOTING—23.

Bankhead	*Davis*	*Martin*	Smith, Mich.
Beveridge	Depew	Nixon	*Smith, S. C.*
Bourne	Dixon	Oliver	*Taliaferro*
Chamberlain	Flint	*Rayner*	*Taylor*
Clarke, Ark.	Frye	Richardson	Warren
Daniel	*McLaurin*	Scott	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Finance Committee offered similar amendments to paragraphs 314, 315, 316, and 317, involving the same questions. For convenience, the vote was taken on these four paragraphs en bloc, and upon the question of agreeing to the several amendments to the several paragraphs the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2846, June 5):

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 28, as follows:

YEAS—39.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Page
Borah	Crane	Guggenheim	Penrose
Bradley	Cullom	Hale	Perkins
Brandegee	Curtis	Heyburn	Piles
Briggs	Depew	Johnson, N. Dak.	Smoot
Bulkeley	Dick	Jones	Stephenson
Burnham	Dillingham	Kean	Sutherland
Burrows	du Pont	Lodge	Warner
Burton	Elkins	McCumber	Wetmore
Carter	*Foster*	*McEnery*	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—28.

Bacon	Crawford	*Gore*	*Owen*
Bailey	*Culberson*	*Hughes*	*Paynter*
Bristow	Cummins	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Shively*
Brown	Dolliver	La Follette	*Simmons*
Burkett	*Fletcher*	Nelson	*Smith, Md.*
Clapp	*Frazier*	*Newlands*	*Stone*
Clay	Gamble	*Overman*	*Tillman*

NOT VOTING—24.

Bankhead	*Davis*	*Money*	Scott
Beveridge	Dixon	Nixon	Smith, Mich.
Bourne	Flint	Oliver	*Smith, S. C.*
Chamberlain	Frye	*Rayner*	*Taliaferro*
Clarke, Ark.	*McLaurin*	Richardson	*Taylor*
Daniel	*Martin*	Root	Warren

So the amendments to paragraphs 314, 315, 316, and 317 were agreed to.

The Finance Committee proposed an amendment to paragraph 319, increasing the duty, by which amendment a duty was imposed upon "cotton window Hollands" of 3 cents per square yard and 20 per cent ad valorem.

Upon the question of the adoption of this amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2874, June 7):

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 26, as follows:

YEAS—41.

Aldrich	Cullom	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Borah	Curtis	Jones	Scott
Bradley	Depew	Kean	Smith, Mich.
Brandegee	Dick	Lodge	Smoot
Briggs	Elkins	McCumber	Stephenson
Burnham	Flint	*McEnery*	Sutherland
Burrows	*Foster*	Oliver	Warner
Burton	Gallinger	Page	Wetmore
Carter	Guggenheim	Penrose	
Clark, Wyo.	Hale	Perkins	
Crane	Heyburn	Piles	

NAYS—26.

Bacon	*Culberson*	*Hughes*	*Paynter*
Bailey	Cummins	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Simmons*
Beveridge	Dolliver	La Follette	*Stone*
Bristow	*Fletcher*	*McLaurin*	*Taliaferro*
Brown	*Frazier*	Nelson	*Taylor*
Burkett	Gamble	*Newlands*	
Clay	*Gore*	*Overman*	

NOT VOTING—24.

Bankhead	Crawford	Frye	Richardson
Bourne	*Daniel*	*Martin*	*Shively*
Bulkeley	*Davis*	*Money*	*Smith, Md.*
Chamberlain	Dillingham	Nixon	*Smith, S. C.*
Clapp	Dixon	*Owen*	*Tillman*
Clarke, Ark.	du Pont	*Rayner*	Warren

So the amendment of the committee was agreed to.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

The Senate having under consideration paragraph 321, imposing cumulative duties additional to duties otherwise imposed, Mr. Dolliver offered to amend the paragraph *by striking from the same the following words:*

On all cotton cloth mercerized or subjected to any similar process, 1 cent per square yard.

On the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2898, June 7, 1909):

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 38, as follows:

YEAS—32.

Bacon	*Culberson*	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Overman*
Bailey	Cummins	Jones	*Owen*
Beveridge	Dolliver	La Follette	*Paynter*
Bristow	*Fletcher*	*McLaurin*	*Shively*
Brown	*Frazier*	*Martin*	*Simmons*
Burkett	Gamble	*Money*	*Smith, Md.*
Clapp	*Gore*	Nelson	*Stone*
Clay	*Hughes*	*Newlands*	*Taliaferro*

NAYS—38.

Aldrich	Cullom	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Bradley	Curtis	Kean	Scott
Brandegee	Depew	Lodge	Smith, Mich.
Briggs	Dixon	McCumber	Smoot
Burnham	Elkins	*McEnery*	Stephenson
Burrows	Flint	Oliver	Warner
Burton	Gallinger	Page	Warren
Carter	Guggenheim	Penrose	Wetmore
Clark, Wyo.	Hale	Perkins	
Crane	Heyburn	Piles	

NOT VOTING—21.

Bankhead	Crawford	*Foster*	Sutherland
Borah	*Daniel*	Frye	*Taylor*
Bourne	*Davis*	Nixon	*Tillman*
Bulkeley	Dick	*Rayner*	
Chamberlain	Dillingham	Richardson	
Clarke, Ark.	du Pont	*Smith, S. C.*	

So Mr. Dolliver's amendment was rejected.

To paragraph 326 Mr. Lodge offered the following amendment, increasing the duty on cheap cotton gloves:

Cotton gloves, knitted or woven, valued at more than $1.20 and not more than $6 per dozen pairs, 50 cents per dozen pairs and 45 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than $6 per dozen pairs, 55 per cent ad valorem.

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2912, June 7):

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 24, as follows:

YEAS—41.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Guggenheim	Piles
Borah	Crane	Hale	Root
Bradley	Crawford	Heyburn	Smith, Mich.
Brandegee	Depew	Johnson, N. Dak.	Smoot
Briggs	Dick	Kean	Stephenson
Brown	Dixon	Lodge	Warner
Burkett	du Pont	*McEnery*	Warren
Burnham	Elkins	Oliver	Wetmore
Burrows	Flint	Page	
Burton	Gallinger	Penrose	
Carter	Gamble	Perkins	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—24.

Bacon	Cummins	La Follette	*Overman*
Bailey	Dolliver	*McLaurin*	*Paynter*
Bristow	*Fletcher*	*Martin*	*Shively*
Clapp	*Gore*	*Money*	*Simmons*
Clay	*Hughes*	Nelson	*Smith, Md.*
Culberson	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Newlands*	*Stone*

NOT VOTING—26.

Bankhead	Curtis	Jones	*Smith, S. C.*
Beveridge	*Daniel*	McCumber	Sutherland
Bourne	*Davis*	Nixon	*Taliaferro*
Bulkeley	Dillingham	*Owen*	*Taylor*
Chamberlain	*Foster*	*Rayner*	*Tillman*
Clarke, Ark.	*Frazier*	Richardson	
Cullom	Frye	Scott	

So the amendment of the committee was agreed to.

Paragraph 368 in the woolen schedule imposed a duty of 25 cents per pound on top waste and roving waste and 20 cents a pound on slubbing waste, ring waste, and garnetted waste.

The Finance Committee offered an amendment *imposing 30 cents per pound on all the articles enumerated in the paragraph.*

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2967, June 9):

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 30, as follows:

YEAS—40.

Aldrich	Carter	Gamble	Piles
Borah	Clark, Wyo.	Guggenheim	Root
Bourne	Crane	Heyburn	Scott
Bradley	Crawford	Johnson, N. Dak.	Smith, Mich
Brandegee	Cullom	Kean	Smoot
Briggs	Dick	Lodge	Stephenson
Bulkeley	Dixon	McCumber	Sutherland
Burnham	du Pont	Page	Warner
Burrows	Flint	Penrose	Warren
Burton	Gallinger	Perkins	Wetmore

NAYS—30.

Bacon	Cummins	La Follette	*Rayner*
Beveridge	*Davis*	*Martin*	*Simmons*
Bristow	Dolliver	*Money*	*Smith, Md.*
Brown	*Fletcher*	Nelson	*Stone*
Burkett	*Foster*	*Newlands*	*Taliaferro*
Clapp	*Gore*	*Overman*	*Taylor*
Clay	*Hughes*	*Owen*	
Culberson	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Paynter*	

NOT VOTING—21.

Bailey	Depew	Jones	*Shively*
Bankhead	Dillingham	*McEnery*	*Smith, S. C.*
Chamberlain	Elkins	*McLaurin*	*Tillman*
Clarke, Ark.	*Frazier*	Nixon	
Curtis	Frye	Oliver	
Daniel	Hale	Richardson	

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

Paragraph 369 of the House bill was as follows:

Shoddy, 20 cents per pound; noils, wool extract, yarn waste, thread waste, and all other wastes composed wholly or in part of wool and not specially provided for in this section, 18 cents per pound.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

The Senate Finance Committee proposed an amendment *increasing the duty on shoddy to 25 cents per pound and increasing the duty on all other articles enumerated in the paragraph to 20 cents a pound.*

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2972, June 9):

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 31, as follows:

YEAS—42.

Aldrich	Crane	Guggenheim	Root
Borah	Crawford	Heyburn	Scott
Bradley	Cullom	Johnson, N. Dak.	Smith, Mich.
Brandegee	Curtis	Kean	Smoot
Briggs	Dick	Lodge	Stephenson
Bulkeley	Dillingham	McCumber	Sutherland
Burnham	Dixon	*McEnery*	Warner
Burrows	du Pont	Page	Warren
Burton	Flint	Penrose	Wetmore
Carter	Gallinger	Perkins	
Clark, Wyo.	Gamble	Piles	

NAYS—31.

Bacon	Cummins	La Follette	*Paynter*
Beveridge	*Davis*	*McLaurin*	*Rayner*
Bristow	Dolliver	*Martin*	*Simmons*
Brown	*Fletcher*	*Money*	*Smith, Md.*
Burkett	*Foster*	Nelson	*Stone*
Clapp	*Gore*	*Newlands*	*Taliaferro*
Clay	*Hughes*	*Overman*	*Taylor*
Culberson	*Jonhston, Ala.*	*Owen*	

NOT VOTING—18.

Bailey	*Daniel*	Hale	*Shively*
Bankhead	Depew	Jones	*Smith, S. C.*
Bourne	Elkins	Nixon	*Tillman*
Chamberlain	*Frazier*	Oliver	
Clarke, Ark.	Frye	Richardson	

So the amendment of the Committee on Finance was agreed to.

To paragraph 372 Mr. Dolliver offered a substitute reducing the duty, as follows:

372. Wools advanced from a scoured state, known as tops, valued at not more than 40 cents per pound, 30 cents per pound; valued at more than 40 cents per pound, 35 cents per pound; and in addition thereto to all the foregoing, 20 per cent ad valorem.

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2978, June 9):

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 42, as follows:

YEAS—29.

Bacon	*Davis*	*McLaurin*	*Simmons*
Bristow	Dolliver	*Martin*	*Smith, Md.*
Brown	*Fletcher*	*Money*	*Stone*
Burkett	*Foster*	Nelson	*Taliaferro*
Clapp	*Gore*	*Newlands*	*Taylor*
Clay	*Hughes*	*Overman*	
Culberson	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Paynter*	
Cummins	La Follette	*Rayner*	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—42.

Aldrich	Crane	Guggenheim	Root
Borah	Crawford	Heyburn	Scott
Bradley	Cullom	Johnson, N. Dak.	Smith, Mich.
Brandegee	Curtis	Kean	Smoot
Briggs	Dick	Lodge	Stephenson
Bulkeley	Dillingham	McCumber	Sutherland
Burnham	Dixon	*McEnery*	Warner
Burrows	du Pont	Page	Warren
Burton	Flint	Penrose	Wetmore
Carter	Gallinger	Perkins	
Clark, Wyo.	Gamble	Piles	

NOT VOTING—20.

Bailey	*Clarke, Ark.*	Frye	*Owen*
Bankhead	*Daniel*	Hale	Richardson
Beveridge	Depew	Jones	*Shively*
Bourne	Elkins	Nixon	*Smith, S. C.*
Chamberlain	*Frazier*	Oliver	*Tillman*

So Mr. Dolliver's amendment was rejected.

Mr. Dolliver proposed a reduction of the duty by an amendment, to strike out paragraph 373 and in lieu thereof to insert the following:

372. On yarns made wholly or in part of wool, valued at not more than 40 cents per pound, 27½ cents per pound on the wool contained therein; valued at more than 40 cents per pound, 38½ cents per pound on the wool contained therein; and in addition thereto to all the foregoing 35 per cent ad valorem.

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3010, June 10):

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—31.

Bacon	*Culberson*	*Hughes*	*Paynter*
Beveridge	Cummins	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Rayner*
Bristow	*Davis*	La Follette	*Simmons*
Brown	Dolliver	*Martin*	*Smith, Md.*
Burkett	*Fletcher*	*Money*	*Stone*
Chamberlain	*Foster*	Nelson	*Taliaferro*
Clapp	*Frazier*	*Newlands*	*Taylor*
Clay	*Gore*	*Overman*	

NAYS—43.

Aldrich	Crane	Guggenheim	Piles
Borah	Crawford	Heyburn	Root
Bourne	Cullom	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Bradley	Curtis	Kean	Smith, Mich.
Brandegee	Depew	Lodge	Smoot
Briggs	Dick	McCumber	Stephenson
Bulkeley	Dillingham	*McEnery*	Sutherland
Burnham	Dixon	Oliver	Warner
Burrows	Flint	Page	Warren
Burton	Gallinger	Penrose	Wetmore
Clark, Wyo.	Gamble	Perkins	

NOT VOTING—17.

Bailey	du Pont	*McLaurin*	*Smith, S. C.*
Bankhead	Elkins	Nixon	*Tillman*
Carter	Frye	*Owen*	
Clarke, Ark.	Hale	Richardson	
Daniel	Jones	*Shively*	

So Mr. Dolliver's amendment was rejected.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

To paragraph 374 Mr. Dolliver offered the following as a substitute therefor, reducing the duty:

374. Cloths, knit fabrics, women's and children's dress goods, coat linings, Italian cloths, bunting and goods of similar character or description, and all manufactures made wholly or in part of wool, not specially provided for in this section, valued at not more than 40 cents per pound, 33 cents per pound on the wool contained therein; valued above 40 cents per pound, 44 cents per pound on the wool contained therein; and in addition thereto, on all the foregoing, 50 per cent ad valorem: Provided, That all manufactures in part of wool not specially provided for in this schedule, when composed in chief value of a material other than wool, shall be subject to the rate at which the same would be chargeable under this section if composed wholly of the material thereof of chief value, and in addition thereto shall be subject to a duty of 44 cents per pound on the wool contained therein.

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3013, June 10):

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 42, as follows:

YEAS—30.

Bacon	*Culberson*	*Hughes*	*Rayner*
Beveridge	Cummins	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Simmons*
Bristow	*Davis*	La Follette	*Smith, Md.*
Brown	Dolliver	*McLaurin*	*Stone*
Burkett	*Fletcher*	*Martin*	*Taliaferro*
Chamberlain	*Foster*	*Money*	*Taylor*
Clapp	*Frazier*	Nelson	
Clay	*Gore*	*Overman*	

NAYS—42.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Perkins
Borah	Crane	Gamble	Piles
Bourne	Crawford	Heyburn	Root
Bradley	Cullom	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Brandegee	Curtis	Kean	Smoot
Briggs	Depew	Lodge	Stephenson
Bulkeley	Dick	McCumber	Sutherland
Burnham	Dillingham	*McEnery*	Warner
Burrows	Dixon	Oliver	Warren
Burton	du Pont	Page	
Carter	Flint	Penrose	

NOT VOTING—19.

Bailey	Frye	Nixon	Smith, Mich.
Bankhead	Guggenheim	*Owen*	*Smith, S. C.*
Clarke, Ark.	Hale	*Paynter*	*Tillman*
Daniel	Jones	Richardson	Wetmore
Elkins	*Newlands*	*Shively*	

So Mr. Dolliver's amendment was rejected.

To paragraph 374 Mr. Dolliver offered the following as a substitute therefor, reducing the duty:

374. Woolen or worsted cloths, woolen or worsted shawls, and all manufactures of every description made wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the goat, alpaca, or other animals not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, valued at not exceeding 40 cents per pound, 35 cents per pound and in addition thereto 35 per cent ad valorem; valued at above 40 cents per pound and not exceeding 60 cents per pound, 35 cents per pound and 40 per cent ad valorem; valued above 60 cents per pound, 45 cents per pound and in addition thereto 40 per cent ad valorem.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3014, June 10):

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—30.

Bacon	Cummins	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Rayner*
Beveridge	*Davis*	La Follette	*Simmons*
Bristow	Dolliver	*Martin*	*Smith, Md.*
Brown	*Fletcher*	*Money*	*Stone*
Burkett	*Foster*	Nelson	*Taliaferro*
Chamberlain	*Frazier*	*Newlands*	*Taylor*
Clapp	*Gore*	*Overman*	
Clay	*Hughes*	*Paynter*	

NAYS—43.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Gamble	Penrose
Borah	Crane	Guggenheim	Perkins
Bourne	Crawford	Heyburn	Piles
Bradley	Cullom	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Brandegee	Curtis	Kean	Scott
Briggs	Depew	Lodge	Smoot
Bulkeley	Dick	McCumber	Stephenson
Burnham	Dillingham	*McEnery*	Sutherland
Burrows	Dixon	Nixon	Warner
Burton	du Pont	Oliver	Warren
Carter	Gallinger	Page	

NOT VOTING—18.

Bailey	Elkins	*McLaurin*	*Smith, S. C.*
Bankhead	Flint	*Owen*	*Tillman*
Clarke, Ark.	Frye	Richardson	Wetmore
Culberson	Hale	*Shively*	
Daniel	Jones	Smith, Mich.	

So Mr. Dolliver's amendment was rejected.

To paragraph 375 Mr. Dolliver offered the following as a substitute therefor, reducing the duty:

375. Blankets and flannels for underwear, composed wholly or in part of wool, valued at not more than 40 cents per pound, 22 cents per pound on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 30 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than 40 cents and not more than 50 cents per pound, 33 cents per pound on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 35 per cent ad valorem. Blankets composed wholly or in part of wool, valued at more than 50 cents per pound, 33 cents per pound on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 40 per cent ad valorem. Flannels composed wholly or in part of wool, valued at above 50 cents per pound, shall be classified and pay the same duties as women's and children's dress goods.

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3014, June 10):

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—31.

Bacon	Cummins	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Owen*
Beveridge	*Davis*	La Follette	*Paynter*
Bristow	Dolliver	*McLaurin*	*Rayner*
Brown	*Fletcher*	*Martin*	*Simmons*
Burkett	*Foster*	*Money*	*Smith, Md.*
Chamberlain	*Frazier*	Nelson	*Taliaferro*
Clapp	*Gore*	*Newlands*	*Taylor*
Clay	*Hughes*	*Overman*	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—43.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Gamble	Perkins
Borah	Crane	Guggenheim	Piles
Bourne	Crawford	Heyburn	Root
Bradley	Cullom	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Brandegee	Curtis	Kean	Smith, Mich.
Briggs	Depew	Lodge	Smoot
Bulkeley	Dick	McCumber	Stephenson
Burnham	Dillingham	*McEnery*	Sutherland
Burrows	Dixon	Oliver	Warner
Burton	du Pont	Page	Warren
Carter	Gallinger	Penrose	

NOT VOTING—17.

Bailey	Elkins	Nixon	*Tillman*
Bankhead	Flint	Richardson	Wetmore
Clarke, Ark.	Frye	*Shively*	
Culberson	Hale	*Smith, S. C.*	
Daniel	Jones	*Stone*	

So Mr. Dolliver's amendment was rejected.

Thereupon Mr. Dolliver offered an additional amendment to paragraph 375 as a substitute therefor, reducing the duty, as follows:

375. Flannels, blankets, and hats, composed wholly or in part of wool, the hair of the goat, alpaca, or other animals, valued at not exceeding 30 cents per pound, 10 cents per pound; valued at above 30 cents per pound and not exceeding 40 cents per pound, 12 cents per pound; valued at above 40 cents per pound and not exceeding 60 cents per pound, 18 cents per pound; and in addition thereto, upon all the above-named articles, 35 per cent ad valorem; valued at above 60 cents per pound, 45 cents per pound, and in addition thereto 40 per cent ad valorem.

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3015, June 10):

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—29.

Bacon	*Clay*	La Follette	*Rayner*
Bankhead	Cummins	*McLaurin*	*Simmons*
Beveridge	*Davis*	*Martin*	*Smith, Md.*
Bristow	Dolliver	Nelson	*Taliaferro*
Brown	*Frazier*	*Newlands*	*Taylor*
Burkett	*Gore*	*Overman*	
Chamberlain	*Hughes*	*Owen*	
Clapp	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Paynter*	

NAYS—43.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Gamble	Perkins
Borah	Crane	Guggenheim	Piles
Bourne	Crawford	Heyburn	Root
Bradley	Cullom	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Brandegee	Curtis	Kean	Smith, Mich.
Briggs	Depew	Lodge	Smoot
Bulkeley	Dick	*McEnery*	Stephenson
Burnham	Dillingham	Nixon	Sutherland
Burrows	du Pont	Oliver	Warner
Burton	Flint	Page	Warren
Carter	Gallinger	Penrose	

NOT VOTING—19.

Bailey	Elkins	Jones	*Smith, S. C.*
Clarke, Ark.	*Fletcher*	McCumber	*Stone*
Culberson	*Foster*	*Money*	*Tillman*
Daniel	Frye	Richardson	Wetmore
Dixon	Hale	*Shively*	

So Mr. Dolliver's amendment was rejected.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

To paragraph 376 Mr. Dolliver offered the following as a substitute therefor, reducing the duty:

376. Women's and children's dress goods, coat linings, Italian cloths, and goods of similar character or description, of which the warp consists wholly of cotton or other vegetable fiber, and the remainder of the fabric composed wholly or in part of wool, valued at not more than 20 cents per square yard, 11 cents per square yard and 25 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than 20 cents per square yard, 11 cents per square yard and 35 per cent ad valorem: Provided, That on all the foregoing weighing over 4 ounces per square yard the duty shall be the same as is imposed by this schedule on cloths.

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3022, June 10, 1909):

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 41, as follows:

YEAS—30.

Bacon	*Clay*	*Hughes*	*Overman*
Bankhead	*Culberson*	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Owen*
Beveridge	Cummins	La Follette	*Paynter*
Bristow	*Davis*	*McLaurin*	*Rayner*
Brown	Dolliver	*Martin*	*Taliaferro*
Burkett	*Fletcher*	*Money*	*Taylor*
Chamberlain	*Foster*	Nelson	
Clapp	*Gore*	*Newlands*	

NAYS—41.

Aldrich	Crawford	Guggenheim	Perkins
Bradley	Cullom	Heyburn	Root
Brandegee	Curtis	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Briggs	Depew	Jones	Smith, Mich.
Bulkeley	Dick	Kean	Smoot
Burnham	Dillingham	Lodge	Stephenson
Burrows	Dixon	McCumber	Sutherland
Burton	du Pont	Nixon	Warner
Carter	Flint	Oliver	
Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Page	
Crane	Gamble	Penrose	

NOT VOTING—20.

Bailey	Elkins	Piles	*Smith, S. C.*
Borah	*Frazier*	Richardson	*Stone*
Bourne	Frye	*Shively*	*Tillman*
Clarke, Ark.	Hale	*Simmons*	Warren
Daniel	*McEnery*	*Smith, Md.*	Wetmore

So Mr. Dolliver's amendment was rejected.

To paragraph 379 Mr. Dolliver offered the following as a substitute therefor, reducing the duty:

379. Webbings, gorings, bandings, beltings, bindings, braids, galloons, edgings, insertings, flouncings, fringes, gimps, cords, cords and tassels, ribbons, ornaments, laces, trimmings, and articles made wholly or in part of lace, embroideries and all articles embroidered by hand or machinery, head nets, nettings, buttons or barrel buttons or buttons of other forms for tassels or ornaments, and manufactures of wool ornamented with beads or spangles of whatever material composed, any of the foregoing made of wool or of which wool is a component material, whether containing india rubber or not, 50 cents per pound on the wool contained therein and in addition thereto 60 per cent ad valorem: Provided, That if the duties upon any article held to be dutiable under Schedule K of this section shall exceed 100 per cent ad valorem, duty shall be assessed thereon at 100 per cent ad valorem.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3032, June 10):

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—32.

Bacon	*Culberson*	*Hughes*	*Owen*
Bankhead	Cummins	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Paynter*
Beveridge	*Davis*	La Follette	*Rayner*
Bristow	Dolliver	*McLaurin*	*Simmons*
Brown	*Fletcher*	*Martin*	*Smith, Md.*
Burkett	*Foster*	Nelson	*Stone*
Chamberlain	*Frazier*	*Newlands*	*Taliaferro*
Clapp	*Gore*	*Overman*	*Taylor*

NAYS—43.

Aldrich	Crane	Gamble	Penrose
Borah	Crawford	Guggenheim	Perkins
Bradley	Cullom	Heyburn	Root
Brandegee	Curtis	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Briggs	Depew	Jones	Smith, Mich.
Bulkeley	Dick	Kean	Smoot
Burnham	Dillingham	McCumber	Stephenson
Burrows	Dixon	*McEnery*	Sutherland
Burton	du Pont	Nixon	Warner
Carter	Flint	Oliver	Warren
Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Page	

NOT VOTING—16.

Bailey	*Daniel*	Lodge	*Shively*
Bourne	Elkins	*Money*	*Smith, S. C.*
Clarke, Ark.	Frye	Piles	*Tillman*
Clay	Hale	Richardson	Wetmore

So Mr. Dolliver's amendment was rejected.

To the woolen schedule Mr. Dolliver offered an amendment, to be known as 391¾, reducing the duty, as follows:

Page 135, after line 12, insert the following:

"391¾. All invoices of manufactured or partly manufactured articles subject to duty under this schedule shall specify separately the quantity of wool contained in every such article, and duty shall not be assessed upon a less quantity of wool than so stated in the invoice, and any such article concerning which the invoice does not specify the quantity of wool shall be assessed as if composed wholly of wool. This schedule shall take effect ninety days after the passage of this act, and until that time Schedule K of the act approved July 24, 1897, entitled 'An act to provide revenue for the Government and to encourage the industries of the United States,' shall remain in full force and effect."

Provided, That in no event shall the duty on any of the foregoing articles in paragraphs 368, 369, or 370 exceed 60 per cent ad valorem.

Provided, That in no case shall the duty upon wools, wool wastes, noils, or any of the foregoing articles in the previous paragraphs of this schedule exceed 60 per cent ad valorem.

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3039, June 10, 1909):

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 39, as follows:

YEAS—27.

Bacon	*Chamberlain*	*Foster*	Nelson
Bailey	Clapp	*Frazier*	*Newlands*
Bankhead	*Clay*	*Gore*	*Overman*
Beveridge	Cummins	*Hughes*	*Paynter*
Bristow	*Davis*	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Simmons*
Brown	Dolliver	La Follette	*Stone*
Burkett	*Fletcher*	*Martin*	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—39.

Aldrich	Crane	Gamble	Penrose
Borah	Crawford	Guggenheim	Perkins
Bradley	Cullom	Heyburn	Root
Brandegee	Curtis	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Bulkeley	Dick	Jones	Smoot
Burnham	Dillingham	Kean	Stephenson
Burrows	Dixon	Lodge	Sutherland
Burton	du Pont	*McEnery*	Warner
Carter	Elkins	Oliver	Warren
Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Page	

NOT VOTING—25.

Bourne	Frye	Piles	*Taliaferro*
Briggs	Hale	*Rayner*	*Taylor*
Clarke, Ark.	McCumber	Richardson	*Tillman*
Culberson	*McLaurin*	*Shively*	Wetmore
Daniel	*Money*	*Smith, Md.*	
Depew	Nixon	Smith, Mich.	
Flint	*Owen*	*Smith, S. C.*	

So Mr. Dolliver's amendment was rejected.

To paragraph 365 Mr. Dolliver offered the following as a substitute therefor, reducing the duty:

365. The duty upon all wools and hair of the first and second classes shall be based upon the shrinkage which would result in scouring such wools under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe; if shrinking 65 per cent or more, 11 cents per pound; if shrinking less than 65 per cent and not more than 55 per cent, 13 cents per pound; if shrinking less than 55 per cent and not more than 45 per cent, 16 cents per pound; if shrinking less than 45 per cent and not more than 35 per cent, 20 cents per pound; if shrinking less than 35 per cent and not more than 25 per cent, 24 cents per pound; if shrinking less than 25 per cent and not more than 15 per cent, 27 cents per pound; if shrinking less than 15 per cent, 36 cents per pound.

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3054, June 10):

The result was announced—yeas 21, nays 37, as follows:

YEAS—21.

Bacon	Clapp	*Gore*	*Newlands*
Bankhead	*Clay*	*Hughes*	*Overman*
Beveridge	Cummins	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Simmons*
Bristow	*Davis*	La Follette	
Brown	Dolliver	*Martin*	
Burkett	*Fletcher*	Nelson	

NAYS—37.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Gamble	Root
Borah	Crane	Heyburn	Scott
Bradley	Crawford	Johnson, N. Dak.	Smoot
Brandegee	Cullom	Jones	Stephenson
Bulkeley	Dick	Kean	Sutherland
Burnham	Dillingham	Lodge	Warner
Burrows	Dixon	Oliver	Warren
Burton	du Pont	Page	
Carter	Elkins	Penrose	
Chamberlain	Gallinger	Perkins	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NOT VOTING—33.

Bailey	*Foster*	Nixon	*Smith, S. C.*
Bourne	*Frazier*	*Owen*	*Stone*
Briggs	Frye	*Paynter*	*Taliaferro*
Clarke, Ark.	Guggenheim	Piles	*Taylor*
Culberson	Hale	*Rayner*	*Tillman*
Curtis	McCumber	Richardson	Wetmore
Daniel	*McEnery*	*Shively*	
Depew	*McLaurin*	*Smith, Md.*	
Flint	*Money*	Smith, Mich.	

So Mr. Dolliver's amendment was rejected.

Mr. La Follette offered the following amendments to the several paragraphs of the wool schedule (Schedule K) reducing the rates of duty proposed in the said paragraphs of the bill:

Amend paragraph 356 by striking out the word "three," in line 23, on page 124, and insert the word "two."

Amend paragraph 357 by striking out the same and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "357. Class 1, all wool not hereinafter included in class 2."

Strike out paragraph 358.

Amend paragraph 359 by striking out the word "three," in line 14, on page 125, and insert in lieu thereof the word "two."

Amend paragraph 361 by inserting after the word "duty," in line 9, on page 126, the words "as class 1;" and by striking out all of the balance of line 9 and all of line 10.

Amend paragraph 362 by striking out the same and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Paragraph 362. The duty on wools of the first class shall be 45 per cent ad valorem."

Strike all of paragraph 363.

Amend paragraph 364 by striking out all of line 9, on page 127, after the word "be," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Thirty-five per cent ad valorem;" also by striking out all of lines 10 to 20, inclusive, on said page 127.

Strike out all of paragraphs 365 and 366.

Strike out all of paragraph 367.

Amend the committee amendment to paragraph 368 by striking out the words "30 cents per pound," in line 10, on page 129, and insert in lieu thereof the words "45 per cent ad valorem."

Amend paragraph 369 by striking out the words "25 cents per pound," in line 11, on page 129, and the words "20 cents per pound," in line 14, and inserting after the word "section," in line 14, the words "45 per cent ad valorem."

Amend paragraph 370 by striking out all of line 15, on page 129, after the word "flocks," and all of line 16, and insert in lieu thereof the words "45 per cent ad valorem."

Amend paragraph 371 to read as follows:

"371. Tops, 50 per cent ad valorem."

Amend paragraph 373 by striking out all of the paragraph after the word "pound," in line 26, on page 129, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "55 per cent."

Amend paragraph 374 by striking out the words "or in part of wool," in line 9, on page 130, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "of wool, or of which wool is the component material of chief value."

Also amend the paragraph by striking out all of the paragraph after the word "section," and inserting in lieu thereof the words "65 per cent ad valorem."

Strike out all of paragraphs 375, 376, 377, 378, and 379.

Amend paragraph 380 by striking out all of the paragraph after the word "description," in line 11, on page 133, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "60 per cent ad valorem."

Amend paragraph 381 by striking out all of the paragraph after the word "description," in line 15, on page 133, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "60 per cent ad valorem."

Amend paragraph 382 by striking out all of the paragraph after the word "description," in line 18, on page 133, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "60 per cent ad valorem."

Amend paragraph 383 by striking out all of the paragraph after the word "description," in line 23, on page 133, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "60 per cent ad valorem."

Amend paragraph 384 by striking out all of the paragraph after the word "otherwise," in line 1, on page 134, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "60 per cent ad valorem."

Amend paragraph 385 by striking out all of the paragraph after the word "carpets," in line 4, on page 134, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "60 per cent ad valorem."

Amend paragraph 386 by striking out all of the paragraph after the word "carpets," in line 6, on page 134, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "60 per cent ad valorem."

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Amend paragraph 387 by striking out all of the paragraph after the word "rugs," in line 11, on page 134, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "60 per cent ad valorem."

Amend paragraph 388 by striking out all of the paragraph after the word "otherwise," in lines 15 and 16, on page 134, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "60 per cent ad valorem."

By unanimous consent the vote was taken upon these several amendments, and was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3073, June 11):

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 44, as follows:

YEAS—32.

Bacon	Clapp	*Hughes*	*Owen*
Bailey	*Clay*	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Paynter*
Bankhead	Cummins	La Follette	*Rayner*
Beveridge	*Davis*	*Martin*	*Simmons*
Bristow	Dolliver	*Money*	*Smith, Md.*
Brown	*Foster*	Nelson	*Stone*
Burkett	*Frazier*	*Newlands*	*Taliaferro*
Chamberlain	*Gore*	*Overman*	*Tillman*

NAYS—44.

Aldrich	Crawford	Gallinger	Penrose
Borah	Cullom	Gamble	Perkins
Bourne	Curtis	Guggenheim	Piles
Brandegee	Depew	Heyburn	Root
Bulkeley	Dick	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Burnham	Dillingham	Kean	Smoot
Burrows	Dixon	Lodge	Stephenson
Burton	du Pont	*McEnery*	Sutherland
Carter	Elkins	Nixon	Warner
Clark, Wyo.	Flint	Oliver	Warren
Crane	Frye	Page	Wetmore

NOT VOTING—15.

Bradley	*Daniel*	McCumber	Smith, Mich.
Briggs	*Fletcher*	*McLaurin*	*Smith, S. C.*
Clarke, Ark.	Hale	Richardson	*Taylor*
Culberson	Jones	*Shively*	

So Mr. La Follette's amendments were rejected.

Mr. Bacon offered an amendment to paragraphs 356 to 372, inclusive, reducing the rates of duty proposed in the said paragraphs of the bill, by striking out the said paragraphs and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

The duty upon all wools, hair of the camel, goat, alpaca, and other like animals, and upon shoddy, noils, wool extract, woolen rags, mungo, and flocks, yarn waste, thread waste, and all other waste composed wholly or in part of wool, shall be 30 per cent ad valorem.

The vote upon the proposed amendment to thus strike out and insert was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3123, June 12, 1909):

The result was announced—yeas 21, nays 50, as follows:

YEAS—21.

Bacon	*Foster*	*Money*	*Stone*
Bailey	*Frazier*	*Overman*	*Taliaferro*
Bankhead	*Gore*	*Paynter*	*Tillman*
Clay	*Hughes*	*Rayner*	
Culberson	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Simmons*	
Davis	*Martin*	*Smith, Md.*	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—50.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Flint	Penrose
Borah	Crane	Frye	Perkins
Bourne	Crawford	Gallinger	Piles
Brandegee	Cullom	Guggenheim	Root
Bristow	Cummins	Heyburn	Scott
Brown	Curtis	Johnson, N. Dak.	Smoot
Bulkeley	Depew	Kean	Stephenson
Burkett	Dick	La Follette	Sutherland
Burnham	Dillingham	Lodge	Warner
Burrows	Dixon	McCumber	Warren
Burton	Dolliver	Nelson	Wetmore
Carter	du Pont	Nixon	
Clapp	Elkins	Page	

NOT VOTING—20.

Beveridge	*Daniel*	*McEnery*	Richardson
Bradley	*Fletcher*	*McLauren*	*Shively*
Briggs	Gamble	*Newlands*	Smith, Mich.
Chamberlain	Hale	Oliver	*Smith, S. C.*
Clarke, Ark.	Jones	*Owen*	*Taylor*

So Mr. Bacon's amendment was rejected.

Mr. Bacon then offered an amendment proposing to amend the bill further by striking out paragraph 373 and succeeding paragraphs to 389, inclusive, and by inserting the several paragraphs in lieu thereof, reducing the duty, as follows:

373. On yarns made wholly or in part of wool, valued at not more than 30 cents per pound, the duty per pound shall be two and one-half times the duty imposed by this section on 1 pound of unwashed wool of the first class, and in addition thereto 25 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than 30 cents per pound, the duty per pound shall be three and one-half times the duty imposed by this section on 1 pound of unwashed wool of the first class, and in addition thereto, upon all the foregoing, 40 per cent ad valorem. (In equivalent, maximum 143.02 per cent ad valorem.)

And insert in lieu thereof the following:

"*373. On yarns made wholly or in part of wool, 40 per cent ad valorem.*"

Amend further by striking out paragraph 374, on page 130, which is as follows:

"374. On cloths, knit fabrics, and all manufactures of every description made wholly or in part of wool, not specially provided for in this section, valued at not more than 40 cents per pound, the duty per pound shall be three times the duty imposed by this section on a pound of unwashed wool of the first class; valued at above 40 cents per pound and not above 70 cents per pound, the duty per pound shall be four times the duty imposed by this section on 1 pound of unwashed wool of the first class, and in addition thereto, upon all the foregoing, 50 per cent ad valorem; valued at over 70 cents per pound, the duty per pound shall be four times the duty imposed by this section on 1 pound of unwashed wool of the first class and 55 per cent ad valorem." (In equivalent, maximum 141 per cent ad valorem.)

And insert the following in lieu thereof:

"*374. On knit fabrics, and all fabrics made on knitting machines or frames, not including wearing apparel, and on shawls made wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the camel, goat, alpaca, or other animals, valued at not exceeding 40 cents per pound, 35 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than 40 cents per pound, forty per cent ad valorem.*"

Amend further by striking out paragraph 375, on page 130, which is as follows:

"375. On blankets, and flannels for underwear composed wholly or in part of wool, valued at not more than 40 cents per pound, the duty per pound shall be the same as the duty imposed by this section on 2 pounds of unwashed wool of the first class, and in addition thereto 30 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than 40 cents and not more than 50 cents per pound, the duty per pound shall be three times the duty imposed by this section on 1 pound of unwashed wool of the first class, and in addition thereto 35 per cent ad valorem. On blankets composed wholly or in part of wool, valued at more than 50 cents per pound, the duty per pound shall be three times the duty imposed by this section on 1 pound of unwashed wool of the first class, and in addition thereto 40 per cent ad valorem. Flannels composed wholly or in part of wool, valued

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

at above 50 cents per pound, shall be classified and pay the same duty as women's and children's dress goods, coat linings, Italian cloths, and goods of similar character and description provided by this section: *Provided*, That on blankets over 3 yards in length the same duties shall be paid as on cloths." (In equivalent, maximum 165.42 per cent ad valorem.)

And insert the following in lieu thereof:

"*375. On blankets, hats of wool, flannels for underwear and felts for printing machines, composed wholly or in part of wool, the hair of the camel, goat, alpaca, or other animals, valued at not more than 30 cents per pound, 25 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than 30 and not more than 40 cents per pound, 30 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than 40 cents per pound, 35 per cent ad valorem: Provided, That on blankets over 3 yards in length the same duties shall be paid as on woolen and worsted cloths.*"

Amend further by striking out paragraph 376, on page 131, and paragraph 377, on page 132, which are as follows:

"376. On women's and children's dress goods, coat linings, Italian cloths, and goods of similar description and character of which the warp consists wholly of cotton or other vegetable material, with the remainder of the fabric composed wholly or in part of wool, valued at not exceeding 15 cents per square yard, the duty shall be 7 cents per square yard; valued at more than 15 cents per square yard, the duty shall be 8 cents per square yard; and in addition thereto on all the foregoing valued at not above 70 cents per pound, 50 per cent ad valorem; valued above 70 cents per pound, 55 per cent ad valorem." (In equivalent, maximum 115.53 per cent ad valorem.)

"377. On women's and children's dress goods, coat linings, Italian cloths, bunting, and goods of similar description or character composed wholly or in part of wool, and not specially provided for in this section, the duty shall be 11 cents per square yard; and in addition thereto on all the foregoing valued at not above 70 cents per pound, 50 per cent ad valorem; valued above 70 cents per pound, 55 cent per ad valorem: *Provided*, That on all the foregoing weighing over 4 ounces per square yard, the duty shall be the same as imposed by this schedule on cloths." (In equivalent, maximum 118 per cent ad valorem.)

And insert the following in lieu thereof:

"*On women's and children's dress goods, coat linings, Italian cloths, bunting, or goods of similar description or character, and on all manufactures composed wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the camel, goat, alpaca, or other animals, valued at not over 50 cents per pound, 35 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than 50 cents per pound, 50 per cent ad valorem.*"

Amend further by striking out paragraph 378, on page 132, which is as follows:

"378. On clothing, ready-made, and articles of wearing apparel of every description, wool hats, shawls whether knitted or woven, and knitted articles of every description made up or manufactured wholly or in part, felts not woven, and not specially provided for in this section, composed wholly or in part of wool, the duty per pound shall be four times the duty imposed by this section on 1 pound of unwashed wool of the first class, and in addition thereto 60 per cent ad valorem." (In equivalent, maximum 95.98 per cent ad valorem.)

And insert the following in lieu thereof:

"*378. On clothing, ready-made, and articles of wearing apparel of every description, made up or manufactured wholly or in part, not specially provided for in this act, felts not specially provided for in this act, all the foregoing composed wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the camel, goat, alpaca, or other animals, valued at above $1.50 per pound, 50 per cent ad valorem; valued at less than $1.50 per pound, 35 per cent ad valorem. On cloaks, dolmans, jackets, talmas, ulsters, or other outside garments for ladies' and children's apparel, and goods of similar description or used for like purposes, and on knit wearing apparel, composed wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the camel, goat, alpaca, or other animals, made up or manufactured wholly or in part, 40 per cent ad valorem.*"

Amend further by striking out paragraph 379, on page 132, which is as follows:

"379. Webbings, gorings, suspenders, braces, bandings, beltings, bindings, braids, galloons, edgings, insertings, flouncings, fringes, gimps, cords, cords and tassels, ribbons, ornaments, laces, trimmings, and articles made wholly or in part of lace, embroideries and all articles embroidered by hand or machinery, head nets, nettings, buttons or barrel buttons, or buttons of other forms for tassels or ornaments, and manufactures of wool ornamented with beads or spangles of whatever material composed, any of the foregoing made of wool or of which wool is a component material, whether containing india rubber or not, 50 cents per pound and 60 per cent ad valorem." (In equivalent, maximum 80.83 per cent ad valorem.)

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

And insert the following in lieu thereof:

"*379. On webbings, gorings, suspenders, braces, beltings, bindings, braids, galloons, fringes, gimps, cords, cords and tassels, dress trimmings, laces, embroideries, head nets, nettings and veilings, buttons or barrel buttons, or buttons of other forms for tassels or ornaments, any of the foregoing which are elastic or nonelastic, made of wool, worsted, the hair of the camel, goat, alpaca, or other animals, or of which wool, worsted, the hair of the camel, goat, alpaca, or other animals is a component material, 45 per cent ad valorem.*"

Amend further by striking out paragraph 380, on page 133, which is as follows:

"380. Aubusson, Axminster, moquette, and chenille carpets, figured or plain, and all carpets or carpeting of like character or description, 60 cents per square yard and in addition thereto 40 per cent ad valorem." (In equivalent, 66.34 per cent ad valorem.)

And insert the following in lieu thereof:

"*380. Aubusson, Axminster, moquette, and chenille carpets, figured or plain, carpets woven whole for rooms, and all carpets or carpeting of like character or descriptions, 40 per cent ad valorem.*"

Amend further by striking out paragraph 381, on page 133, which is as follows:

"381. Saxony, Wilton, and Tournay velvet carpets, figured or plain, and all carpets or carpeting of like character or description, 60 cents per square yard and in addition thereto 40 per cent ad valorem." (In equivalent, 72.67 per cent ad valorem.)

And insert the following in lieu thereof:

"*381. Saxony, Wilton, and Tournay velvet carpets, figured or plain, and all carpets or carpeting of like character or description, 40 per cent ad valorem.*"

Amend further by striking out paragraph 382, on page 133, which is as follows:

"382. Brussels carpets, figured or plain, and all carpets or carpeting of like character or description, 44 cents per square yard and in addition thereto 40 per cent ad valorem." (In equivalent, 75.81 per cent ad valorem.)

And insert the following in lieu thereof:

"*382. Brussels carpets, figured or plain, and all carpets or carpeting of like character or description, 40 per cent ad valorem.*"

Amend further by striking out paragraph 383, on page 133, which is as follows:

"383. Velvet and tapestry velvet carpets, figured or plain, printed on the warp or otherwise, and all carpets or carpeting of like character or description, 40 cents per square yard and in addition thereto 40 per cent ad valorem." (In equivalent, 58.86 per cent ad valorem.)

And insert the following in lieu thereof:

"*383. Velvet and tapestry velvet carpets, figured or plain, printed on the warp or otherwise, and all carpets or carpeting of like character or description, 40 per cent ad valorem.*"

Amend further by striking out paragraph 384, on page 133, which is as follows:

"384. Tapestry Brussels carpets, figured or plain, and all carpets or carpeting of like character or description, printed on the warp or otherwise, 28 cents per square yard, and in addition thereto 40 per cent ad valorem." (In equivalent, 60.73 per cent ad valorem.)

And insert the following in lieu thereof:

"*384. Tapestry Brussels carpets, figured or plain, and all carpets or carpeting of like character or description, printed on the warp or otherwise, 40 per cent ad valorem.*"

Amend further by striking out paragraph 385, on page 134, which is as follows:

"385. Treble ingrain, three-ply, and all chain Venetian carpets, 22 cents per square yard, and in addition thereto 40 per cent ad valorem." (In equivalent, 66.72 per cent ad valorem.)

And insert the following in lieu thereof:

"*385. Treble ingrain, three-ply, and all chain Venetian carpets, 30 per cent ad valorem.*"

Amend further by striking out paragraph 386, on page 134, which is as follows:

"386. Wool Dutch and two-ply ingrain carpets, 18 cents per square yard, and in addition thereto 40 per cent ad valorem." (In equivalent, 58.63 per cent ad valorem.)

And insert in lieu thereof:

"*386. Wool Dutch and two-ply ingrain carpets, 30 per cent ad valorem.*"

Amend further by striking out paragraph 387, on page 134, which is as follows:

"387. Carpets of every description, woven whole for rooms, and oriental, Berlin, Aubusson, Axminster, and similar rugs, 10 cents per square foot and 40 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That in the measurement of all mats, rugs, carpets, and similar articles, of whatever material composed, the selvage, if any, shall be included." (In equivalent, 60.01 per cent ad valorem.)

And insert the following in lieu thereof:

"*387. Carpets of every description woven whole for rooms, and oriental, Berlin, and other similar rugs, 40 per cent ad valorem.*"

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Amend further by striking out paragraph 388, on page 134, which is as follows:

"388. Druggets and bockings, printed, colored, or otherwise, 22 cents per square yard and in addition thereto 40 per cent ad valorem." (In equivalent, 70.86 per cent ad valorem.)

And insert the following in lieu thereof:

"*388. Druggets and bockings, printed, colored, or otherwise, felt carpeting, figured or plain, 30 per cent ad valorem.*"

Amend further by striking out paragraph 389, on page 134, which is as follows:

"389. Carpets and carpeting of wool, flax, or cotton, or composed in part of any of them, not specially provided for in this section, and mats, matting, and rugs of cotton, 50 per cent ad valorem."

And insert the following in lieu thereof:

"*389. Carpets and carpeting, of wool, flax, or cotton, composed in part of either, not specially provided for in this act, 30 per cent ad valorem.*"

Upon the question of the adoption to thus strike out and insert, the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3126, June 12):

The result was announced—yeas 20, nays 50, as follows:

YEAS—20.

Bacon	*Davis*	*Martin*	*Simmons*
Bailey	*Frazier*	*Money*	*Smith, Md.*
Bankhead	*Gore*	*Overman*	*Stone*
Clay	*Hughes*	*Paynter*	*Taliaferro*
Culberson	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Rayner*	*Tillman*

NAYS—50.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Frye	Penrose
Borah	Crane	Gallinger	Perkins
Bourne	Crawford	Guggenheim	Piles
Brandegee	Cummins	Heyburn	Root
Bristow	Curtis	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Brown	Depew	Kean	Smoot
Bulkeley	Dick	La Follette	Stephenson
Burkett	Dillingham	Lodge	Sutherland
Burnham	Dixon	*McEnery*	Warner
Burrows	Dolliver	Nelson	Warren
Burton	du Pont	Nixon	Wetmore
Carter	Elkins	Oliver	
Clapp	Flint	Page	

NOT VOTING—21.

Beveridge	*Daniel*	McCumber	Smith, Mich.
Bradley	*Fletcher*	*McLaurin*	*Smith, S. C.*
Briggs	*Foster*	*Newlands*	*Taylor*
Chamberlain	Gamble	*Owen*	
Clarke, Ark.	Hale	Richardson	
Cullom	Jones	*Shively*	

So Mr. Bacon's amendments were rejected.

Mr. Gore offered an amendment proposing to reduce the duty on blankets by adding the following proviso to paragraph 375:

Provided, however, That in no case shall the duty on blankets exceed 75 per cent ad valorem.

Upon the question of the adoption of this amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3078, June 11, 1909):

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—29.

Bacon	*Culberson*	*Martin*	*Simmons*
Bailey	*Davis*	*Money*	*Smith, Md.*
Bankhead	Dolliver	Nelson	*Stone*
Bristow	*Frazier*	*Newlands*	*Taliaferro*
Brown	*Gore*	*Overman*	*Tillman*
Burkett	*Hughes*	*Owen*	
Clapp	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Paynter*	
Clay	La Follette	*Rayner*	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—43.

Aldrich	Crawford	Frye	Perkins
Borah	Cullom	Gallinger	Piles
Bourne	Cummins	Guggenheim	Root
Brandegee	Curtis	Heyburn	Scott
Bulkeley	Depew	Johnson, N. Dak.	Smoot
Burnham	Dick	Kean	Stephenson
Burrows	Dillingham	Lodge	Sutherland
Burton	Dixon	*McEnery*	Warner
Carter	du Pont	Nixon	Warren
Clark, Wyo.	Elkins	Page	Wetmore
Crane	Flint	Penrose	

NOT VOTING—19.

Beveridge	*Daniel*	Jones	*Shively*
Bradley	*Fletcher*	McCumber	Smith, Mich.
Briggs	*Foster*	*McLaurin*	*Smith, S. C.*
Chamberlain	Gamble	Oliver	*Taylor*
Clarke, Ark.	Hale	Richardson	

So Mr. Gore's amendment was rejected.

Mr. Cummins offered an amendment to the amendment proposed by Mr. Bailey, of Texas, imposing a general income tax, which amendment was accepted by Mr. Bailey as a modification of his original amendment. Mr. Aldrich, of Rhode Island, moved to postpone further consideration of the amendment until the 18th day of June. Upon the motion to postpone, the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3081, June 11, 1909):

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 34, as follows:

YEAS—45.

Aldrich	Crane	Frye	Perkins
Beveridge	Crawford	Gallinger	Root
Bradley	Cullom	Guggenheim	Scott
Brandegee	Curtis	Heyburn	Smoot
Brown	Depew	Johnson, N. Dak.	Stephenson
Bulkeley	Dick	Kean	Sutherland
Burkett	Dillingham	Lodge	Warner
Burnham	Dixon	Nelson	Warren
Burrows	Dolliver	Nixon	Wetmore
Burton	du Pont	Oliver	
Carter	Elkins	Page	
Clark, Wyo.	Flint	Penrose	

NAYS—34.

Bacon	*Culberson*	La Follette	*Rayner*
Bailey	Cummins	*McEnery*	*Simmons*
Bankhead	*Davis*	*Martin*	*Smith, Md.*
Borah	*Fletcher*	*Money*	*Stone*
Bourne	*Foster*	*Newlands*	*Taliaferro*
Bristow	*Frazier*	*Overman*	*Taylor*
Chamberlain	*Gore*	*Owen*	*Tillman*
Clapp	*Hughes*	*Paynter*	
Clay	*Johnston, Ala.*	Piles	

NOT VOTING—12.

Briggs	Gamble	McCumber	*Shively*
Clarke, Ark.	Hale	*McLaurin*	Smith, Mich.
Daniel	Jones	Richardson	*Smith, S. C.*

So the motion of Mr. Aldrich to postpone was agreed to.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Mr. Cummins moved to recommit Schedule K to the committee, with instructions as follows:

To again consider the same and report a schedule as follows, to wit:

"1. With the duties on wool unchanged.

"2. With so-called 'compensatory duties' to the woolen manufacturers that will measure the difference between the price which domestic manufacturers pay for wool and the price paid by their chief foreign competitors.

"3. A further duty upon imported woolen manufactures that will represent the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad, with a fair manufacturers' profit added, less the compensatory duties already given to domestic manufacturers because of the higher price they are compelled to pay for wool."

Upon the question of the adoption of the motion to recommit with instructions the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3082, June 11, 1909):

The result was announced—yeas 8, nays 59, as follows:

YEAS—8.

Beveridge	Brown	Clapp	Dolliver
Bristow	Burkett	Cummins	Nelson

NAYS—59.

Aldrich	Crawford	*Gore*	*Paynter*
Bacon	*Culberson*	Guggenheim	Penrose
Bankhead	Cullom	Heyburn	Piles
Bourne	Curtis	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Bradley	*Davis*	Kean	Scott
Brandegee	Depew	Lodge	*Simmons*
Bulkeley	Dick	*McEnery*	Smoot
Burnham	Dillingham	*McLaurin*	Stephenson
Burrows	Dixon	*Martin*	*Stone*
Burton	du Pont	*Money*	Sutherland
Carter	Elkins	Nixon	*Taliaferro*
Chamberlain	Flint	Oliver	*Tillman*
Clark, Wyo.	*Foster*	*Overman*	Warren
Clay	Frye	*Owen*	Wetmore
Crane	Gallinger	Page	

NOT VOTING—24.

Bailey	*Frazier*	La Follette	*Shively*
Borah	Gamble	McCumber	*Smith, Md.*
Briggs	Hale	*Newlands*	Smith, Mich.
Clarke, Ark.	*Hughes*	Perkins	*Smith, S. C.*
Daniel	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Rayner*	*Taylor*
Fletcher	Jones	Richardson	Warner

So the motion of Mr. Cummins was rejected.

The Finance Committee proposed an amendment to increase the duty from 20 to 30 cents per pound on wool waste by striking out paragraph 368 of the House bill and inserting the following in lieu thereof:

368. Top waste, slubbing waste, roving waste, ring waste, and garnetted waste, 30 cents per pound.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment to thus strike out and insert, the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3121, June 12):

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 30, as follows:

YEAS—40.

Aldrich	Carter	Gamble	Piles
Borah	Clark, Wyo.	Guggenheim	Root
Bourne	Crane	Heyburn	Scott
Bradley	Crawford	Johnson, N. Dak.	Smith, Mich.
Brandegee	Cullom	Kean	Smoot
Briggs	Dick	Lodge	Stephenson
Bulkeley	Dixon	McCumber	Sutherland
Burnham	du Pont	Page	Warner
Burrows	Flint	Penrose	Warren
Burton	Gallinger	Perkins	Wetmore

NAYS—30.

Bacon	Cummins	La Follette	*Rayner*
Beveridge	*Davis*	*Martin*	*Simmons*
Bristow	Dolliver	*Money*	*Smith, Md.*
Brown	*Fletcher*	Nelson	*Stone*
Burkett	*Foster*	*Newlands*	*Taliaferro*
Clapp	*Gore*	*Overman*	*Taylor*
Clay	*Hughes*	*Owen*	
Culberson	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Paynter*	

NOT VOTING—21.

Bailey	Depew	Jones	*Shively*
Bankhead	Dillingham	*McEnery*	*Smith, S. C.*
Chamberlain	Elkins	*McLaurin*	*Tillman*
Clarke, Ark.	*Frazier*	Nixon	
Curtis	Frye	Oliver	
Daniel	Hale	Richardson	

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

The Finance Committee offered an amended paragraph, to be known as No. 711½, *admitting certain works of art free of duty*. Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3137, June 12):

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 14, as follows:

YEAS—53.

Aldrich	Crane	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Beveridge	Crawford	Kean	Scott
Bourne	Cullom	La Follette	*Smith, Md.*
Bradley	*Davis*	Lodge	Smoot
Brandegee	Depew	*Martin*	Stephenson
Briggs	Dick	*Money*	*Stone*
Bristow	Dillingham	*Newlands*	*Taliaferro*
Bulkeley	Dolliver	Nixon	*Tillman*
Burnham	du Pont	Oliver	Warner
Burrows	Elkins	*Overman*	Warren
Burton	Flint	Page	Wetmore
Carter	Frye	Penrose	
Chamberlain	Gallinger	Perkins	
Clay	Guggenheim	*Rayner*	

NAYS—14.

Borah	Cummins	Heyburn	*Paynter*
Brown	Curtis	*Hughes*	Piles
Burkett	Dixon	McCumber	
Clark, Wyo.	*Fletcher*	Nelson	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NOT VOTING—24.

Bacon	*Daniel*	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Shively*
Bailey	*Foster*	Jones	*Simmons*
Bankhead	*Frazier*	*McEnery*	Smith, Mich.
Clapp	Gamble	*McLaurin*	*Smith, S. C.*
Clarke, Ark.	*Gore*	*Owen*	Sutherland
Culberson	Hale	Richardson	*Taylor*

So the paragraph as amended was agreed to.

The Finance Committee proposed an amendment to the bill fixing rates of duty upon importations into the United States from the Philippine Islands. Mr. Bristow of Kansas proposed an amendment to the amendment *excepting sugar from the duty imposed by the committee amendment upon articles imported into the Philippine Islands from foreign countries, and thence reimported into the United States.*

Upon the question of the adoption of this amendment to the committee amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3186, June 14):

The result was announced—yeas 11, nays 49, as follows:

YEAS—11.

Bristow	Cummins	*Fletcher*	*Newlands*
Brown	Davis	*Gore*	*Tillman*
Clapp	Doliver	La Follette	

NAYS—49.

Aldrich	Crane	Johnson, N. Dak.	Perkins
Bacon	Crawford	Jones	Piles
Borah	Cullom	Kean	Root
Bradley	*Daniel*	Lodge	*Simmons*
Brandegee	Depew	McCumber	*Smith, S. C.*
Briggs	Dick	*McEnery*	Smoot
Bulkeley	Dillingham	*Martin*	Stephenson
Burkett	Dixon	Nelson	Sutherland
Burnham	du Pont	Nixon	Warner
Burrows	*Foster*	*Overman*	Wetmore
Burton	Gallinger	Page	
Carter	Guggenheim	*Paynter*	
Clark, Wyo.	Heyburn	Penrose	

NOT VOTING—31.

Bailey	Curtis	*Johnson, Ala.*	*Shively*
Bankhead	Elkins	*McLaurin*	*Smith, Md.*
Beveridge	Flint	*Money*	Smith, Mich.
Bourne	*Frazier*	Oliver	*Stone*
Chamberlain	Frye	*Owen*	*Taliaferro*
Clarke, Ark.	Gamble	*Rayner*	*Taylor*
Clay	Hale	Richardson	Warren
Culberson	*Hughes*	Scott	

So Mr. Bristow's amendment to the amendment of the committee was rejected.

Mr. Stone offered an amendment to the above-stated committee amendment *proposing to declare the policy of the United States as to the retention of the Philippine Islands.*

Upon the question of the adoption of this amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3188, June 14):

The result was announced—yeas 18, nays 44, as follows:

YEAS—18.

Bacon	*Frazier*	*Money*	*Stone*
Bailey	*Gore*	*Newlands*	*Taliaferro*
Clay	*Hughes*	*Overman*	*Tillman*
Davis	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Paynter*	
Fletcher	*McEnery*	*Simmons*	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—44.

Aldrich	*Chamberlain*	Flint	Page
Beveridge	Clapp	Gallinger	Perkins
Brandegee	Crane	Guggenheim	Piles
Briggs	Crawford	Heyburn	Root
Bristow	Depew	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Bulkeley	Dick	Kean	Smoot
Burkett	Dillingham	La Follette	Stephenson
Burnham	Dixon	Lodge	Sutherland
Burrows	Dolliver	Nelson	Warner
Burton	du Pont	Nixon	Warren
Carter	Elkins	Oliver	Wetmore

NOT VOTING—29.

Bankhead	Cullom	Jones	*Shively*
Borah	Cummins	McCumber	*Smith, Md.*
Bourne	Curtis	*McLaurin*	Smith, Mich.
Bradley	*Daniel*	*Martin*	*Smith, S. C.*
Brown	*Foster*	*Owen*	*Taylor*
Clark, Wyo.	Frye	Penrose	
Clarke, Ark.	Gamble	*Rayner*	
Culberson	Hale	Richardson	

So Mr. Stone's amendment to the amendment of the committee was rejected.

Mr. Bulkeley moved to refer the committee amendment relative to the Philippine tariff to the Committee on the Philippines.

Upon the question of the adoption of the motion to refer the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3189, June 14):

The result was announced—yeas 21, nays 40, as follows:

YEAS—21.

Bacon	Clapp	*Gore*	*Newlands*
Bailey	*Clay*	*Hughes*	*Overman*
Brandegee	*Davis*	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Paynter*
Bristow	Dick	La Follette	
Bulkeley	*Fletcher*	*McEnery*	
Chamberlain	*Frazier*	*Martin*	

NAYS—40.

Aldrich	Crane	Heyburn.	Perkins
Beveridge	Crawford	Johnson, N. Dak.	Piles
Borah	Depew	Kean	Root
Briggs	Dixon	Lodge	Scott
Burkett	Dolliver	*Money*	Smoot
Burnham	du Pont	Nelson	Stephenson
Burrows	Elkins	Nixon	Sutherland
Burton	Flint	Oliver	Warner
Carter	Gallinger	Page	Warren
Clark, Wyo.	Guggenheim	Penrose	Wetmore

NOT VOTING—30.

Bankhead	Curtis	McCumber	Smith, Mich.
Bourne	*Daniel*	*McLaurin*	*Smith, S. C.*
Bradley	Dillingham	*Owen*	*Stone*
Brown	*Foster*	*Rayner*	*Taliaferro*
Clarke, Ark.	Frye	Richardson	*Taylor*
Culberson	Gamble	*Shively*	*Tillman*
Cullom	Hale	*Simmons*	
Cummins	Jones	*Smith, Md*	

So Mr. Bulkeley's motion was rejected.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Mr. La Follette offered an amendment to the above-stated Philippine amendment, by which amendment to the amendment *the number of cigars to be admitted free of duty from the Philippine Islands was limited to 60,000,000 per annum.* Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment to the committee amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3364, June 15):

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 38, as follows:

YEAS—27.

Bacon	Cummins	*Hughes*	*Owen*
Borah	*Davis*	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Paynter*
Bristow	Dolliver	La Follette	*Simmons*
Brown	*Fletcher*	*McEnery*	*Smith, S. C.*
Burkett	*Foster*	*Money*	*Taliaferro*
Clapp	*Frazier*	*Newlands*	*Tillman*
Clay	*Gore*	*Overman*	

NAYS—38.

Aldrich	Crawford	Heyburn	Piles
Bourne	Cullom	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Brandegee	Depew	Jones	Scott
Briggs	Dick	Kean	Smoot
Buckley	Dillingham	Lodge	Sutherland
Burnham	du Pont	McCumber	Warner
Burrows	Flint	Nelson	Warren
Burton	Frye	Nixon	Wetmore
Carter	Gallinger	Page	
Crane	Guggenheim	Perkins	

NOT VOTING—26.

Bailey	*Culberson*	*McLaurin*	*Smith, Md.*
Bankhead	Curtis	*Martin*	Smith, Mich.
Beveridge	*Daniel*	Oliver	Stephenson
Bradley	Dixon	Penrose	*Stone*
Chamberlain	Elkins	*Rayner*	*Taylor*
Clark, Wyo.	Gamble	Richardson	
Clarke, Ark.	Hale	*Shively*	

So Mr. La Follette's amendment to the amendment of the Committee on Finance was rejected.

Mr. Fletcher offered an amendment striking out paragraph 471d and inserting the following in lieu thereof:

471d. There shall be levied, collected, and paid upon all articles coming into the United States from the Philippine Islands the rates of duty which are required to be levied, collected, and paid upon like articles imported from foreign countries, except as provided by existing law now in force.

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment to thus strike out and insert, the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3441, June 16):

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—26.

Bacon	*Davis*	La Follette	*Simmons*
Bailey	Dixon	*McEnery*	*Smith, Md.*
Bankhead	*Fletcher*	*Martin*	*Smith, S. C.*
Borah	*Foster*	*Overman*	*Taliaferro*
Bristow	*Gore*	*Owen*	*Tillman*
Chamberlain	*Hughes*	*Paynter*	
Clapp	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Rayner*	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—43.

Aldrich	Carter	Frye	Oliver
Beveridge	Crane	Gallinger	Page
Bourne	Crawford	Gamble	Perkins
Brandegee	Cullom	Guggenheim	Piles
Briggs	Cummins	Heyburn	Root
Brown	Curtis	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Bulkeley	Dick	Jones	Smoot
Burkett	Dillingham	Kean	Sutherland
Burnham	Dolliver	Lodge	Warner
Burrows	du Pont	Nelson	Wetmore
Burton	Elkins	Nixon	

NOT VOTING—22.

Bradley	Depew	*Money*	Stephenson
Clark, Wyo.	Flint	*Newlands*	*Stone*
Clarke, Ark.	*Frazier*	Penrose	*Taylor*
Clay	Hale	Richardson	Warren
Culberson	McCumber	*Shively*	
Daniel	*McLaurin*	Smith, Mich.	

So Mr. Fletcher's amendment was rejected.

Mr. Gore offered an amendment to the above-stated Philippine committee amendment, striking out the words "*Except in any fiscal year sugar in excess of 300,000 gross tons,*" and by inserting in lieu thereof the following words: "*Except sugar in excess of 300,000 gross tons during any one fiscal year: Provided, however, That the free importation of 300,000 gross tons for fiscal year shall not extend beyond July 1, 1911.*"

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment to thus strike out and insert, the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3444, June 16):

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—25.

Bacon	*Davis*	*Martin*	*Smith, Md.*
Bailey	*Fletcher*	*Money*	*Smith, S. C.*
Bankhead	*Gore*	*Overman*	*Taliaferro*
Bristow	*Hughes*	*Owen*	*Tillman*
Chamberlain	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Paynter*	
Clapp	La Follette	*Rayner*	
Cummins	*McEnery*	*Simmons*	

NAYS—43.

Aldrich	Crane	Gallinger	Page
Bourne	Crawford	Gamble	Perkins
Brandegee	Cullom	Guggenheim	Piles
Briggs	Curtis	Heyburn	Root
Brown	Dick	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Bulkeley	Dillingham	Jones	Smoot
Burkett	Dixon	Kean	Sutherland
Burnham	Dolliver	Lodge	Warner
Burrows	du Pont	Nelson	Warren
Burton	Elkins	Nixon	Wetmore
Carter	Frye	Oliver	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NOT VOTING—23.

Beveridge	*Culberson*	Hale	*Shively*
Borah	*Daniel*	McCumber	Smith, Mich.
Bradley	Depew	*McLaurin*	Stephenson
Clark, Wyo.	Flint	*Newlands*	*Stone*
Clarke, Ark.	*Foster*	Penrose	*Taylor*
Clay	*Frazier*	Richardson	

So Mr. Gore's amendment was rejected.

The question recurred on agreeing to the Philippine paragraph as amended, and upon this the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3444, June 16):

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 28, as follows:

YEAS—42.

Aldrich	Crane	Frye	Page
Bourne	Cullom	Gallinger	Perkins
Brandegee	Cummins	Guggenheim	Piles
Briggs	Curtis	Heyburn	Scott
Brown	Dick	Johnson, N. Dak.	Smoot
Bulkeley	Dillingham	Jones	Sutherland
Burkett	Dixon	Kean	Warner
Burnham	Dolliver	Lodge	Warren
Burrows	du Pont	Nelson	Wetmore
Burton	Elkins	Nixon	
Carter	Flint	Oliver	

NAYS—28.

Bacon	*Clay*	La Follette	*Rayner*
Bailey	Crawford	*McEnery*	Root
Bankhead	*Davis*	*Martin*	*Simmons*
Borah	*Fletcher*	*Money*	*Smith, Md.*
Bristow	*Gore*	*Overman*	*Smith, S. C.*
Chamberlain	*Hughes*	*Owen*	*Taliaferro*
Clapp	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Paynter*	*Tillman*

NOT VOTING—21.

Beveridge	Depew	*McLaurin*	Stephenson
Bradley	*Foster*	*Newlands*	*Stone*
Clark, Wyo.	*Frazier*	Penrose	*Taylor*
Clarke, Ark.	Gamble	Richardson	
Culberson	Hale	*Shively*	
Daniel	McCumber	Smith, Mich.	

So the paragraph as amended was agreed to.

Mr. Stone offered an amendment striking out Finance Committee's substitute to paragraph 190, which prescribes the duty on zinc ore, and inserting the following in lieu thereof:

Zinc in blocks or pigs; zinc, old and worn-out, fit only to be manufactured; oxide of zinc in whatever form or combination; and all manufactures made wholly of zinc, or of which zinc is a material component, shall be admitted free of duty.

Upon the question of the adoption of this amendment to thus strike out and insert, the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3447, June 16):

The result was announced—yeas 16, nays 49, as follows:

YEAS—16.

Bacon	*Davis*	*Money*	*Simmons*
Chamberlain	*Fletcher*	*Overman*	*Smith, S. C.*
Clay	*Foster*	*Owen*	*Stone*
Daniel	*Martin*	*Paynter*	*Taliaferro*

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—49.

Aldrich	Clapp	Gallinger	Page
Borah	Clark, Wyo.	Guggenheim	Perkins
Bourne	Crane	Heyburn	Piles.
Brandegee	Crawford	*Hughes*	Root
Briggs	Cummins	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Bristow	Curtis	Jones	Smoot
Brown	Dick	Kean	Sutherland
Bulkeley	Dixon	Lodge	Warner
Burkett	Dolliver	McCumber	Warren
Burnham	du Pont	*McEnery*	Wetmore
Burrows	Elkins	Nelson	
Burton	Flint	Nixon	
Carter	Frye	Oliver	

NOT VOTING—26.

Bailey	Depew	La Follette	*Smith, Md.*
Bankhead	Dillingham	*McLaurin*	Smith, Mich.
Beveridge	*Frazier*	*Newlands*	Stephenson
Bradley	Gamble	Penrose	*Taylor*
Clarke, Ark.	*Gore*	*Rayner*	*Tillman*
Culberson	Hale	Richardson	
Cullom	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Shively*	

So Mr. Stone's amendment to the amendment was rejected.

A message was received from the President of the United States making certain recommendations relative to imposing a tax upon all corporations, and also relative to the proposal of a constitutional amendment authorizing the imposition of an income tax. Mr. Gore, of Oklahoma, moved to refer the message, with instructions, to the Finance Committee. Mr. Aldrich, of Rhode Island, moved to lay the motion on the table. Upon the question of the adoption to lay on the table the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3453, June 16):

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 25, as follows:

YEAS—51.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Frye	Nixon
Borah	Crane	Gallinger	Oliver
Brandegee	Crawford	Gamble	Page
Briggs	Cullom	Guggenheim	Perkins
Bristow	Cummins	Hale	Piles
Brown	Curtis	Heyburn	Root
Bulkeley	Dick	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Burkett	Dillingham	Jones	Smoot
Burnham	Dixon	Kean	Sutherland
Burrows	Dolliver	La Follette	Warner
Burton	du Pont	Lodge	Warren
Carter	Elkins	McCumber	Wetmore
Clapp	Flint	Nelson	

NAYS—25.

Bacon	*Davis*	*Martin*	*Smith, S. C.*
Bailey	*Fletcher*	*Money*	*Stone*
Bankhead	*Foster*	*Newlands*	*Taliaferro*
Chamberlain	*Gore*	*Overman*	*Tillman*
Clay	*Hughes*	*Paynter*	
Culberson	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Rayner*	
Daniel	*McEnery*	*Simmons*	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NOT VOTING—15.

Beveridge	Depew	Penrose	Smith, Mich.
Bourne	*Frazier*	Richardson	Stephenson
Bradley	*McLaurin*	*Shively*	*Taylor*
Clarke, Ark.	*Owen*	*Smith, Md.*	

So the motion to table was agreed to.

To paragraph 408, relating to duties on pictures, cards, labels, and so forth, composed wholly or in chief value of paper lithographically printed, Mr. Bristow, of Kansas, offered an amendment *striking out "three" and inserting "two,"* so that if amended it would read *"two cents a pound and 15 per cent ad valorem."* Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3493, June 17):

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 35, as follows:

YEAS—27.

Bacon	*Chamberlain*	*Davis*	*Money*
Bankhead	Clapp	*Fletcher*	*Newlands*
Beveridge	*Clay*	*Gore*	*Rayner*
Bristow	Crawford	*Hughes*	*Simmons*
Brown	*Culberson*	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Stone*
Burkett	Cummins	La Follette	*Taliaferro*
Burton	Curtis	*Martin*	

NAYS—35.

Aldrich	Crane	Guggenheim	Page
Borah	Cullom	Hale	Penrose
Brandegee	Depew	Heyburn	Piles
Briggs	Dick	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Bulkeley	Dixon	Kean	Scott
Burnham	Dolliver	Lodge	Smoot
Burrows	Flint	McCumber	Sutherland
Carter	Gallinger	Nixon	Warren
Clark, Wyo.	Gamble	Oliver	

NOT VOTING—29.

Bailey	*Foster*	*Owen*	Stephenson
Bourne	*Frazier*	*Paynter*	*Taylor*
Bradley	Frye	Perkins	*Tillman*
Clarke, Ark.	Jones	Richardson	Warner
Daniel	*McEnery*	*Shively*	Wetmore
Dillingham	*McLaurin*	*Smith, Md.*	
du Pont	Nelson	Smith, Mich.	
Elkins	*Overman*	*Smith, S. C.*	

So Mr. Bristow's amendment was rejected.

To paragraph 412, imposing duties upon common window glass, Mr. Bacon, of Georgia, offered an amendment reducing said duties as follows:

97. Unpolished cylinder, crown, and common window glass, not exceeding 150 square inches, 1 cent per pound; above that, and not exceeding 384 square inches, 1¼ cents per pound; above that, and not exceeding 720 square inches, 1¾ cents per pound; above that, and not exceeding 864 square inches, 2 cents per pound.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment to thus strike out and insert the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3501, June 17, 1909):

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 52, as follows:

YEAS—25.

Bacon	*Fletcher*	*Money*	*Smith, S. C.*
Bankhead	*Gore*	*Newlands*	*Stone*
Bristow	*Hughes*	*Overman*	*Taylor*
Chamberlain	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Owen*	*Tillman*
Clay	La Follette	*Paynter*	
Daniel	*McLaurin*	*Rayner*	
Davis	*Martin*	*Simmons*	

NAYS—52.

Aldrich	Clapp	Frye	Oliver
Beveridge	Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Page
Borah	Crane	Gamble	Penrose
Bourne	Crawford	Guggenheim	Perkins
Brandegee	Cullom	Hale	Piles
Briggs	Cummins	Heyburn	Root
Brown	Curtis	Jones	Scott
Bulkeley	Depew	Kean	Smith, Mich.
Burkett	Dick	Lodge	Smoot
Burnham	Dillingham	McCumber	Sutherland
Burrows	Dixon	*McEnery*	Warner
Burton	Dolliver	Nelson	Warren
Carter	Flint	Nixon	Wetmore

NOT VOTING—14.

Bailey	du Pont	Johnson, N. Dak.	Stephenson
Bradley	Elkins	Richardson	*Taliaferro*
Clarke, Ark.	*Foster*	*Shively*	
Culberson	*Frazier*	*Smith, Md.*	

So Mr. Bacon's amendment to the amendment was rejected.

To paragraph 405, imposing duty on printing paper suitable for the printing of books and newspapers, Mr. Brown, of Nebraska, offered an amendment *striking out the words "valued at not above two and one-fourth cents per pound, one-tenth of one cent per pound,"* stating at the time that if the amendment were adopted he would follow it with an amendment *putting such printing paper on the free list.* Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3527, June 18):

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 52, as follows:

YEAS—29.

Bacon	*Culberson*	*McLaurin*	*Shively*
Bankhead	*Daniel*	*Martin*	*Simmons*
Beveridge	*Davis*	*Money*	*Smith, S. C.*
Bristow	*Fletcher*	*Newlands*	*Stone*
Brown	*Frazier*	*Overman*	*Tillman*
Burkett	*Gore*	*Owen*	
Chamberlain	*Hughes*	*Paynter*	
Clay	*McEnery*	*Rayner*	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—52.

Aldrich	Crane	Gallinger	Oliver
Bailey	Crawford	Gamble	Page
Borah	Cullom	Guggenheim	Penrose
Bourne	Cummins	Hale	Perkins
Brandegee	Curtis	Heyburn	Piles
Briggs	Dick	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Bulkeley	Dillingham	Jones	Scott
Burnham	Dixon	Kean	Smith, Mich.
Burrows	Dolliver	La Follette	Smoot
Burton	du Pont	Lodge	Sutherland
Carter	Elkins	Lorimer	Warner
Clapp	Flint	Nelson	Warren
Clark, Wyo.	Frye	Nixon	Wetmore

NOT VOTING—11.

Bradley	*Foster*	Richardson	*Taliaferro*
Clarke, Ark.	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Smith, Md.*	*Taylor*
Depew	McCumber	Stephenson	

So Mr. Brown's amendment was rejected.

The Committee on Finance proposed to amend the above-stated paragraph (405) by *striking out "one-tenth of a cent per pound" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "two-tenths,"* so that if amended it would read as follows: *"Valued at not above two and one-quarter cents per pound, two-tenths of a cent a pound."* To this amendment Mr. La Follette, of Wisconsin, offered the following amendment:

Provided, That this rate shall be effective until July 1, 1912, after which time the rate shall be one-tenth of 1 per cent per pound.

Upon the question of the adoption of this amendment to the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3556, June 18, 1909):

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 44, as follows:

YEAS—31.

Bacon	*Clay*	*Hughes*	*Paynter*
Bankhead	Cummins	La Follette	*Rayner*
Beveridge	Curtis	*McLaurin*	*Shively*
Bristow	*Davis*	*Martin*	*Simmons*
Brown	Dolliver	*Money*	*Smith, S. C.*
Burkett	*Fletcher*	*Newlands*	*Stone*
Chamberlain	*Frazier*	*Overman*	*Tillman*
Clapp	*Gore*	*Owen*	

NAYS—44.

Aldrich	Crawford	Heyburn	Perkins
Borah	Cullom	Jones	Piles
Brandegee	Dick	Kean	Root
Briggs	Dillingham	Lodge	Scott
Bulkeley	Dixon	Lorimer	Smith, Mich.
Burnham	Flint	*McEnery*	Smoot
Burrows	Frye	Nelson	Sutherland
Burton	Gallinger	Nixon	*Taliaferro*
Carter	Gamble	Oliver	Warner
Clark, Wyo.	Guggenheim	Page	Warren
Crane	Hale	Penrose	Wetmore

NOT VOTING—17.

Bailey	*Daniel*	Johnson, N. Dak.	Stephenson
Bourne	Depew	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Taylor*
Bradley	du Pont	McCumber	
Clarke, Ark.	Elkins	Richardson	
Culberson	*Foster*	*Smith, Md.*	

So Mr. La Follette's amendment was rejected.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

The question then recurred on behalf of the amendment offered by Mr. Aldrich in behalf of the committee to paragraph 405, and the vote thereon was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3557, June 18, 1909):

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 32, as follows:

YEAS—44.

Aldrich	Crane	Hale	Penrose
Borah	Crawford	Heyburn	Perkins
Brandegee	Cullom	Johnson, N. Dak.	Piles
Briggs	Dick	Jones	Root
Bulkeley	Dillingham	Kean	Scott
Burnham	Dixon	Lodge	Smoot
Burrows	Flint	Lorimer	Sutherland
Burton	Frye	Nelson	*Taliaferro*
Carter	Gallinger	Nixon	Warner
Clapp	Gamble	Oliver	Warren
Clark, Wyo.	Guggenheim	Page	Wetmore

NAYS—32.

Bacon	Cummins	*Hughes*	*Paynter*
Bankhead	Curtis	La Follette	*Rayner*
Beveridge	*Daniel*	*McLaurin*	*Shively*
Bristow	*Davis*	*Martin*	*Simmons*
Brown	Dolliver	*Money*	Smith, Mich.
Burkett	*Fletcher*	*Newlands*	*Smith, S. C.*
Chamberlain	*Frazier*	*Overman*	*Stone*
Clay	*Gore*	*Owen*	*Tillman*

NOT VOTING—16.

Bailey	*Culberson*	*Foster*	Richardson
Bourne	Depew	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Smith, Md.*
Bradley	du Pont	McCumber	Stephenson
Clarke, Ark.	Elkins	*McEnery*	*Taylor*

So Mr. Aldrich's amendment was agreed to.

To the amendment proposed by the Finance Committee, No. 447½, placing hides on the dutiable list, Mr. McLaurin offered an amendment as follows:

The word "hides" as used in this paragraph shall be understood to include all skins of any kind and all kinds of cattle and calves of any weight or size of such skins, however small.

Upon the question of the adoption of this amendment to the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3690, June 22):

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 48, as follows:

YEAS—31.

Bacon	Crawford	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Overman*
Bailey	*Culberson*	Jones	*Shively*
Bankhead	*Davis*	McCumber	*Simmons*
Borah	Dick	*McLaurin*	*Smith, Md.*
Bradley	*Fletcher*	*Martin*	*Stone*
Chamberlain	*Foster*	*Money*	*Taliaferro*
Clapp	*Gore*	Nelson	*Tillman*
Clay	*Hughes*	*Newlands*	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—48.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Frye	*Owen*
Beveridge	Crane	Gallinger	Page
Brandegee	Cullom	Gamble	Penrose
Briggs	Cummins	Hale	Piles
Bristow	Curtis	Heyburn	Root
Brown	*Daniel*	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Bulkeley	Dillingham	La Follette	Smith, Mich.
Burkett	Dixon	Lodge	Smoot
Burnham	Dolliver	Lorimer	Sutherland
Burrows	du Pont	*McEnery*	Warner
Burton	Elkins	Nixon	Warren
Carter	Flint	Oliver	Wetmore

NOT VOTING—13.

Bourne	Guggenheim	*Rayner*	*Taylor*
Clarke, Ark.	Kean	Richardson	
Depew	*Paynter*	*Smith, S. C.*	
Frazier	Perkins	Stephenson	

So Mr. McLaurin's amendment to the amendment of the committee was rejected.

To the above-stated committee amendment imposing a duty on hides, Mr. Stone, of Missouri, offered an amendment so that the section when amended would read as follows:

447½. Hides of cattle, raw or uncured, whether dry, salted, or pickled, leather made from the hides of cattle; boots and shoes made of leather, or of which leather is the component material of chief value; harness, saddles, and saddlery, finished or unfinished, made of leather, or of which leather is the component material of chief value; bands and belting, made of leather, for use on machinery; all the foregoing shall be admitted free of duty.

Upon the question of the adoption of this amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3691, June 22, 1909):

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 48, as follows:

YEAS—26.

Bacon	*Culberson*	La Follette	*Simmons*
Bailey	Cummins	*McLaurin*	*Smith, Md.*
Bristow	*Daniel*	*Martin*	*Stone*
Chamberlain	*Davis*	*Money*	*Taliaferro*
Clapp	*Fletcher*	*Overman*	*Tillman*
Clay	*Gore*	*Owen*	
Crawford	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Shively*	

NAYS—48.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Oliver
Beveridge	Crane	Gamble	Page
Borah	Cullom	Hale	Penrose
Bradley	Curtis	Heyburn	Piles
Brandegee	Dick	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Brown	Dillingham	Jones	Scott
Bulkeley	Dixon	Lodge	Smith, Mich.
Burkett	Dolliver	Lorimer	Smoot
Burnham	du Pont	McCumber	Sutherland
Burrows	Elkins	*McEnery*	Warner
Burton	Flint	Nelson	Warren
Carter	Frye	Nixon	Wetmore

NOT VOTING—18.

Bankhead	*Foster*	*Newlands*	*Smith, S. C.*
Bourne	*Frazier*	*Paynter*	Stephenson
Briggs	Guggenheim	Perkins	*Taylor*
Clarke, Ark.	*Hughes*	*Rayner*	
Depew	Kean	Richardson	

So Mr. Stone's amendment to the amendment of the committee was rejected.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Upon the question of the adoption of the committee amendment No. 447½, *imposing a 15 per cent duty on hides*, the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3703, June 22, 1909):

The roll call having been concluded, the result was announced—yeas 46, nays 30, as follows:

YEAS—46.

Aldrich	*Culberson*	Guggenheim	Piles
Bailey	Cummins	Hale	Scott
Borah	Curtis	Heyburn	*Smith, Md.*
Bradley	Dick	*Hughes*	Smoot
Brandegee	Dixon	Johnson, N. Dak.	Stone
Bristow	Dolliver	Jones	Sutherland
Brown	Elkins	Lorimer	*Taliaferro*
Bulkeley	*Fletcher*	McCumber	Warner
Burkett	Flint	*McEnery*	Warren
Carter	*Foster*	*Newlands*	Wetmore
Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Nixon	
Crawford	Gamble	Penrose	

NAYS—30.

Bacon	Clapp	*Gore*	Page
Bankhead	*Clay*	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Paynter*
Beveridge	Crane	La Follette	Root
Briggs	Cullom	Lodge	*Shively*
Burnham	*Daniel*	*Martin*	Smith, Mich.
Burrows	*Davis*	Nelson	*Tillman*
Burton	du Pont	*Overman*	
Chamberlain	Frye	*Owen*	

NOT VOTING—16.

Bourne	*Frazier*	Oliver	*Simmons*
Clarke, Ark.	Kean	Perkins	*Smith, S. C.*
Depew	*McLaurin*	*Rayner*	Stephenson
Dillingham	*Money*	Richardson	*Taylor*

So the amendment of the Committee on Finance was agreed to.

To paragraph 197 Mr. McCumber proposed an amendment, as follows:

Sawed lumber, not specially provided for in this section, $1 per thousand feet board measure.

Upon the question of the adoption of this amendment, the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3709, June 23):

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 44, as follows:

YEAS—26.

Bankhead	Clapp	Gamble	Nelson
Beveridge	*Clay*	*Gore*	*Overman*
Bristow	Crawford	*Hughes*	*Paynter*
Brown	Cummins	*Johnston, Ala.*	Smith, Mich.
Burkett	Curtis	La Follette	*Tillman*
Burton	*Davis*	McCumber	
Carter	Dolliver	*McLaurin*	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—44.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Guggenheim	Perkins
Bacon	Crane	Hale	Piles
Bailey	Cullom	Heyburn	Root
Borah	Depew	Jones	Scott
Bradley	Dick	Kean	*Simmons*
Brandegee	Dillingham	Lodge	*Smith, Md.*
Briggs	Dixon	*Martin*	Smoot
Bulkeley	*Fletcher*	*Money*	Sutherland
Burnham	Flint	Oliver	*Taliaferro*
Burrows	*Foster*	Page	*Taylor*
Chamberlain	Gallinger	Penrose	Warren

NOT VOTING—22.

Bourne	*Frazier*	Nixon	Stephenson
Clarke, Ark.	Frye	*Owen*	*Stone*
Culberson	Johnson, N. Dak.	*Rayner*	Warner
Daniel	Lorimer	Richardson	Wetmore
du Pont	*McEnery*	*Shively*	
Elkins	*Newlands*	*Smith, S. C.*	

So Mr. McCumber's amendment to the amendment of the committee was rejected.

Mr. McCumber further offered an amendment to the committee amendment to reduce the duty by striking out the duties prescribed in the committee amendment and inserting the following in lieu thereof:

For one side so planed or finished, 25 cents per 1,000 feet board measure; for planing or finishing on one side and tonguing and grooving or for planing or finishing on two sides, 50 cents per 1,000 feet board measure; for planing or finishing on three sides, 75 cents per 1,000 feet board measure; for planing or finishing on two sides and tonguing and grooving, 75 cents; for planing and finishing on four sides, $1 per 1,000 feet board measure; and in estimating board measure under this schedule no deduction shall be made on board measure on account of planing, tonguing, and grooving.

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment, the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3717, June 23):

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 49, as follows:

YEAS—30.

Bacon	*Clay*	*Gore*	*Overman*
Beveridge	Crawford	*Hughes*	*Owen*
Bristow	Cummins	Johnson, N. Dak.	*Paynter*
Brown	Curtis	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Rayner*
Burkett	*Davis*	La Follette	*Stone*
Burton	Dolliver	McCumber	*Tillman*
Carter	du Pont	*McLaurin*	
Clapp	Gamble	Nelson	

NAYS—49.

Aldrich	Depew	Lodge	*Simmons*
Borah	Dick	Lorimer	*Smith, Md.*
Bourne	Dillingham	*McEnery*	Smith, Mich.
Bradley	Dixon	*Martin*	Smoot
Brandegee	Elkins	*Money*	Sutherland
Briggs	*Fletcher*	Nixon	*Taliaferro*
Bulkeley	*Foster*	Oliver	*Taylor*
Burnham	Frye	Page	Warner
Burrows	Gallinger	Penrose	Warren
Chamberlain	Guggenheim	Perkins	Wetmore
Clark, Wyo.	Hale	Piles	
Crane	Heyburn	Root	
Cullom	Kean	Scott	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NOT VOTING—13.

Bailey	*Daniel*	*Newlands*	Stephenson
Bankhead	Flint	Richardson	
Clarke, Ark.	*Frazier*	*Shively*	
Culberson	Jones	*Smith, S. C.*	

So Mr. McCumber's amendment to the amendment of the committee was rejected.

Upon the question of the adoption of the committee amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3718, June 23, 1909):

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 28, as follows:

YEAS—50.

Aldrich	Crane	Hale	Root
Bacon	*Daniel*	Heyburn	Scott
Bailey	Depew	Kean	*Simmons*
Borah	Dick	Lodge	*Smith, Md.*
Bourne	Dillingham	Lorimer	Smoot
Bradley	Dixon	*McEnery*	Sutherland
Brandegee	du Pont	*Martin*	*Taliaferro*
Briggs	Elkins	Nixon	*Taylor*
Bulkeley	*Fletcher*	Oliver	Warner
Burnham	*Foster*	Page	Warren
Carter	Frye	Penrose	Wetmore
Chamberlain	Gallinger	Perkins	
Clark, Wyo.	Guggenheim	Piles	

NAYS—28

Bankhead	*Clay*	*Gore*	*Overman*
Beveridge	Crawford	*Hughes*	*Owen*
Bristow	Cummins	Johnson, N. Dak.	*Paynter*
Brown	Curtis	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Rayner*
Burkett	*Davis*	La Follette	Smith, Mich.
Burton	Dolliver	McCumber	*Stone*
Clapp	Gamble	Nelson	*Tillman*

NOT VOTING—14.

Burrows	Flint	*Money*	*Smith, S. C.*
Clarke, Ark	*Frazier*	*Newlands*	Stephenson
Culberson	Jones	Richardson	
Cullom	*McLaurin*	*Shively*	

So the amendment as modified was agreed to.

Mr. Taliaferro offered the following amendment:

275. Pineapples in barrels or other packages, one-half of 1 cent per pound; in bulk, $8 per thousand.

On the question of the adoption of this amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3743, June 23):

The result was announced—yeas 34, nays 30, as follows:

YEAS—34.

Bailey	Dick	Heyburn	Scott
Borah	Dixon	Johnson, N. Dak.	*Simmons*
Brandegee	du Pont	Lorimer	*Taliaferro*
Bulkeley	*Fletcher*	*McEnery*	*Taylor*
Burnham	*Foster*	Oliver	Warner
Carter	Frye	Page	Warren
Chamberlain	Gallinger	Penrose	Wetmore
Clapp	Guggenheim	Perkins	
Clay	Hale	Piles	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—30.

Aldrich	Crane	Kean	*Rayner*
Beveridge	Crawford	La Follette	Root
Briggs	Cullom	Lodge	*Smith, Md.*
Bristow	Cummins	McCumber	Smoot
Brown	Curtis	*Martin*	Sutherland
Burkett	*Davis*	Nelson	*Tillman*
Burrows	Gamble	*Overman*	
Burton	*Gore*	*Paynter*	

NOT VOTING—28.

Bacon	*Daniel*	*Hughes*	*Owen*
Bankhead	Depew	*Johnston, Ala.*	Richardson
Bourne	Dillingham	Jones	*Shively*
Bradley	Dolliver	*McLaurin*	Smith, Mich.
Clark, Wyo.	Elkins	*Money*	*Smith, S. C.*
Clarke, Ark.	Flint	*Newlands*	Stephenson
Culberson	*Frazier*	Nixon	*Stone*

So Mr. Taliaferro's amendment to the amendment of the committee was agreed to.

The Finance Committee, as a substitute to paragraph 424, offered an amendment *imposing a duty of 60 cents a ton on coal, bituminous and shale.* Mr. McCumber offered an amendment to the substitute striking out "sixty" and inserting "forty," so that the duty would be 40 cents per ton. Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment to the committee amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3754, June 23, 1909):

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 45, as follows:

YEAS—28.

Bacon	*Clay*	Gamble	Nelson
Bristow	Crawford	*Gore*	*Overman*
Brown	Cummins	*Hughes*	*Paynter*
Burkett	Curtis	Johnson, N. Dak.	*Rayner*
Burton	*Davis*	*Johnston, Ala.*	Root
Carter	Dolliver	La Follette	*Smith, S. C.*
Clapp	*Fletcher*	McCumber	*Stone*

NAYS—45.

Aldrich	*Daniel*	Jones	*Simmons*
Bailey	Depew	Kean	*Smith, Md.*
Borah	Dick	Lodge	Smith, Mich.
Brandegee	Dillingham	Lorimer	Smoot
Briggs	Dixon	*McEnery*	Sutherland
Bulkeley	du Pont	*Martin*	*Taliaferro*
Burnham	Elkins	Oliver	*Tillman*
Burrows	*Foster*	Page	Warner
Chamberlain	Gallinger	Penrose	Wetmore
Clark, Wyo.	Guggenheim	Perkins	
Crane	Hale	Piles	
Cullom	Heyburn	Scott	

NOT VOTING—19.

Bankhead	*Culberson*	*Money*	*Shively*
Beveridge	Flint	*Newlands*	Stephenson
Bourne	*Frazier*	Nixon	*Taylor*
Bradley	Frye	*Owen*	Warren
Clarke, Ark.	*McLaurin*	Richardson	

So the amendment of Mr. McCumber to the amendment of the committee was rejected.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

To paragraph 448, imposing a duty of 15 per cent ad valorem on boots and shoes made of leather, the Finance Committee offered an amendment *increasing the duty to 20 per cent ad valorem.* Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment thus increasing the duty the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3833, June 24):

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 24, as follows:

YEAS—32.

Aldrich	Carter	du Pont	Oliver
Borah	Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Page
Brandegee	Crane	Guggenheim	Penrose
Bulkeley	Depew	Hale	Root
Burkett	Dick	Heyburn	Smoot
Burnham	Dillingham	Johnson, N. Dak.	Sutherland
Burrows	Dixon	Kean	Warner
Burton	Dolliver	Lodge	Wetmore

NAYS—24.

Bacon	Crawford	*Gore*	*Newlands*
Bankhead	Cummins	*Hughes*	*Paynter*
Bristow	Curtis	*Johnson, Ala.*	*Shively*
Chamberlain	*Davis*	La Follette	*Simmons*
Clapp	*Fletcher*	*Martin*	*Stone*
Clay	Gamble	Nelson	*Tillman*

NOT VOTING—36.

Bailey	*Daniel*	*McEnery*	Richardson
Beveridge	Elkins	*McLaurin*	Scott
Bourne	Flint	*Money*	*Smith, Md.*
Bradley	*Foster*	Nixon	Smith, Mich.
Briggs	*Frazier*	*Overman*	*Smith, S. C.*
Brown	Frye	*Owen*	Stephenson
Clarke, Ark.	Jones	Perkins	*Taliaferro*
Culberson	Lorimer	Piles	*Taylor*
Cullom	McCumber	*Rayner*	Warren

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. Bristow proposed an amendment by striking out paragraph 448 as amended and to substitute in lieu thereof the following paragraph placing hides and leather and the manufactured products thereof on the free list:

Hides of cattle, raw or uncured, whether dry, salted, or pickled, harness, saddles, saddlery in sets or in parts, finished or unfinished, band, bend, or belting leather, rough leather, sole leather, dressed upper, and all other leather; calfskins, tanned or untanned and dressed; kangaroo, sheep, and goat skins (including lamb and kid skins), dressed and finished; skins and bookbinders' calfskins, glove leather, leather shoe laces, finished or unfinished, and boots and shoes made of leather shall be admitted into the ports of the United States free of duty: Provided, That articles mentioned in this paragraph, if imported from a country which levies an import duty on like articles imported from the United States, shall be subject to the rate of duty existing prior to the passage of this act.

Mr. Aldrich moved to lay the amendment on the table.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Upon the question of the adoption of the motion to lay the amendment on the table the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3834, June 24):

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 23, as follows:

YEAS—33.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Gamble	Penrose
Brandegee	Crane	Guggenheim	Root
Briggs	Depew	Hale	Smoot
Bulkeley	Dick	Heyburn	Warner
Burkett	Dillingham	Johnson, N. Dak.	Warren
Burnham	Dixon	Kean	Wetmore
Burrows	du Pont	Lodge	
Burton	Flint	Oliver	
Carter	Gallinger	Page	

NAYS—23.

Bacon	Crawford	*Hughes*	*Paynter*
Bankhead	Cummins	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Shively*
Bristow	Curtis	La Follette	*Simmons*
Chamberlain	*Davis*	*Martin*	*Stone*
Clapp	*Fletcher*	Nelson	*Tillman*
Clay	*Gore*	*Newlands*	

NOT VOTING—36.

Bailey	*Daniel*	*McEnery*	Richardson
Beveridge	Dolliver	*McLaurin*	Scott
Borah	Elkins	*Money*	*Smith, Md.*
Bourne	*Foster*	Nixon	Smith, Mich.
Bradley	*Frazier*	*Overman*	*Smith, S. C.*
Brown	Frye	*Owen*	Stephenson
Clarke, Ark.	Jones	Perkins	Sutherland
Culberson	Lorimer	Piles	*Taliaferro*
Cullom	McCumber	*Rayner*	*Taylor*

So Mr. Bristow's amendment was laid on the table.

Mr. Cummins offered an amendment to paragraph 116, *striking therefrom so much thereof as imposed a duty of $2.50 per ton on wrought and cast scrap iron and scrap steel.*

Upon the question of the adoption of this amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3880, June 25, 1909):

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 42, as follows:

YEAS—28.

Bacon	*Culberson*	*Fletcher*	*Money*
Beveridge	Cummins	*Frazier*	Nelson
Bristow	Curtis	Gamble	*Newlands*
Brown	*Daniel*	*Gore*	*Overman*
Chamberlain	*Davis*	*Hughes*	*Smith, Md.*
Clay	Dolliver	La Follette	*Stone*
Crawford	du Pont	*Martin*	*Taliaferro*

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—42.

Aldrich	Crane	*Johnston, Ala.*	Root
Bankhead	Cullom	Jones	Scott
Bradley	Dick	Kean	Smoot
Brandegee	Dillingham	Lodge	Sutherland
Bulkeley	Flint	*McEnery*	*Taylor*
Burkett	*Foster*	Nixon	*Tillman*
Burnham	Gallinger	Oliver	Warner
Burrows	Guggenheim	Page	Warren
Burton	Hale	Penrose	Wetmore
Carter	Heyburn	Perkins	
Clark, Wyo.	Johnson, N. Dak.	Piles	

NOT VOTING—22.

Bailey	Depew	*McLaurin*	*Simmons*
Borah	Dixon	*Owen*	Smith, Mich.
Bourne	Elkins	*Paynter*	*Smith, S. C.*
Briggs	Frye	*Rayner*	Stephenson
Clapp	Lorimer	Richardson	
Clarke, Ark.	McCumber	*Shively*	

So the amendment of Mr. Cummins was rejected.

Mr. Cummins offered further amendment to said paragraph 116, *by striking out $2.50 per ton, the duty imposed in said paragraph on iron in pigs, etc., and wrought and cast scrap iron and scrap steel, and inserting $1 as the rate of duty in lieu thereof.*

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3881, June 25, 1909):

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 45, as follows:

YEAS—26.

Bacon	*Clay*	*Fletcher*	*Newlands*
Beveridge	Crawford	*Frazier*	*Overman*
Borah	*Culberson*	Gamble	*Owen*
Bristow	Cummins	*Gore*	*Paynter*
Brown	Curtis	*Hughes*	*Taliaferro*
Burkett	*Davis*	La Follette	
Chamberlain	Dolliver	Nelson	

NAYS—45.

Aldrich	Daniel	*Johnston, Ala.*	Root
Bankhead	Depew	Jones	Scott
Bradley	Dick	Kean	Smoot
Brandegee	Dillingham	Lodge	Sutherland
Briggs	du Pont	*McEnery*	*Taylor*
Bulkeley	Flint	*Martin*	*Tillman*
Burnham	Frye	Nixon	Warner
Burrows	Gallinger	Oliver	Warren
Burton	Guggenheim	Page	Wetmore
Carter	Hale	Penrose	
Crane	Heyburn	Perkins	
Cullom	Johnson, N. Dak.	Piles	

NOT VOTING—21.

Bailey	Elkins	*Rayner*	*Smith, S. C.*
Bourne	*Foster*	Richardson	Stephenson
Clapp	Lorimer	*Shively*	*Stone*
Clark, Wyo.	McCumber	*Simmons*	
Clarke, Ark.	*McLaurin*	*Smith, Md.*	
Dixon	*Money*	Smith, Mich.	

So Mr. Cummins's amendment was rejected.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

The Finance Committee offered an amendment to paragraph 160 *increasing the duty of one-fourth of 1 cent per pound on wire nails to one-half of 1 cent per pound;* also further amendment to said paragraph *increasing the duty on wire nails of less size from one-half of 1 cent per pound to three-fourths of 1 cent per pound.* Upon the question of the adoption of this amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3885, June 25, 1909):

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 33, as follows:

YEAS—41.

Aldrich	Cullom	Heyburn	Piles
Brandegee	Depew	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Briggs	Dick	Jones	Scott
Bulkeley	Dillingham	Kean	Smoot
Burkett	du Pont	Lodge	Sutherland
Burnham	Elkins	*McEnery*	Warner
Burrows	Flint	Nixon	Warren
Burton	Frye	Oliver	Wetmore
Carter	Gallinger	Page	
Clark, Wyo.	Guggenheim	Penrose	
Crane	Hale	Perkins	

NAYS—33.

Bacon	*Clay*	Gamble	*Paynter*
Bailey	Crawford	*Gore*	*Smith, Md.*
Bankhead	Cummins	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Stone*
Beveridge	Curtis	La Follette	*Taliaferro*
Borah	*Daniel*	*Martin*	*Taylor*
Bristow	*Davis*	*Money*	*Tillman*
Brown	Dolliver	Nelson	
Chamberlain	*Fletcher*	*Overman*	
Clapp	*Frazier*	*Owen*	

NOT VOTING—18.

Bourne	*Foster*	*Newlands*	Smith, Mich.
Bradley	*Hughes*	*Rayner*	*Smith, S. C.*
Clarke, Ark.	Lorimer	Richardson	Stephenson
Culberson	McCumber	*Shively*	
Dixon	*McLaurin*	*Simmons*	

So the committee amendments were agreed to.

To paragraph 181 Mr. Heyburn offered the following amendments:

In the rate of duty prescribed for monazite sand and thorite, to strike out "4" and insert "6 cents per pound," and add thereafter the following words:

"Thorium, oxide of and salts of, and gas mantles treated with chemicals or metallic oxides, 60 per cent ad valorem. Gas-mantle scrap, consisting in chief value of metallic oxide, 20 per cent ad valorem."

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3894, June 25):

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 24, as follows:

YEAS—39.

Aldrich	Cullom	Heyburn	Penrose
Borah	Depew	Johnson, N. Dak.	Piles
Brandegee	Dick	Jones	Root
Briggs	du Pont	Kean	Scott
Bulkeley	Elkins	Lodge	Smoot
Burrows	Flint	McCumber	Sutherland
Burton	Frye	*McEnery*	Warner
Carter	Gallinger	Nixon	Warren
Clark, Wyo.	Guggenheim	Oliver	Wetmore
Crane	Hale	Page	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—24.

Bankhead	Clapp	Dolliver	La Follette
Beveridge	Crawford	*Fletcher*	*Martin*
Bristow	Cummins	*Foster*	*Money*
Brown	Curtis	*Frazier*	Nelson
Burkett	*Daniel*	Gamble	*Paynter*
Chamberlain	*Davis*	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Shively*

NOT VOTING—29.

Bacon	Dillingham	*Owen*	Stephenson
Bailey	Dixon	Perkins	*Stone*
Bourne	*Gore*	*Rayner*	*Taliaferro*
Bradley	*Hughes*	Richardson	*Taylor*
Burnham	Lorimer	*Simmons*	*Tillman*
Clarke, Ark.	*McLaurin*	*Smith, Md.*	
Clay	*Newlands*	Smith, Mich.	
Culberson	*Overman*	*Smith, S. C.*	

So Mr. Heyburn's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. Penrose offered an amendment proposing a duty upon petroleum, as follows:

87½. Petroleum, crude, one-half cent per gallon.

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3908, June 25):

The result was announced—yeas 34, nays 40, as follows:

YEAS—34

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Guggenheim	Perkins
Borah	Cullom	Hale	Scott
Brandegee	Curtis	Heyburn	Smoot
Briggs	Depew	Kean	Sutherland
Bulkeley	Dick	*McEnery*	Warner
Burnham	du Pont	Nixon	Warren
Burrows	Elkins	Oliver	Wetmore
Burton	Flint	*Owen*	
Carter	Frye	Penrose	

NAYS—40.

Bacon	Crawford	*Gore*	*Overman*
Bailey	*Culberson*	*Hughes*	Page
Bankhead	Cummins	Johnson, N. Dak.	*Paynter*
Bristow	*Davis*	*Johnston, Ala.*	Piles
Brown	Dillingham	Jones	Root
Burkett	Dolliver	La Follette	*Shively*
Chamberlain	*Fletcher*	McCumber	Smith, Mich.
Clapp	*Foster*	*Martin*	*Stone*
Clay	*Frazier*	Nelson	*Taliaferro*
Crane	Gamble	*Newlands*	*Tillman*

NOT VOTING—18.

Beveridge	Dixon	*Money*	*Smith, S. C.*
Bourne	Gallinger	*Rayner*	Stephenson
Bradley	Lodge	Richardson	*Taylor*
Clarke, Ark.	Lorimer	*Simmons*	
Daniel	*McLaurin*	*Smith, Md.*	

So Mr. Penrose's amendment was rejected.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Mr. Bacon offered an amendment to place agricultural implements on the free list by inserting the following paragraph:

651½. Plows, tooth and disk harrows, harvesters, forage and feed cutters, reapers, agricultural drills and planters, mowers, horse rakes, cultivators, thrashing machines, and cotton gins: Provided, That articles mentioned in this paragraph, if imported from a country which lays an import duty on like articles imported from the United States, shall be subject to duties existing prior to the passage of this act.

Upon the question of the adoption of the foregoing paragraph the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3939, June 26):

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 45, as follows:

YEAS—26.

Bacon	*Fletcher*	*Martin*	*Smith, Md.*
Bailey	*Foster*	*Money*	*Stone*
Bankhead	*Frazier*	*Newlands*	*Taliaferro*
Bristow	*Gore*	*Overman*	*Taylor*
Chamberlain	*Hughes*	*Owen*	*Tillman*
Clapp	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Paynter*	
Culberson	La Follette	*Shively*	

NAYS—45.

Aldrich	Crane	Gallinger	Penrose
Borah	Crawford	Gamble	Perkins
Bradley	Cullom	Guggenheim	Piles
Brandegee	Curtis	Hale	Scott
Briggs	Depew	Heyburn	Smoot
Brown	Dick	Johnson, N. Dak.	Sutherland
Burkett	Dillingham	Jones	Warner
Burnham	Dolliver	Kean	Warren
Burrows	du Pont	McCumber	Wetmore
Burton	Elkins	Nixon	
Carter	Flint	Oliver	
Clark, Wyo.	Frye	Page	

NOT VOTING—21.

Beveridge	*Daniel*	*McLaurin*	Smith, Mich.
Bourne	*Davis*	Nelson	*Smith, S. C.*
Bulkeley	Dixon	*Rayner*	Stephenson
Clarke, Ark.	Lodge	Richardson	
Clay	Lorimer	Root	
Cummins	*McEnery*	*Simmons*	

So the amendment of Mr. Bacon was rejected.

To paragraph 194, Mr Beveridge offered an amendment *reducing the duty on cash registers from 30 per cent ad valorem to 15 per cent ad valorem.* Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3946, June 26):

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 33, as follows:

YEAS—31.

Bacon	*Culberson*	Gamble	*Money*
Bankhead	Cullom	*Gore*	*Overman*
Beveridge	Cummins	*Hughes*	*Owen*
Bristow	Curtis	Johnson, N. Dak.	*Shively*
Brown	*Davis*	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Smith, Md.*
Burkett	Dolliver	La Follette	Smith, Mich
Chamberlain	*Fletcher*	McCumber	*Tillman*
Clapp	*Frazier*	*McLaurin*	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—33.

Aldrich	Depew	Jones	Scott
Borah	Dick	Kean	Smoot
Brandegee	Dillingham	*McEnery*	Sutherland
Briggs	Elkins	Nixon	Warner
Burnham	Flint	Oliver	Warren
Burrows	Gallinger	Page	Wetmore
Burton	Guggenheim	Penrose	
Carter	Hale	Perkins	
Crane	Heyburn	Root	

NOT VOTING—28.

Bailey	Crawford	Lorimer	Richardson
Bourne	*Daniel*	*Martin*	*Simmons*
Bradley	Dixon	Nelson	*Smith, S. C.*
Bulkeley	du Pont	*Newlands*	Stephenson
Clark, Wyo.	*Foster*	*Paynter*	*Stone*
Clarke, Ark.	Frye	Piles	*Taliaferro*
Clay	Lodge	*Rayner*	*Taylor*

So Mr. Beveridge's amendment was rejected.

Mr. Davis offered the following amendment:

472½. Sawed boards, planks, deals, and all other lumber of white wood, sycamore, basswood, and all sawed lumber of every kind, whether dressed or undressed, finished or unfinished, shall be admitted free of duty.

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3949, June 26):

The result was announced—yeas 18, nays 37, as follows:

YEAS—18.

Beveridge	Crawford	*Gore*	*Shively*
Bristow	Cummins	Johnson, N. Dak.	*Stone*
Brown	*Davis*	La Follette	*Tillman*
Burkett	*Frazier*	Nelson	
Clapp	Gamble	*Owen*	

NAYS—37.

Aldrich	Cullom	Heyburn	Piles
Borah	Depew	Jones	Root
Brandegee	Dick	Kean	*Smith, Md.*
Briggs	Dillingham	*McEnery*	Smoot
Burnham	Dolliver	*Money*	Sutherland
Burrows	Flint	Nixon	Warner
Burton	*Foster*	Oliver	Wetmore
Chamberlain	Frye	Page	
Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Penrose	
Crane	Hale	Perkins	

NOT VOTING—37.

Bacon	Curtis	Lorimer	*Simmons*
Bailey	*Daniel*	McCumber	Smith, Mich.
Bankhead	Dixon	*McLaurin*	*Smith, S. C.*
Bourne	du Pont	*Martin*	Stephenson
Bradley	Elkins	*Newlands*	*Taliaferro*
Bulkeley	*Fletcher*	*Overman*	*Taylor*
Carter	Guggenheim	*Paynter*	Warren
Clarke, Ark.	*Hughes*	*Rayner*	
Clay	*Johnston, Ala.*	Richardson	
Culberson	Lodge	Scott	

So Mr. Davis's amendment was rejected.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

To paragraph 349 Mr. Jones offered the following amendment:

Except jute grain bags, known commercially as standard Calcutta 22 inches by 32 inches grain bags, which shall be admitted free of duty.

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3953, June 26):

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 33, as follows:

YEAS—25.

Bacon	Cummins	Johnson, N. Dak.	Piles
Bankhead	*Davis*	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Shively*
Bristow	*Fletcher*	Jones	*Stone*
Brown	*Foster*	La Follette	*Tillman*
Chamberlain	*Frazier*	Nelson	
Clapp	*Gore*	*Overman*	
Crawford	*Hughes*	*Owen*	

NAYS—33.

Aldrich	Cullom	Heyburn	Smith, Mich.
Brandegee	Depew	Kean	Smoot
Briggs	Dick	*McEnery*	Sutherland
Burnham	Dolliver	Nixon	Warner
Burrows	Flint	Oliver	Warren
Burton	Frye	Page	Wetmore
Carter	Gallinger	Penrose	
Clark, Wyo.	Gamble	Perkins	
Crane	Hale	Root	

NOT VOTING—34.

Bailey	*Culberson*	Lorimer	Scott
Beveridge	Curtis	McCumber	*Simmons*
Borah	*Daniel*	*McLaurin*	*Smith, Md.*
Bourne	Dillingham	*Martin*	*Smith, S. C.*
Bradley	Dixon	*Money*	Stephenson
Bulkeley	du Pont	*Newlands*	*Taliaferro*
Burkett	Elkins	*Paynter*	*Taylor*
Clarke, Ark.	Guggenheim	*Rayner*	
Clay	Lodge	Richardson	

So the amendment of Mr. Jones was rejected.

Mr. Cummins offered the following amendments reducing duties in the metal schedule:

Paragraph 116. It is proposed to strike out paragraph 116 and substitute the following:

"*116. Iron in pigs, iron kentledge, spiegeleisen, and ferromanganese, $1.50 per ton; wrought and cast scrap iron and scrap steel, 50 cents per ton; but nothing shall be deemed scrap iron or scrap steel except waste or refuse iron or steel which, having at one time been advanced in manufacture to the final form for use, and, having been used, has by such use become unfit for further use, and has become fit only to be remanufactured.*"

Paragraph 118. In line 7 of paragraph 118 strike out the word "six-tenths" and insert "four-tenths;" and in line 11 strike out the word "four-tenths" and insert "one-fourth."

Paragraph 119. Strike out the paragraph and substitute the following therefor:

"*119. Beams, girders, joists, angles, channels, car-truck channels, tees, columns and posts or parts or sections of columns and posts, deck and bulb beams, and building forms, together with all other structural shapes of iron or steel, whether plain, punched, or fitted for use, assembled and manufactured, three-tenths of 1 cent per pound.*"

Paragraph 124. Strike out of line 22 the word "seven-fortieths" and insert "six-fortieths;" and to strike out of line 23 the word "two-tenths" and insert "seven-fortieths."

Paragraph 125. Strike from line 2, page 36, the word "five-tenths" and insert "three-tenths;" and strike from line 4 the word "six-tenths" and insert "four-tenths."

Paragraph 129. In line 16, after the word "blanks," insert the words "two-tenths of 1 cent per pound."

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Paragraph 134. Strike out lines 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and the word "pound" in line 8, and substitute therefor the following:

"*134. Round iron or steel wire, not smaller than No. 13 wire gauge, valued at not more than 2½ cents per pound, three-tenths of 1 cent per pound; smaller than No. 13 and not smaller than No. 16 wire gauge, valued at not more than 3½ cents per pound, five-tenths of 1 cent per pound; smaller than No. 16 wire gauge, and valued at not more than 4 cents per pound, three-fourths of 1 cent per pound.*"

It is also proposed to insert after the word "wire," in line 8, on page 41, the words "not herein specially provided for."

Paragraph 160. Strike out the paragraph and the committee amendments thereto and insert the following:

"*160. Wire nails made of wrought iron or steel, not less than 1 inch in length and not lighter than No. 16 wire gauge, two-fifths of 1 cent per pound; less than 1 inch in length and lighter than No. 16 wire gauge, one-half of 1 cent per pound.*"

Insert as a new paragraph, 160½, as follows:

"*160½. Barbed wire for fencing, two-fifths of 1 cent per pound.*"

By consent of the Senate these several amendments were considered and voted upon en bloc.

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendments the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3974, June 28):

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 40, as follows:

YEAS—31.

Bankhead	Cummins	*Gore*	*Owen*
Borah	Curtis	*Hughes*	*Shively*
Bristow	*Davis*	La Follette	*Smith, S. C.*
Brown	Dolliver	*McLaurin*	*Stone*
Chamberlain	*Fletcher*	*Martin*	*Taliaferro*
Clay	*Foster*	*Money*	*Taylor*
Crawford	*Frazier*	Nelson	*Tillman*
Culberson	Gamble	*Overman*	

NAYS—40.

Aldrich	Crane	Johnson, N. Dak.	Perkins
Bradley	Cullom	Jones	Piles
Brandegee	Depew	Kean	Root
Briggs	Dick	Lodge	Scott
Burkett	Dillingham	McCumber	Smith, Mich.
Burham	Dixon	*McEnery*	Smoot
Burrows	Flint	Nixon	Sutherland
Burton	Gallinger	Oliver	Warner
Carter	Guggenheim	Page	Warren
Clark, Wyo.	Heyburn	Penrose	Wetmore

NOT VOTING—21.

Bacon	*Clarke, Ark.*	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Simmons*
Bailey	*Daniel*	Lorimer	*Smith, Md.*
Beveridge	du Pont	*Newlands*	Stephenson
Bourne	Elkins	*Paynter*	
Burkley	Frye	*Rayner*	
Clapp	Hale	Richardson	

So the amendments of Mr. Cummins were rejected.

Mr. Gore offered the following amendment:

653½. All text-books imported for use in the public schools of any State, Territory, district, or municipality in the United States, or imported for use in any college or university maintained in whole or in part by local or federal taxation, shall be admitted free of duty. And the Secretary of the Treasury is so authorized to prescribe suitable rules and regulations to carry this provision into effect.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3982, June 28, 1909):

The result was announced—yeas 17, nays 45, as follows:

YEAS—17.

Bankhead	*Foster*	*Martin*	*Taylor*
Chamberlain	*Frazier*	*Money*	*Tillman*
Clay	*Gore*	*Overman*	
Davis	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Shively*	
Fletcher	*McEnery*	*Taliaferro*	

NAYS—45.

Aldrich	Burton	Gamble	Perkins
Beveridge	Carter	Guggenheim	Piles
Borah	Crane	Heyburn	Root
Bourne	Cullom	Kean	Scott
Bradley	Curtis	La Follette	Smoot
Brandegee	Depew	Lodge	Sutherland
Briggs	Dick	McCumber	Warner
Bristow	Dillingham	Nelson	Warren
Brown	Dixon	Nixon	Wetmore
Burkett	Dolliver	Oliver	
Burnham	du Pont	Page	
Burrows	Gallinger	Penrose	

NOT VOTING—30.

Bacon	Cummins	Jones	*Simmons*
Bailey	*Daniel*	Lorimer	*Smith, Md.*
Bulkeley	Elkins	*McLaurin*	Smith, Mich.
Clapp	Flint	*Newlands*	*Smith, S. C.*
Clark, Wyo.	Frye	*Owen*	Stephenson
Clarke, Ark.	Hale	*Paynter*	*Stone*
Crawford	*Hughes*	*Rayner*	
Culberson	Johnson, N. Dak.	Richardson	

So Mr. Gore's amendment was rejected.

Mr. Bacon offered an amendment placing salt on the free list by adding the following paragraph to the free list, to be known as paragraph 662½:

Salt in bags, sacks, barrels, or other packages, or in bulk: Provided, That if salt is imported from any country, whether independent or a dependency, which imposes a duty upon salt exported from the United States, then there shall be levied, paid, and collected upon such salt the rate of duty existing prior to the passage of this act.

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3983, June 28):

The result was announced—yeas 18, nays 42, as follows:

YEAS—18.

Bacon	*Davis*	*Martin*	*Taliaferro*
Bankhead	*Fletcher*	*Money*	*Taylor*
Clay	*Frazier*	*Overman*	*Tillman*
Culberson	*Gore*	*Owen*	
Daniel	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Shively*	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—42.

Aldrich	Crane	Gallinger	Penrose
Beveridge	Cullom	Gamble	Perkins
Borah	Curtis	Guggenheim	Root
Bradley	Depew	Heyburn	Scott
Brandegee	Dick	Kean	Smoot
Briggs	Dillingham	Lodge	Sutherland
Burkett	Dixon	McCumber	Warner
Burnham	Dolliver	*McEnery*	Warren
Burrows	du Pont	Nelson	Wetmore
Burton	Flint	Oliver	
Carter	*Foster*	Page	

NOT VOTING—32.

Bailey	*Clarke, Ark.*	Jones	*Rayner*
Bourne	Crawford	La Follette	Richardson
Bristow	Cummins	Lorimer	*Simmons*
Brown	Elkins	*McLaurin*	*Smith, Md.*
Bulkeley	Frye	*Newlands*	Smith, Mich.
Chamberlain	Hale	Nixon	*Smith, S. C.*
Clapp	*Hughes*	*Paynter*	Stephenson
Clark, Wyo.	Johnson, N. Dak.	Piles	*Stone*

So Mr. Bacon's amendment was rejected.

Mr. Bacon then offered an amendment to paragraph 291, to *strike out so much of the paragraph as remitted the duties on imported salt used in curing fish taken by vessels licensed to engage in fisheries, and so forth, and also so much of the paragraph as remitted the duties on imported salt used by exporters in curing meats in the United States.* The paragraph proposed to be stricken out is as follows:

Provided, That imported salt in bond may be used in curing fish taken by vessels licensed to engage in the fisheries and in curing fish on the shores of the navigable waters of the United States under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe; and upon proof that the salt has been used for either of the purposes stated in this proviso, the duties on the same shall be remitted: Provided further, That exporters of meats, whether packed or smoked, which have been cured in the United States with imported salt, shall, upon satisfactory proof, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe, that such meats have been cured with imported salt, have refunded to them from the Treasury the duties paid on the salt so used in curing such exported meats, in amounts not less than $100.

Upon the question of the adoption of this amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3984, June 28, 1909):

The result was announced—yeas 17, nays 39, as follows:

YEAS—17.

Bacon	*Daniel*	*Hughes*	*Owen*
Bankhead	*Davis*	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Taylor*
Bristow	*Foster*	La Follette	
Clay	*Frazier*	*Martin*	
Culberson	*Gore*	*Overman*	

NAYS—39.

Aldrich	Crane	Gallinger	Penrose
Beveridge	Crawford	Gamble	Perkins
Bradley	Cullom	Guggenheim	Root
Brandegee	Curtis	Heyburn	Scott
Briggs	Depew	Kean	Smoot
Burkett	Dick	Lodge	Sutherland
Burnham	Dixon	McCumber	Warner
Burrows	du Pont	*McEnery*	Warren
Burton	Flint	Oliver	Wetmore
Carter	Frye	Page	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NOT VOTING—36.

Bailey	Cummins	*McLaurin*	*Shively*
Borah	Dillingham	*Money*	*Simmons*
Bourne	Dolliver	Nelson	*Smith, Md.*
Brown	Elkins	*Newlands*	Smith, Mich.
Bulkeley	*Fletcher*	Nixon	*Smith, S. C.*
Chamberlain	Hale	*Paynter*	Stephenson
Clapp	Jonhson, N. Dak.	Piles	*Stone*
Clark, Wyo.	Jones	*Rayner*	*Taliaferro*
Clarke, Ark.	Lorimer	Richardson	*Tillman*

So Mr. Bacon's amendment was rejected.

Mr. Culberson proposed the following amendment placing hoop or band iron for baling cotton or any other commodity on the free list, as follows:

583½. Hoop or band iron, or hoop or band steel, cut to lengths, or wholly or partly manufactured into hoops or ties, coated or not coated with paint or any other preparation, with or without buckles or fastenings, for baling cotton or any other commodity.

Upon the question of the adoption of this amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3992, June 28, 1909):

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 38, as follows:

YEAS—31.

Bacon	*Culberson*	Johnson, N. Dak.	*Overman*
Bankhead	Cummins	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Owen*
Beveridge	*Daniel*	La Follette	*Smith, S. C.*
Bristow	*Davis*	*McEnery*	*Stone*
Brown	du Pont	*Martin*	*Taliaferro*
Clapp	*Fletcher*	*Money*	*Taylor*
Clay	*Foster*	Nelson	*Tillman*
Crawford	*Frazier*	*Newlands*	

NAYS—38.

Aldrich	Crane	Gamble	Perkins
Borah	Cullom	Guggenheim	Root
Brandegee	Curtis	Heyburn	Scott
Briggs	Depew	Jones	Smoot
Burkett	Dick	Kean	Sutherland
Burnham	Dillingham	Lodge	Warner
Burrows	Dixon	Nixon	Warren
Burton	Flint	Oliver	Wetmore
Carter	Frye	Page	
Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Penrose	

NOT VOTING—23.

Bailey	Dolliver	McCumber	*Shively*
Bourne	Elkins	*McLaurin*	*Simmons*
Bradley	*Gore*	*Paynter*	*Smith, Md.*
Bulkeley	Hale	Piles	Smith, Mich.
Chamberlain	*Hughes*	*Rayner*	Stephenson
Clarke, Ark.	Lorimer	Richardson	

So Mr. Culberson's amendment was rejected.

Mr. Tillman offered an amendment *placing a duty of 10 cents per pound upon tea*, as follows:

258½. Tea, 10 cents per pound.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 4027, June 29, 1909):

The result was announced—yeas 18, nays 55, as follows:

YEAS—18.

Bailey	Dick	Heyburn	Smith, Mich.
Bradley	du Pont	Nixon	*Tillman*
Bulkeley	Elkins	Perkins	Wetmore
Burnham	Frye	Root	
Carter	Gallinger	Scott	

NAYS—55.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	*Gore*	Oliver
Bacon	*Clay*	*Hughes*	*Overman*
Bankhead	Crawford	Johnson, N. Dak.	*Owen*
Beveridge	*Culberson*	*Johnston, Ala*	Page
Borah	Cullom	Jones	Penrose
Bourne	Cummins	Kean	*Shively*
Brandegee	Curtis	La Follette	*Simmons*
Bristow	*Daniel*	Lodge	*Smith, S. C.*
Brown	*Davis*	Lorimer	Smoot
Burkett	Dillingham	McCumber	*Stone*
Burrows	Dixon	*McLaurin*	Sutherland
Burton	*Fletcher*	*Martin*	*Taylor*
Chamberlain	Flint	Nelson	Warner
Clapp	*Foster*	*Newlands*	

NOT VOTING—19.

Briggs	*Frazier*	*Money*	*Smith, Md.*
Clarke, Ark.	Gamble	*Paynter*	Stephenson
Crane	Guggenheim	Piles	*Taliaferro*
Depew	Hale	*Rayner*	Warren
Dolliver	*McEnery*	Richardson	

So Mr. Tillman's amendment was rejected.

Mr. Aldrich offered an amendment imposing a tax commonly known as the "corporation tax," which is found on page 4029 of the Record, the said amendment being an amendment to the substitute offered by Mr. Lodge for the income-tax amendment offered by Mr. Bailey.

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment offered by Mr. Aldrich, the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 4115, July 2, 1909):

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 31, as follows:

YEAS—45.

Aldrich	Cullom	Guggenheim	Perkins
Bradley	Curtis	Heyburn	Piles
Brandegee	Depew	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Briggs	Dick	Jones	Scott
Brown	Dillingham	Kean	Smoot
Burkett	Dixon	Lodge	Sutherland
Burnham	du Pont	Lorimer	Warner
Burrows	Elkins	McCumber	Warren
Burton	Flint	Nelson	Wetmore
Carter	Frye	Nixon	
Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Page	
Crawford	Gamble	Penrose	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—31.

Bacon	*Culberson*	*Gore*	*Overman*
Bailey	Cummins	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Owen*
Bankhead	*Daniel*	La Follette	*Rayner*
Borah	*Davis*	*McEnery*	*Shively*
Bristow	Dolliver	*McLaurin*	*Stone*
Bulkeley	*Fletcher*	*Martin*	*Taliaferro*
Chamberlain	*Foster*	*Money*	*Taylor*
Clapp	*Frazier*	*Newlands*	

NOT VOTING—16.

Beveridge	Crane	*Paynter*	Smith, Mich
Bourne	Hale	Richardson	*Smith, S. C.*
Clarke, Ark.	*Hughes*	*Simmons*	Stephenson
Clay	Oliver	*Smith, Md.*	*Tillman*

So the amendment of Mr. Aldrich to the substitute of Mr. Lodge was agreed to.

The question then recurred upon the corporation-tax amendment offered by Mr. Aldrich as a substitute for the general income-tax amendment offered by Mr. Bailey. Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment offered by Mr. Aldrich as a substitute the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 4116, July 2, 1909):

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 31, as follows:

YEAS—45.

Aldrich	Cullom	Guggenheim	Perkins
Bradley	Curtis	Heyburn	Piles
Brandegee	Depew	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Briggs	Dick	Jones	Scott
Brown	Dillingham	Kean	Smoot
Burkett	Dixon	Lodge	Sutherland
Burnham	du Pont	Lorimer	Warner
Burrows	Elkins	McCumber	Warren
Burton	Flint	Nelson	Wetmore
Carter	Frye	Nixon	
Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Page	
Crawford	Gamble	Penrose	

NAYS—31.

Bacon	*Culberson*	*Gore*	*Overman*
Bailey	Cummins	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Owen*
Bankhead	*Daniel*	La Follette	*Rayner*
Borah	*Davis*	*McEnery*	*Shively*
Bristow	Dolliver	*McLaurin*	*Stone*
Bulkeley	*Fletcher*	*Martin*	*Taliaferro*
Chamberlain	*Foster*	*Money*	*Taylor*
Clapp	*Frazier*	*Newlands*	

NOT VOTING—16.

Beveridge	Crane	*Paynter*	Smith, Mich.
Bourne	Hale	Richardson	*Smith, S. C.*
Clarke, Ark.	*Hughes*	*Simmons*	Stephenson
Clay	Oliver	*Smith, Md.*	*Tillman*

So Mr. Aldrich's substitute for Mr. Bailey's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. Bacon then offered as an amendment to the substitute as it had been adopted the following as a proviso thereto:

Insert at the conclusion of the first paragraph of section 4:

"*Provided, That the provisions of this section shall not apply to any corporation or association organized and operated for religious, charitable, or educational purposes, no part of the profit of which inures to the benefit of any private stockholder or individual, but all of the profit of which is in good faith devoted to the said religious, charitable, or educational purpose.*

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

"Provided further, That the provisions of this section shall not apply to incorporations or associations of fraternal orders or organizations designed and operated exclusively for mutual benefit or for the mutual assistance of its members.

"Provided further, That the provisions of this section shall not apply to any insurance or other corporations or associations organized and operated exclusively for the mutual benefit of its members in which there are no joint-stock shares entitled to dividends or individual profit to the holders thereof.

"Provided further, That the provisions of this section shall not apply to any corporation or association designed and operated solely for mercantile business the gross sales of which do not exceed $250,000 per annum."

Mr. Aldrich moved to lay the amendment on the table. Upon the question of the adoption of the motion to lay the amendment on the table the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 4117, July 2):

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 32, as follows:

YEAS—42.

Aldrich	Curtis	Guggenheim	Perkins
Bradley	Depew	Heyburn	Piles
Brown	Dick	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Burkett	Dillingham	Jones	Scott
Burnham	Dixon	Kean	Smoot
Burrows	du Pont	Lodge	Sutherland
Burton	Elkins	Lorimer	Warner
Carter	Flint	McCumber	Warren
Clark, Wyo.	Frye	Nelson	Wetmore
Crawford	Gallinger	Page	
Cullom	Gamble	Penrose	

NAYS—32.

Bacon	Clapp	*Frazier*	*Newlands*
Bailey	*Culberson*	*Gore*	*Overman*
Bankhead	Cummins	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Owen*
Borah	*Daniel*	La Follette	*Rayner*
Brandegee	*Davis*	*McEnery*	*Shively*
Bristow	Dolliver	*McLaurin*	*Stone*
Bulkeley	*Fletcher*	*Martin*	*Taliaferro*
Chamberlain	*Foster*	*Money*	*Taylor*

NOT VOTING—18.

Beveridge	Crane	*Paynter*	*Smith, S. C.*
Bourne	Hale	Richardson	Stephenson
Briggs	*Hughes*	*Simmons*	*Tillman*
Clarke, Ark.	Nixon	*Smith, Md.*	
Clay	Oliver	Smith, Mich.	

So Mr. Bacon's amendment to the amendment was laid on the table.

Mr. Bacon then offered an amendment, to be inserted at the conclusion of the substitute as adopted, as follows:

The SECRETARY. At the conclusion of the amendment insert the following, to be known as paragraph 9:

Paragraph 9. That every corporation, joint-stock company and association, and every person in the United States holding the bonds, debentures, or other evidences of indebtedness of any corporation or association organized under the laws of either the United States or of any State or Territory of the United States shall, upon the right to hold and possess said bonds and to collect the principal and interest of said bonds, be subject to pay annually a special excise tax equivalent to 2 per cent upon the annual interest payable upon said bonds.

That every corporation, joint-stock company and association having outstanding bonds upon which interest is payable annually, semiannually, or quarterly, or at less intervals of time, shall on the 1st day of October of each year make out and transmit to the collector of internal revenue for the district in which said corporation, company, or association shall be situated a report of the said outstanding bonds, the denominations of said bonds, the aggre-

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

gate amount of the same, the rate of interest payable on the same, and the dates when said interest is due and payable, which report shall be transmitted forthwith by the collector to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. It shall further be the duty of every such corporation, company, and association when such interest becomes due and payable to deduct and retain the proportion of said amount payable to each of the holders of said bonds, the amount of excise tax payable by said bondholder under the provisions of this section, and to thereafter pay the same to the said collector of internal revenue under the rules and regulations which shall be prescribed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue; and the receipt of the said collector of internal revenue for the said amounts thus paid to him by said corporation, company, or association shall be received by said bondholder, to the extent named therein, in payment of the amount due upon the bond or bonds so held by him.

Mr. Aldrich moved to lay the amendment on the table.

Upon the question of the adoption of the motion to lay the amendment on the table the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 4118, July 2):

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 34, as follows:

YEAS—41.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Perkins
Bradley	Cullom	Guggenheim	Root
Brandegee	Curtis	Heyburn	Scott
Briggs	Depew	Johnson, N. Dak.	Smoot
Brown	Dick	Kean	Sutherland
Bulkeley	Dillingham	Lodge	Warner
Burkett	Dixon	Lorimer	Warren
Burnham	du Pont	McCumber	Wetmore
Burrows	Elkins	Nelson	
Burton	Flint	Page	
Carter	Frye	Penrose	

NAYS—34.

Bacon	Cummins	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Owen*
Bailey	*Daniel*	Jones	Piles
Bankhead	*Davis*	La Follette	*Rayner*
Borah	Dolliver	*McEnery*	*Shively*
Bristow	*Fletcher*	*McLaurin*	*Stone*
Chamberlain	*Foster*	*Martin*	*Taliaferro*
Clapp	*Frazier*	*Money*	*Taylor*
Crawford	Gamble	*Newlands*	
Culberson	*Gore*	*Overman*	

NOT VOTING—17.

Beveridge	Hale	Richardson	Stephenson
Bourne	*Hughes*	*Simmons*	*Tillman*
Clarke, Ark.	Nixon	*Smith, Md.*	
Clay	Oliver	Smith, Mich.	
Crane	*Paynter*	*Smith, S. C.*	

So Mr. Bacon's amendment to the amendment was laid on the table.

The question then recurred on the question of the adoption of the amendment offered by Mr. Aldrich (imposing corporation tax) as it had been amended.

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment as amended the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 4121, July 2, 1909):

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

The result was announced—yeas 59, nays 11, as follows:

YEAS—59.

Aldrich	Cullom	Gamble	Page
Bailey	Curtis	Guggenheim	Penrose
Bankhead	*Daniel*	Johnson, N. Dak.	Perkins
Bradley	*Davis*	*Johnston, Ala.*	Piles
Brandegee	Depew	Jones	*Rayner*
Briggs	Dick	Kean	Root
Brown	Dillingham	Lodge	Scott
Burkett	Dixon	Lorimer	Smoot
Burnham	duPont	McCumber	Sutherland
Burrows	Elkins	*McEnery*	*Taliaferro*
Burton	*Fletcher*	*McLaurin*	*Taylor*
Carter	Flint	*Martin*	Warner
Clark, Wyo.	*Foster*	*Money*	Warren
Crawford	Frye	Nelson	Wetmore
Culberson	Gallinger	*Newlands*	

NAYS—11.

Borah	*Chamberlain*	Dolliver	La Follette
Bristow	Clapp	Heyburn	*Shively*
Bulkeley	Cummins	*Hughes*	

NOT VOTING—22.

Bacon	*Frazier*	*Owen*	*Smith, S. C.*
Beveridge	*Gore*	*Paynter*	Stephenson
Bourne	Hale	Richardson	*Stone*
Clarke, Ark.	Nixon	*Simmons*	*Tillman*
Clay	Oliver	*Smith, Md.*	
Crane	*Overman*	Smith, Mich.	

So the amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. Aldrich moved to amend the bill by the insertion of a new section providing for the maximum and minimum tariff, which is found on page 4154 of the Record. As an amendment to that part of the amendment relating to the appointment of persons by the President to make required investigations, Mr. Culberson offered an amendment, as follows:

Not exceeding seven, not more than four of whom shall belong to any one political party, who shall each receive a salary of $7,500 per annum.

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment to the amendment, the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 4171, July 3, 1909):

The result was announced—yeas 17, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—17.

Bacon	*Frazier*	*Newlands*	*Taliaferro*
Culberson	*Gore*	*Owen*	*Taylor*
Daniel	*Hughes*	*Shively*	
Davis	La Follette	*Simmons*	
Fletcher	*Martin*	*Stone*	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—43.

Aldrich	Burton	Dolliver	Nelson
Borah	Carter	du Pont	Nixon
Bourne	Clapp	Flint	Page
Bradley	Clark, Wyo.	Frye	Penrose
Brandegee	Crawford	Gallinger	Root
Briggs	Cullom	Gamble	Scott
Bristow	Cummins	Heyburn	Smoot
Brown	Curtis	Johnson, N. Dak.	Sutherland
Burkett	Depew	Jones	Warren
Burnham	Dick	Kean	Wetmore
Burrows	Dillingham	McCumber	

NOT VOTING—32.

Bailey	Dixon	*McEnery*	*Rayner*
Bankhead	Elkins	*McLaurin*	Richardson
Beveridge	*Foster*	*Money*	*Smith, Md.*
Bulkeley	Guggenheim	Oliver	Smith, Mich.
Chamberlain	Hale	*Overman*	*Smith, S. C.*
Clarke, Ark.	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Paynter*	Stephenson
Clay	Lodge	Perkins	*Tillman*
Crane	Lorimer	Piles	Warner

So Mr. Culberson's amendment to the amendment was rejected.

To the amendment providing for the maximum and minimum tariff, Mr. Gore offered a substitute, which is found on page 4171 of the Record.

Upon the question of the adoption of the substitute for the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 4172, July 3):

The result was announced—yeas 16, nays 39, as follows:

YEAS—16.

Bacon	*Davis*	*Hughes*	*Shively*
Bristow	*Fletcher*	La Follette	*Simmons*
Clapp	*Frazier*	*Martin*	*Stone*
Culberson	*Gore*	*Owen*	*Taliaferro*

NAYS—39.

Aldrich	Carter	Dolliver	Nixon
Bourne	Clark, Wyo.	du Pont	Page
Bradley	Crawford	Flint	Penrose
Brandegee	Cullom	Gallinger	Root
Briggs	Cummins	Gamble	Scott
Brown	Curtis	Johnson, N. Dak.	Smoot
Burkett	Depew	Jones	Sutherland
Burnham	Dick	Kean	Warren
Burrows	Dillingham	McCumber	Wetmore
Burton	Dixon	Nelson	

NOT VOTING—37.

Bailey	Elkins	*McLaurin*	*Smith, Md.*
Bankhead	*Foster*	*Money*	Smith, Mich.
Beveridge	Frye	*Newlands*	*Smith, S. C.*
Borah	Guggenheim	Oliver	Stephenson
Bulkeley	Hale	*Overman*	*Taylor*
Chamberlain	Heyburn	*Paynter*	*Tillman*
Clarke, Ark.	*Johnston, Ala.*	Perkins	Warner
Clay	Lodge	Piles	
Crane	Lorimer	*Rayner*	
Daniel	*McEnery*	Richardson	

So Mr. Gore's amendment was rejected.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Mr. Dolliver offered an amendment to the amendment creating a customs commission, which is found on page 4172 of the Record.

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 4176, July 3):

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 28, as follows:

YEAS—23.

Bacon	Cummins	*Gore*	*Shively*
Bourne	Curtis	*Hughes*	*Simmons*
Bristow	Dolliver	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Stone*
Burkett	*Fletcher*	Jones	*Taliaferro*
Clapp	*Frazier*	La Follette	*Taylor*
Crawford	Gamble	Nelson	

NAYS—28.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Heyburn	Penrose
Bradley	Cullom	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Briggs	Depew	Kean	Scott
Burnham	Dick	McCumber	Smoot
Burrows	Dillingham	*McEnery*	Sutherland
Burton	Dixon	Nixon	Warren
Carter	Gallinger	Page	Wetmore

NOT VOTING—41.

Bailey	*Culberson*	Lorimer	*Rayner*
Bankhead	*Daniel*	*McLaurin*	Richardson
Beveridge	*Davis*	*Martin*	*Smith, Md.*
Borah	du Pont	*Money*	Smith, Mich.
Brandegee	Elkins	*Newlands*	*Smith, S. C.*
Brown	Flint	Oliver	Stephenson
Bulkeley	*Foster*	*Overman*	*Tillman*
Chamberlain	Frye	*Owen*	Warner
Clarke, Ark.	Guggenheim	*Paynter*	
Clay	Hale	Perkins	
Crane	Lodge	Piles	

So Mr. Dolliver's amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The question then recurred on the amendment offered by Mr. Aldrich, providing *for the maximum and minimum tariff*.

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 4185, July 3):

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 18, as follows:

YEAS—36.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Flint	Nelson
Bourne	Cullom	Frye	Nixon
Bradley	Cummins	Gallinger	Page
Briggs	Curtis	Gamble	Penrose
Brown	Depew	Heyburn	Perkins
Burkett	Dick	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Burnham	Dillingham	Jones	Smoot
Burrows	Dixon	Kean	Sutherland
Carter	Dolliver	McCumber	Wetmore

NAYS—18.

Bacon	*Davis*	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Shively*
Bristow	Fletcher	La Follette	*Simmons*
Burton	*Frazier*	*McEnery*	*Stone*
Crawford	*Gore*	*McLaurin*	
Culberson	*Hughes*	*Newlands*	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NOT VOTING—38.

Bailey	Crane	*Money*	Smith, Mich.
Bankhead	*Daniel*	Oliver	*Smith, S. C.*
Beveridge	du Pont	*Overman*	Stephenson
Borah	Elkins	*Owen*	*Taliaferro*
Brandegee	*Foster*	*Paynter*	*Taylor*
Bulkeley	Guggenheim	Piles	*Tillman*
Chamberlain	Hale	*Rayner*	Warner
Clapp	Lodge	Richardson	Warren
Clarke, Ark.	Lorimer	Scott	
Clay	*Martin*	*Smith, Md.*	

So the amendment of Mr. Aldrich was agreed to.

The Senate having under consideration the joint resolution for amendment to the Constitution authorizing Congress to impose a general income tax, Mr. Bailey offered an amendment providing that the ratification of the amendment should be submitted to conventions called for the purpose instead of to the legislatures of the States, as provided in the resolution.

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment offered by Mr. Bailey the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 4226, July 5, 1909):

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 46, as follows:

YEAS—30.

Bacon	Cummins	Jones	*Shively*
Bailey	*Davis*	La Follette	*Simmons*
Bankhead	*Fletcher*	*McEnery*	*Smith, S. C.*
Borah	*Foster*	*Money*	*Stone*
Bristow	*Frazier*	*Newlands*	*Taliaferro*
Chamberlain	*Gore*	*Overman*	*Taylor*
Clapp	*Hughes*	*Owen*	
Culberson	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Rayner*	

NAYS—46.

Aldrich	Crane	Gallinger	Penrose
Beveridge	Crawford	Gamble	Perkins
Bourne	Cullom	Guggenheim	Root
Bradley	Curtis	Heyburn	Scott
Briggs	*Daniel*	Johnson, N. Dak.	Smoot
Brown	Depew	Kean	Stephenson
Burkett	Dick	McCumber	Sutherland
Burnham	Dillingham	*Martin*	Warner
Burrows	Dixon	Nelson	Warren
Burton	du Pont	Nixon	Wetmore
Carter	Flint	Oliver	
Clark, Wyo.	Frye	Page	

NOT VOTING—16.

Brandegee	Dolliver	Lorimer	Richardson
Bulkeley	Elkins	*McLaurin*	*Smith, Md.*
Clarke, Ark.	Hale	*Paynter*	Smith, Mich.
Clay	Lodge	Piles	*Tillman*

So Mr. Bailey's first amendment was rejected.

The question then recurred upon the adoption of the joint resolution for the amendment of the Constitution as above stated.

Upon the question of the adoption of the resolution the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 4227, July 5, 1909):

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

The result was announced—yeas 77, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—77.

Aldrich	Crawford	Guggenheim	Penrose
Bacon	*Culberson*	Heyburn	Perkins
Bailey	Cullom	*Hughes*	*Rayner*
Bankhead	Cummins	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Beveridge	Curtis	*Johnston, Ala.*	Scott
Borah	*Daniel*	Jones	*Shively*
Bourne	*Davis*	Kean	*Simmons*
Bradley	Depew	La Follette	*Smith, S. C.*
Briggs	Dick	McCumber	Smoot
Bristow	Dillingham	*McEnery*	Stephenson
Brown	Dixon	*McLaurin*	*Stone*
Burkett	du Pont	*Martin*	Sutherland
Burnham	*Fletcher*	*Money*	*Taliaferro*
Burrows	Flint	Nelson	*Taylor*
Burton	*Foster*	*Newlands*	Warner
Carter	*Frazier*	Nixon	Warren
Chamberlain	Frye	Oliver	Wetmore
Clapp	Gallinger	*Overman*	
Clark, Wyo.	Gamble	*Owen*	
Crane	*Gore*	Page	

NOT VOTING—15.

Brandegee	Dolliver	Lorimer	*Smith, Md.*
Bulkeley	Elkins	*Paynter*	Smith, Mich.
Clarke, Ark.	Hale	Piles	*Tillman*
Clay	Lodge	Richardson	

So the joint resolution was passed, two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in favor thereof.

Mr. Bristow offered an amendment reducing the rate of duty prescribed on writing paper in paragraph 409, as follows:

But not exceeding 15 pounds per ream, 2 cents per pound and 10 per cent ad valorem.

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 4300, July 7):

The result was announced—yeas 34, nays 40, as follows:

YEAS—34.

Bacon	*Chamberlain*	*Hughes*	*Owen*
Bailey	Clapp	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Shively*
Bankhead	Crawford	La Follette	*Simmons*
Beveridge	*Culberson*	*McLaurin*	*Smith, S. C.*
Borah	Cummins	*Martin*	*Stone*
Bristow	*Fletcher*	*Money*	*Taliaferro*
Brown	*Frazier*	Nelson	*Taylor*
Burkett	Gamble	*Newlands*	
Burton	*Gore*	*Overman*	

NAYS—40.

Aldrich	Curtis	Heyburn	Perkins
Bourne	Depew	Johnson, N. Dak.	Piles
Brandegee	Dick	Jones	Scott
Briggs	Dixon	Kean	Smith, Mich.
Bulkeley	Dolliver	Lodge	Smoot
Burnham	du Pont	Lorimer	Stephenson
Burrows	Elkins	Nixon	Sutherland
Carter	Flint	Oliver	Warner
Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Page	Warren
Crane	Hale	Penrose	Wetmore

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NOT VOTING—18.

Bradley	*Davis*	McCumber	Root
Clarke, Ark.	Dillingham	*McEnery*	*Smith, Md.*
Clay	*Foster*	*Paynter*	*Tillman*
Cullom	Frye	*Rayner*	
Daniel	Guggenheim	Richardson	

So Mr. Bristow's amendment was rejected.

Mr. Bacon in the Senate again offered the amendment previously offered in the Committee of the Whole, placing agricultural implements on the free list, by adding the following paragraph to the free list of the bill:

651½. Plows, tooth and disk harrows, harvesters, forage and feed cutters, reapers, agricultural drills and planters, mowers, horserakes, cultivators, thrashing machines, and cotton gins: Provided, That articles mentioned in this paragraph, if imported from a country which lays an import duty on like articles imported from the United States, shall be subject to duties existing prior to the passage of this act.

Upon the question of the adoption of this amendment, the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 4302, July 7, 1909):

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 50, as follows:

YEAS—28.

Bacon	*Daniel*	La Follette	*Shively*
Bailey	*Fletcher*	*McEnery*	*Simmons*
Bankhead	*Foster*	*McLaurin*	*Smith, Md.*
Bristow	*Frazier*	*Martin*	*Smith, S. C.*
Chamberlain	*Gore*	*Money*	*Stone*
Clapp	*Hughes*	*Newlands*	*Taliaferro*
Culberson	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Overman*	*Taylor*

NAYS—50.

Aldrich	Crane	Gamble	Penrose
Beveridge	Crawford	Hale	Perkins
Borah	Cummins	Heyburn	Piles
Brandegee	Curtis	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Briggs	Depew	Jones	Smith, Mich.
Brown	Dick	Kean	Smoot
Bulkeley	Dixon	Lodge	Stephenson
Burkett	Dolliver	Lorimer	Sutherland
Burnham	du Pont	McCumber	Warner
Burrows	Elkins	Nelson	Warren
Burton	Flint	Nixon	Wetmore
Carter	Frye	Oliver	
Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Page	

NOT VOTING—14.

Bourne	Cullom	*Owen*	Root
Bradley	*Davis*	*Paynter*	*Tillman*
Clarke, Ark.	Dillingham	*Rayner*	
Clay	Guggenheim	Richardson	

So Mr. Bacon's amendment was rejected.

In the Senate the question was presented on concurring in the amendment *creating a customs court* as provided in sections 29 and 30.

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment, the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 4345, July 7):

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 26, as follows:

YEAS—50.

Aldrich	Curtis	Jones	Piles
Bacon	Depew	Kean	Scott
Bailey	Dick	Lorimer	*Simmons*
Bankhead	Dixon	McCumber	Smith, Mich.
Bradley	du Pont	*McEnery*	Smoot
Brandegee	Elkins	*Money*	Stephenson
Briggs	Flint	Nelson	Sutherland
Bulkeley	*Foster*	*Newlands*	*Taylor*
Burnham	Frye	Nixon	Warner
Burrows	Gallinger	Oliver	Warren
Burton	Hale	Page	Wetmore
Carter	Heyburn	Penrose	
Crane	Johnson, N. Dak.	Perkins	

NAYS—26.

Beveridge	Clark, Wyo.	*Frazier*	*Martin*
Borah	Crawford	Gamble	*Overman*
Bristow	*Culberson*	*Gore*	*Shively*
Brown	Cummins	*Hughes*	*Smith, S. C.*
Burkett	*Daniel*	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Stone*
Chamberlain	Dolliver	La Follette	
Clapp	*Fletcher*	*McLaurin*	

NOT VOTING—16.

Bourne	*Davis*	*Owen*	Root
Clarke, Ark.	Dillingham	*Paynter*	*Smith, Md.*
Clay	Guggenheim	*Rayner*	*Taliaferro*
Cullom	Lodge	Richardson	*Tillman*

So sections 29 and 30 were concurred in.

Mr. Bailey offered an amendment in the Senate for the corporation-tax amendment, which had been adopted in Committee of the Whole, the amendment which was offered by Mr. Bailey being *for the levy and collection of a general income tax*, which is found on pages 4346, 4347, and 4348 of the Record.

Upon the question of the adoption of the substitute the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 4348, July 7):

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 47, as follows:

YEAS—28.

Bacon	*Culberson*	*Hughes*	*Overman*
Bailey	Cummins	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Shively*
Bankhead	*Daniel*	La Follette	*Simmons*
Borah	*Fletcher*	*McLaurin*	*Smith, S. C.*
Bristow	*Foster*	*Martin*	*Stone*
Chamberlain	*Frazier*	*Money*	*Taliaferro*
Clapp	*Gore*	*Newlands*	*Taylor*

NAYS—47.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Gamble	Penrose
Beveridge	Crane	Hale	Perkins
Bradley	Crawford	Heyburn	Piles
Brandegee	Depew	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Briggs	Dick	Jones	Smith, Mich.
Brown	Dixon	Kean	Smoot
Bulkeley	Dolliver	Lorimer	Stephenson
Burkett	du Pont	McCumber	Sutherland
Burnham	Elkins	Nelson	Warner
Burrows	Flint	Nixon	Warren
Burton	Frye	Oliver	Wetmore
Carter	Gallinger	Page	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NOT VOTING—17.

Bourne	*Davis*	*Owen*	*Smith, Md.*
Clarke, Ark.	Dillingham	*Paynter*	*Tillman*
Clay	Guggenheim	*Rayner*	
Cullom	Lodge	Richardson	
Curtis	*McEnery*	Root	

So Mr. Bailey's amendment was rejected.

Mr. Bacon, in the Senate, offered an amendment to the corporation-tax provision, which had been adopted in the Committee of the Whole, the amendment offered being as follows:

Provided, That the provisions of this section shall not apply to any corporation or association designed and operated solely for mercantile business, the gross sales of which do not exceed $150,000 per annum.

Upon the question of the adoption of this amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 4354, July 7):

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 45, as follows:

YEAS—27.

Bacon	Cummins	*Gore*	*Overman*
Bailey	Curtis	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Shively*
Bankhead	*Daniel*	La Follette	*Simmons*
Borah	Dolliver	*McEnery*	*Stone*
Chamberlain	*Fletcher*	*McLaurin*	*Taliaferro*
Clapp	*Foster*	*Money*	*Taylor*
Culberson	*Frazier*	*Newlands*	

NAYS—45.

Aldrich	Carter	Gamble	Piles
Beveridge	Clark, Wyo.	Hale	Scott
Bradley	Crane	Heyburn	Smith, Mich.
Brandegee	Crawford	Johnson, N. Dak.	Smoot
Briggs	Depew	Kean	Stephenson
Bristow	Dick	Lorimer	Sutherland
Brown	Dixon	McCumber	Warner
Bulkeley	du Pont	Nelson	Warren
Burkett	Elkins	Oliver	Wetmore
Burnham	Flint	Page	
Burrows	Frye	Penrose	
Burton	Gallinger	Perkins	

NOT VOTING—20.

Bourne	Dillingham	*Martin*	Richardson
Clarke, Ark.	Guggenheim	Nixon	Root
Clay	*Hughes*	*Owen*	*Smith, Md.*
Cullom	Jones	*Paynter*	*Smith, S. C.*
Davis	Lodge	*Rayner*	*Tillman*

So Mr. Bacon's amendment was rejected.

Mr. Newlands, in the Senate, offered an amendment to the corporation-tax provision which had been adopted in Committee of the Whole, limiting the tax to the corporations specified in his said amendment, as follows:

Engaged in the business of refining oil or sugar, or in the manufacture of any commodity included in the dutiable list of this act, whose gross receipts exceed $250,000 per annum.

Mr. Aldrich moved to lay the amendment on the table.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

On the question of the adoption of the motion to lay the amendment on the table the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 4355, July 7):

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 24, as follows:

YEAS—46.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Gamble	Penrose
Beveridge	Crane	Hale	Perkins
Bradley	Crawford	Heyburn	Piles
Brandegee	Curtis	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Briggs	Depew	Jones	Smith, Mich.
Brown	Dick	Kean	Smoot
Bulkeley	Dixon	Lorimer	Stephenson
Burkett	du Pont	McCumber	Sutherland
Burnham	Elkins	*McEnery*	Warner
Burrows	Flint	Nelson	Wetmore
Burton	Frye	Oliver	
Carter	Gallinger	Page	

NAYS—24.

Bacon	Cummins	*Hughes*	*Shively*
Bailey	Dolliver	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Simmons*
Bankhead	*Fletcher*	La Follette	*Smith, S. C.*
Bristow	*Foster*	*McLaurin*	*Stone*
Chamberlain	*Frazier*	*Newlands*	*Taliaferro*
Culberson	*Gore*	*Overman*	*Taylor*

NOT VOTING—22.

Borah	*Daniel*	*Money*	Root
Bourne	*Davis*	Nixon	*Smith, Md.*
Clapp	Dillingham	*Owen*	*Tillman*
Clarke, Ark.	Guggenheim	*Paynter*	Warren
Clay	Lodge	*Rayner*	
Cullom	*Martin*	Richardson	

So the amendment submitted by Mr. Newlands was laid on the table.

Mr. McLaurin in the Senate offered an amendment to the corporation-tax provision which had been adopted in the Committee of the Whole *exempting from liability to make returns thereunder of every corporation the capital stock of which does not exceed $50,000 and the net income of which does not exceed $5,000.* Mr. Aldrich moved to lay the amendment on the table.

Upon the question of the adoption of the motion to lay the amendment on the table the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 4356, July 7):

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 24, as follows:

YEAS—46.

Aldrich	Carter	Gallinger	Penrose
Beveridge	Clark, Wyo.	Gamble	Perkins
Bradley	Crane	Hale	Piles
Brandegee	Crawford	Heyburn	Scott
Briggs	Depew	Johnson, N. Dak.	Smith, Mich.
Bristow	Dick	Jones	Smoot
Brown	Dixon	Kean	Stephenson
Bulkeley	Dolliver	Lorimer	Sutherland
Burkett	du Pont	McCumber	Warner
Burnham	Elkins	Nelson	Wetmore
Burrows	Flint	Oliver	
Burton	Frye	Page	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—24.

Bacon	Cummins	*Gore*	*Overman*
Bailey	Curtis	*Hughes*	*Shively*
Bankhead	*Daniel*	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Simmons*
Chamberlain	*Fletcher*	La Follette	*Smith, S. C.*
Clapp	*Foster*	*McLaurin*	*Stone*
Culberson	*Frazier*	*Newlands*	*Taylor*

NOT VOTING—22.

Borah	Dillingham	Nixon	*Smith, Md.*
Bourne	Guggenheim	*Owen*	*Taliaferro*
Clarke, Ark.	Lodge	*Paynter*	*Tillman*
Clay	*McEnery*	*Rayner*	Warren
Cullom	*Martin*	Richardson	
Davis	*Money*	Root	

So Mr. McLaurin's amendment was laid on the table.

Mr. Bacon, for Mr. Clay, in his absence, offered in the Senate an amendment *imposing a tax upon contracts, agreements, and so forth, respecting the purchase or sale of grain, cotton, and other agricultural products, stocks, bonds, and other securities under circumstances named in said amendment, which amendment is to be found on page 4371 of the Record.*

Mr. Aldrich moved to lay the amendment on the table.

Upon the question of the motion to lay the amendment on the table the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 4372, July 8, 1909):

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 34, as follows:

YEAS—44.

Aldrich	Cullom	Gallinger	Oliver
Bradley	Curtis	Gamble	Page
Brandegee	Depew	Hale	Penrose
Briggs	Dick	Heyburn	Perkins
Bulkeley	Dillingham	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Burnham	Dixon	Kean	Smith, Mich.
Burrows	du Pont	Lodge	Smoot
Burton	Elkins	Lorimer	Stephenson
Carter	Flint	McCumber	Sutherland
Clark, Wyo.	*Foster*	*McEnery*	Warner
Crane	Frye	Nixon	Wetmore

NAYS—34.

Bacon	*Culberson*	Jones	*Shively*
Bailey	Cummins	La Follette	*Simmons*
Bankhead	*Daniel*	*McLaurin*	*Smith, Md.*
Bristow	Dolliver	*Martin*	*Smith, S. C.*
Brown	*Fletcher*	*Money*	*Stone*
Burkett	*Frazier*	Nelson	*Taliaferro*
Chamberlain	*Gore*	*Newlands*	*Taylor*
Clapp	*Hughes*	*Overman*	
Crawford	*Johnston, Ala.*	Piles	

NOT VOTING—14.

Beveridge	*Clay*	*Paynter*	*Tillman*
Borah	*Davis*	*Rayner*	Warren
Bourne	Guggenheim	Richardson	
Clarke, Ark.	*Owen*	Root	

So the amendment offered by Mr. Bacon in behalf of Mr. Clay was laid on the table.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

The Senate having under consideration the tobacco amendment offered by Mr. Smoot, Mr. Daniel offered an amendment thereto, reducing the tax, as stated on page 4375 of the Record.

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 4376, July 8, 1909):

The result was announced—yeas 24, nays 53, as follows:

YEAS—24.

Bacon	*Fletcher*	*McLaurin*	*Simmons*
Bailey	*Foster*	*Martin*	*Smith, Md.*
Bankhead	*Frazier*	*Money*	*Smith, S. C.*
Chamberlain	*Gore*	*Newlands*	*Stone*
Culberson	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Overman*	*Taliaferro*
Daniel	*McEnery*	*Shively*	*Taylor*

NAYS—53.

Aldrich	Carter	Frye	Page
Beveridge	Clapp	Gallinger	Penrose
Borah	Clark, Wyo.	Gamble	Perkins
Bourne	Crane	Hale	Piles
Bradley	Crawford	Heyburn	Smith, Mich.
Brandegee	Cummins	Johnson, N. Dak.	Smoot
Briggs	Curtis	Jones	Stephenson
Bristow	Depew	Kean	Sutherland
Brown	Dick	La Follette	Warner
Bulkeley	Dixon	Lorimer	Warren
Burkett	Dolliver	McCumber	Wetmore
Burnham	du Pont	Nelson	
Burrows	Elkins	Nixon	
Burton	Flint	Oliver	

NOT VOTING—15.

Clarke, Ark.	Dillingham	*Owen*	Root
Clay	Guggenheim	*Paynter*	Scott
Cullom	*Hughes*	*Rayner*	*Tillman*
Davis	Lodge	Richardson	

So Mr. Daniel's amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Upon the motion of Mr. Martin sections 14 and 15 were reserved for a separate vote, and upon the question of agreeing to the tobacco amendment excepting sections 14 and 15 the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 4376, July 8):

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 25, as follows:

YEAS—52.

Aldrich	Burton	Elkins	Nixon
Beveridge	Carter	Flint	Oliver
Borah	Clapp	Frye	Page
Bourne	Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Penrose
Bradley	Crane	Gamble	Perkins
Brandegee	Crawford	Hale	Piles
Briggs	Cummins	Heyburn	Smith, Mich.
Bristow	Curtis	Johnson, N. Dak.	Smoot
Brown	Depew	Jones	Stephenson
Bulkeley	Dick	Kean	Sutherland
Burkett	Dixon	La Follette	Warner
Burnham	Dolliver	Lorimer	Warren
Burrows	du Pont	Nelson	Wetmore

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—25.

Bacon	*Foster*	*Martin*	*Smith, S. C.*
Bailey	*Frazier*	*Money*	*Stone*
Bankhead	*Gore*	*Newlands*	*Taliaferro*
Chamberlain	*Hughes*	*Overman*	*Taylor*
Culberson	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Shively*	
Daniel	*McEnery*	*Simmons*	
Fletcher	*McLaurin*	*Smith, Md.*	

NOT VOTING—15.

Clarke, Ark.	Dillingham	*Owen*	Root
Clay	Guggenheim	*Paynter*	Scott
Cullom	Lodge	*Rayner*	*Tillman*
Davis	McGumber	Richardson	

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. Curtis offered an amendment imposing a countervailing duty upon importations of petroleum by a proviso to paragraph 637, as follows:

Provided, That if there be imported into the United States crude petroleum produced in any country which imposes a duty on petroleum exported from the United States, there shall in such cases be levied, paid, and collected a duty upon said petroleum so imported one-half of the duty imposed by such country: Provided further, That importers of crude petroleum shall not be entitled to the drawback provisions of this act.

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 4380, July 8):

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 31, as follows:

YEAS—44.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Hale	Penrose
Borah	Crane	Heyburn	Perkins
Bourne	Curtis	Johnson, N. Dak.	Piles
Bradley	Depew	Jones	Root
Brandegee	Dick	Kean	Scott
Briggs	Dixon	Lorimer	Smoot
Bulkeley	du Pont	*McEnery*	Stephenson
Burnham	Elkins	Nixon	Sutherland
Burrows	Flint	Oliver	Warner
Burton	Frye	*Owen*	Warren
Carter	Gallinger	Page	Wetmore

NAYS—31.

Bacon	*Culberson*	*Hughes*	*Rayner*
Bailey	Cummins	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Shively*
Bristow	*Daniel*	La Follette	*Simmons*
Brown	Dolliver	*McLaurin*	Smith, Mich.
Burkett	*Fletcher*	*Martin*	*Smith, S. C.*
Chamberlain	*Frazier*	Nelson	*Stone*
Clapp	Gamble	*Newlands*	*Taliaferro*
Crawford	*Gore*	*Overman*	

NOT VOTING—17.

Bankhead	*Davis*	McCumber	*Taylor*
Beveridge	Dillingham	*Money*	*Tillman*
Clarke, Ark.	*Foster*	*Paynter*	
Clay	Guggenheim	Richardson	
Cullom	Lodge	*Smith, Md.*	

So the amendment of Mr. Curtis was agreed to.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Mr. Stone in the Senate again offered the amendment placing hides and leather and the products thereof on the free list, which had been previously offered in the Committee of the Whole. The amendment is as follows:

Hides of cattle, raw or uncured, whether dry, salted, or pickled; band, bend, or belting leather, rough leather, sole leather, and all other leather made from the hides or skins of cattle, without regard to size or weight; boots and shoes made of leather or of which leather is the component material of chief value.

Mr. Aldrich moved to lay the amendment on the table.

Upon the question of the adoption of the motion to lay on the table the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 4381, July 8):

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 28, as follows:

YEAS—45.

Aldrich	Carter	Hale	Piles
Borah	Clark, Wyo.	Heyburn	Scott
Bourne	Crane	Johnson, N. Dak.	Smith, Mich.
Bradley	Depew	Jones	Smoot
Brandegee	Dick	Kean	Stephenson
Briggs	Dixon	Lorimer	Sutherland
Brown	du Pont	*McEnery*	Warner
Bulkeley	Elkins	Nelson	Warren
Burkett	Flint	Nixon	Wetmore
Burnham	Frye	Oliver	
Burrows	Galling	Penrose	
Burton	Gamble	Perkins	

NAYS—28.

Bacon	Cummins	*Johnston, Ala.*	Page
Bailey	*Daniel*	La Follette	*Shively*
Bristow	Dolliver	*McLaurin*	*Simmons*
Chamberlain	*Fletcher*	*Martin*	*Smith, S. C.*
Clapp	*Foster*	*Newlands*	*Stone*
Crawford	*Frazier*	*Overman*	*Taliaferro*
Culberson	*Gore*	*Owen*	*Taylor*

NOT VOTING—19.

Bankhead	Curtis	Lodge	Richardson
Beveridge	*Davis*	McCumber	Root
Clarke, Ark.	Dillingham	*Money*	*Smith, Md.*
Clay	Guggenheim	*Paynter*	*Tillman*
Cullom	*Hughes*	*Rayner*	

So Mr. Stone's amendment was laid on the table.

Mr. Burton offered an amendment placing asphaltum and bitumen on the free list by the insertion of a new paragraph in the free list, as follows:

493½. Asphaltum and bitumen, crude, if not dried nor otherwise advanced in any manner.

Mr. Aldrich moved to lay the amendment on the table.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

On the question of the adoption of the motion to lay the amendment on the table the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 4386, July 8):

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 29, as follows:

YEAS—37.

Aldrich	Carter	Hale	Perkins
Bailey	Clark, Wyo.	Heyburn	Piles
Beveridge	Crane	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Bourne	Depew	Jones	Smoot
Brandegee	Dick	Kean	Stephenson
Briggs	Dixon	Lodge	Warren
Bristow	du Pont	Lorimer	Wetmore
Brown	Flint	*McEnery*	
Bulkeley	Gallinger	Page	
Burnham	Gamble	Penrose	

NAYS—29.

Bacon	Dolliver	*McLaurin*	Smith, Mich.
Bankhead	*Fletcher*	*Martin*	*Smith, S. C.*
Burkett	*Foster*	*Money*	*Stone*
Burton	*Frazier*	Nelson	*Taliaferro*
Chamberlain	*Gore*	*Overman*	*Taylor*
Clapp	*Hughes*	*Owen*	
Crawford	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Shively*	
Cummins.	La Follette	*Simmons*	

NOT VOTING—26.

Borah	Curtis	McCumber	Root
Bradley	*Daniel*	*Newlands*	*Smith, Md.*
Burrows	*Davis*	Nixon	Sutherland
Clarke, Ark.	Dillingham	Oliver	*Tillman*
Clay	Elkins	*Paynter*	Warner
Culberson	Frye	*Rayner*	
Cullom	Guggenheim	Richardson	

So Mr. Burton's amendment was laid on the table.

Mr. Bacon in the Senate again offered an amendment which had been previously offered in the Committee of the Whole placing hoop and band iron for baling cotton or any other commodity on the free list, as follows:

Hoop or band iron, or hoop or band steel, cut to lengths, or wholly or partly manufactured into hoops or ties, coated or not coated with paints or any other preparation, with or without buckles or fastenings, for baling cotton or any other commodity.

Mr. Aldrich moved to lay the amendment on the table.

Upon the question to lay the amendment on the table the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 4399, July 8):

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 31, as follows:

YEAS—43.

Aldrich	Carter	Gamble	Perkins
Borah	Clark, Wyo.	Hale	Piles
Bourne	Crane	Heyburn	Scott
Bradley	Depew	Jones	Smith, Mich.
Brandegee	Dick	Kean	Smoot
Briggs	Dixon	Lorimer	Stephenson
Bulkeley	du Pont	McCumber	Sutherland
Burkett	Elkins	Nixon	Warner
Burnham	Flint	Oliver	Warren
Burrows	Frye	Page	Wetmore
Burton	Gallinger	Penrose	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—31.

Bacon	Cummins	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Overman*
Bailey	*Daniel*	La Follette	*Shively*
Bankhead	*Fletcher*	*McEnery*	*Simmons*
Bristow	*Foster*	*McLaurin*	*Smith, S. C.*
Chamberlain	*Frazier*	*Martin*	*Stone*
Clapp	*Gore*	*Money*	*Taliaferro*
Crawford	*Hughes*	Nelson	*Taylor*
Culberson	Johnson, N. Dak.	*Newlands*	

NOT VOTING—18.

Beveridge	Curtis	Lodge	Root
Brown	*Davis*	*Owen*	*Smith, Md.*
Clarke, Ark.	Dillingham	*Paynter*	*Tillman*
Clay	Dolliver	*Rayner*	
Cullom	Guggenheim	Richardson	

So Mr. Bacon's amendment was laid on the table.

Mr. La Follette offered an amendment *creating a tariff commission,* which is found on page 4411 of the Record.

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 4413, July 8):

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 45, as follows:

YEAS—33.

Bacon	*Culberson*	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Shively*
Bailey	Cummins	La Follette	*Simmons*
Bankhead	*Daniel*	*McLaurin*	*Smith, S. C.*
Beveridge	Dolliver	*Martin*	*Stone*
Bristow	*Fletcher*	*Money*	*Taliaferro*
Brown	*Foster*	Nelson	*Taylor*
Burkett	*Frazier*	*Newlands*	
Chamberlain	*Gore*	*Overman*	
Clapp	*Hughes*	*Owen*	

NAYS—45.

Aldrich	Crane	Heyburn	Piles
Borah	Crawford	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Bourne	Depew	Jones	Smith, Mich.
Bradley	Dick	Kean	Smoot
Brandegee	Dixon	Lorimer	Stephenson
Briggs	du Pont	McCumber	Sutherland
Bulkeley	Elkins	*McEnery*	Warner
Burnham	Flint	Nixon	Warren
Burrows	Frye	Oliver	Wetmore
Burton	Gallinger	Page	
Carter	Gamble	Penrose	
Clark, Wyo.	Hale	Perkins	

NOT VOTING—14.

Clarke, Ark.	*Davis*	*Paynter*	*Smith, Md.*
Clay	Dillingham	*Rayner*	*Tillman*
Cullom	Guggenheim	Richardson	
Curtis	Lodge	Root	

So Mr. La Follette's amendment was rejected.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

The question then recurred upon the passage of the bill, and upon this question the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 4416, July 8):

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 34, as follows:

YEAS—45.

Aldrich	Crane	Heyburn	Piles
Borah	Depew	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Bourne	Dick	Jones	Smith, Mich.
Bradley	Dixon	Kean	Smoot
Brandegee	du Pont	Lorimer	Stephenson
Briggs	Elkins	McCumber	Sutherland
Bulkeley	Flint	*McEnery*	Warner
Burnham	Frye	Nixon	Warren
Burrows	Gallinger	Oliver	Wetmore
Burton	Gamble	Page	
Carter	Guggenheim	Penrose	
Clark, Wyo.	Hale	Perkins	

NAYS—34.

Bacon	Crawford	*Hughes*	*Owen*
Bailey	*Culberson*	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Shively*
Bankhead	Cummins	La Follette	*Simmons*
Beveridge	*Daniel*	*McLaurin*	*Smith, S. C.*
Bristow	Dolliver	*Martin*	*Stone*
Brown	*Fletcher*	*Money*	*Taliaferro*
Burkett	*Foster*	Nelson	*Taylor*
Chamberlain	*Frazier*	*Newlands*	
Clapp	*Gore*	*Overman*	

NOT VOTING—13.

Clarke, Ark.	*Davis*	*Rayner*	*Tillman*
Clay	Dillingham	Richardson	
Cullom	Lodge	Root	
Curtis	*Paynter*	*Smith, Md.*	

So the bill was passed.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

VOTES ON TARIFF BILL.

Mr. Bacon presented

THE RECORD OF EVERY YEA-AND-NAY VOTE IN THE SENATE ON THE TARIFF BILL FROM MAY 5, TO JULY 8, 1909, INCLUSIVE.

In the following votes, the names of all Republican Senators are printed in roman text; while the names of all Democratic Senators are printed in italics.

August 4, 1909.—Ordered to be printed.

Paragraph 46 of the tariff bill as it came from the House, imposing a duty on orange mineral—which is a lead product, entering as a principal constituent in the composition of house paint—was as follows:

46. Orange mineral, 2¾ cents per pound.

The Finance Committee of the Senate proposed to amend the paragraph and increase the duty by striking out the words "*two and seven-eighths*" and inserting the words "*three and three-eighths*" in lieu thereof.

Upon the call of the yeas and nays upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 1795, May 5):

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 35, as follows:

Yeas—41.

Aldrich	Cullom	Jones	Scott
Borah	Dillingham	Lodge	Smith, Mich.
Bradley	Dixon	McCumber	Smoot
Brandegee	du Pont	Nixon	Stephenson
Briggs	Elkins	Oliver	Sutherland
Bulkeley	Flint	Page	Warner
Burnham	Frye	Penrose	Warren
Burrows	Gallinger	Perkins	Wetmore
Burton	Guggenheim	Piles	
Carter	Hale	Richardson	
Crane	Heyburn	Root	

Nays—35.

Bacon	Crawford	*Hughes*	*Paynter*
Bailey	*Culberson*	Johnson, N. Dak.	*Rayner*
Bankhead	Cummins	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Simmons*
Bristow	Curtis	La Follette	*Smith, Md.*
Brown	Dolliver	*McEnery*	*Smith, S. C.*
Burkett	*Fletcher*	*McLaurin*	*Stone*
Chamberlain	*Foster*	*Money*	*Taliaferro*
Clarke, Ark.	*Frazier*	Nelson	*Tillman*
Clay	*Gore*	*Overman*	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NOT VOTING—15.

Beveridge	*Daniel*	Gamble	*Owen*
Bourne	*Davis*	Kean	*Shively*
Clapp	Depew	*Martin*	*Taylor*
Clark, Wyo.	Dick	*Newlands*	

So the amendment was agreed to.

Paragraph 179 contained the following provision:

179. Lead dross, including all dross containing lead, lead bullion, or base bullion, lead in pigs in bars, old refuse lead run into blocks or bars, and old scrap lead fit only to be remanufactured, lead in any form not specially provided for in sections 1 and 2 of this act, and the lead contents contained in lead-bearing ores of all kinds; all the foregoing 1½ cents per pound.

The committee, through its chairman [Mr. Aldrich], proposed to strike out the foregoing and insert the following in lieu thereof:

Lead-bearing ore of all kinds, one and one-half cents per pound on the lead contained therein.

The purpose, as stated by the chairman of the Finance Committee, was, in the succeeding section (180), to raise the duty on all the articles named therein except the lead-bearing ore, some of the increases to be 2⅛ cents per pound and the remainder of the increase to be 2½ cents per pound.

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment to thus strike out and insert, the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 1890, May 7):

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 19, as follows:

YEAS—53.

Aldrich	Clapp	Gallinger	Page
Beveridge	Clark, Wyo.	Guggenheim	Penrose
Borah	Crane	Hale	Perkins
Bradley	Crawford	Heyburn	Piles
Brandegee	Cummins	*Hughes*	Root
Briggs	Curtis	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Bristow	Depew	Jones	Smith, Mich.
Brown	Dick	Kean	Stephenson
Bulkeley	Dillingham	Lodge	Sutherland
Burkett	Dixon	McCumber	Warner
Burnham	Dolliver	*McEnery*	Wetmore
Burrows	du Pont	Nelson	
Burton	Flint	Nixon	
Carter	Frye	Oliver	

NAYS—19.

Bacon	*Foster*	*Newlands*	*Smith, S. C.*
Bankhead	*Frazier*	*Overman*	*Stone*
Culberson	*Gore*	*Shively*	*Taliaferro*
Daniel	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Simmons*	*Tillman*
Fletcher	*McLaurin*	*Smith, Md.*	

NOT VOTING—19.

Bailey	Cullom	*Martin*	Richardson
Bourne	*Davis*	*Money*	Smoot
Chamberlain	Elkins	*Owen*	*Taylor*
Clarke, Ark.	Gamble	*Paynter*	Warren
Clay	La Follette	*Rayner*	

So the amendment was agreed to.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Pursuant to a statement made by the Senator from Rhode Island when paragraph 179 was under consideration, the committee moved to strike out paragraph 180, which was as follows:

180. Lead in sheets, pipe, shot, glaziers' lead, and lead wire, 1⅞ cents per pound.

And insert in lieu thereof the following:

180. *Lead dross, lead bullion, or base bullion, lead in pigs and bars, lead in any form not specially provided for in this section, old refuse lead run into blocks and bars, and old scrap lead fit only to be remanufactured; all the foregoing, two and one-eighth cents per pound: lead in sheets, pipe, shot, glaziers' lead, and lead wire, two and one-half cents per pound.*

To the foregoing amendment Mr. Cummins, of Iowa, offered an amendment striking out the words "*two and one-eighth*" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "*one and seven-eighths,*" so that if omitted it will read:

All the foregoing, one and seven-eighths cents per pound.

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment to thus strike out and insert, the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 1955, May 10):

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 44, as follows:

YEAS—35.

Bacon	*Clay*	*Gore*	*Shively*
Bankhead	Crawford	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Simmons*
Beveridge	*Culberson*	La Follette	*Smith, Md.*
Bristow	Cummins	*McLaurin*	*Smith, S. C.*
Brown	*Daniel*	Nelson	*Stone*
Burkett	Dolliver	*Newlands*	*Taliaferro*
Chamberlain	*Fletcher*	*Overman*	*Taylor*
Clapp	*Frazier*	*Paynter*	*Tillman*
Clarke, Ark.	Gamble	*Rayner*	

NAYS—44.

Aldrich	Crane	Heyburn	Perkins
Borah	Curtis	*Hughes*	Piles
Bradley	Depew	Johnson, N. Dak.	Richardson
Brandegee	Dick	Jones	Root
Briggs	Dixon	Kean	Scott
Bulkeley	du Pont	Lodge	Smith, Mich.
Burnham	Flint	*McEnery*	Smoot
Burrows	Frye	Nixon	Stephenson
Burton	Gallinger	Oliver	Sutherland
Carter	Guggenheim	Page	Warner
Clark, Wyo.	Hale	Penrose	Wetmore

NOT VOTING—12.

Bailey	*Davis*	*Foster*	*Money*
Bourne	Dillingham	McCumber	*Owen*
Cullom	Elkins	*Martin*	Warren

So Mr. Cummins's amendment to the amendment of the committee was rejected.

Thereupon Mr. Beveridge, of Indiana, offered an amendment to the amendment by striking out the word "*one-eighth,*" so that the same proposed duty would read, "*All the foregoing, 2 cents per pound.*"

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment to the amendment to thus strike out and insert, the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 1960, May 10):

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 45, as follows:

YEAS—37.

Bacon	Crawford	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Simmons*
Bankhead	*Culberson*	La Follette	*Smith, Md.*
Beveridge	Cummins	*McLaurin*	*Smith, S. C.*
Bristow	*Daniel*	Nelson	*Stone*
Brown	Dolliver	*Newlands*	*Taliaferro*
Burkett	*Fletcher*	*Overman*	*Taylor*
Chamberlain	*Foster*	*Owen*	*Tillman*
Clapp	*Frazier*	*Paynter*	
Clarke, Ark.	Gamble	*Rayner*	
Clay	*Gore*	*Shively*	

NAYS—45.

Aldrich	Curtis	*Hughes*	Richardson
Borah	Depew	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Bradley	Dick	Jones	Scott
Brandegee	Dillingham	Kean	Smith, Mich.
Briggs	Dixon	Lodge	Smoot
Bulkeley	du Pont	McCumber	Stephenson
Burnham	Flint	Nixon	Sutherland
Burrows	Frye	Oliver	Warner
Burton	Gallinger	Page	Wetmore
Carter	Guggenheim	Penrose	
Clark, Wyo.	Hale	Perkins	
Crane	Heyburn	Piles	

NOT VOTING—9.

Bailey	*Davis*	*McEnery*	*Money*
Bourne	Elkins	*Martin*	Warren
Cullom			

So Mr. Beveridge's amendment to the amendment of the committee was rejected.

Paragraph 91 in the House bill was as follows:

China, porcelain, parian, bisque, earthen, stone, and crockery ware, ornamented, decorated, painted, colored, tinted, stained, enameled, gilded, brown, white lined, or printed, and clock cases, with or without movements, pill tiles, plaques, ornaments, toys, charms, vases, statues, statuettes, mugs, cups, steins, and lamps, wholly or in part of such ware; and manufactures in chief value of such ware not specially provided for in sections 1 or 2 of this act, 60 per cent ad valorem.

To the foregoing paragraph Mr. Bacon, of Georgia, offered the following proviso as an amendment to the same reducing the duty:

Provided, That none of the foregoing articles composed of earthen or stone ware shall pay a higher rate of duty than 35 per cent ad valorem.

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment adding this proviso the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 1981, May 11):

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 54, as follows:

YEAS—25.

Bacon	*Frazier*	*Newlands*	*Stone*
Bankhead	*Gore*	*Overman*	*Taliaferro*
Clarke, Ark.	*Hughes*	*Paynter*	*Taylor*
Clay	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Rayner*	*Tillman*
Culberson	La Follette	*Simmons*	
Fletcher	*McLaurin*	*Smith, Md.*	
Foster	*Martin*	*Smith, S. C.*	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—54.

Aldrich	*Chamberlain*	Gamble	Perkins
Beveridge	Crane	Guggenheim	Piles
Borah	Crawford	Hale	Richardson
Bradley	Cullom	Heyburn	Root
Brandegee	Cummins	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Briggs	Curtis	Jones	Smith, Mich.
Bristow	Depew	Kean	Smoot
Brown	Dick	Lodge	Stephenson
Bulkeley	Dillingham	McCumber	Sutherland
Burkett	Dixon	Nelson	Warner
Burnham	Dolliver	Nixon	Warren
Burrows	du Pont	Oliver	Wetmore
Burton	Flint	Page	
Carter	Gallinger	Penrose	

NOT VOTING—12.

Bailey	Clark, Wyo.	Elkins	*Money*
Bourne	*Daniel*	Frye	*Owen*
Clapp	*Davis*	*McEnery*	*Shively*

So Mr. Bacon's amendment was rejected.

Paragraph 92 of the bill as amended upon motion of the committee was as follows:

China, porcelain, parian, bisque, earthen, stone, and crockery ware, plain white, plain brown, including clock cases with or without movements, pill tiles, plaques, ornaments, toys, charms, vases, statues, statuettes, mugs, cups, steins, and lamps, all the foregoing wholly or in chief value of such ware, not painted, colored, tinted, stained, enameled, gilded, printed, or ornamented or decorated in any manner; and manufactures in chief value of such ware not specially provided for in this section, 55 per cent ad valorem.

To the foregoing paragraph as amended, Mr. Bacon, of Georgia, offered an amendment proposing to reduce the duty specified in the same *by striking out the word "fifty-five" and inserting the word "forty" in lieu thereof, so that the rate of duty would be 40 per cent ad valorem.* Upon the question of the adoption of this amendment, thus to strike out and insert, the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 1984, May 11):

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 50, as follows:

YEAS—27.

Bacon	*Fletcher*	*McLaurin*	*Smith, Md.*
Bankhead	*Foster*	*Martin*	*Smith, S. C.*
Bristow	*Frazier*	*Newlands*	*Stone*
Chamberlain	*Gore*	*Overman*	*Taliaferro*
Clarke, Ark.	*Hughes*	*Paynter*	*Taylor*
Crawford	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Rayner*	*Tillman*
Culberson	La Follette	*Simmons*	

NAYS—50.

Beveridge	Cullom	Hale	Piles
Borah	Cummins	Heyburn	Richardson
Bradley	Curtis	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Brandegee	Depew	Jones	Scott
Briggs	Dick	Kean	Smith, Mich.
Brown	Dillingham	Lodge	Smoot
Bulkeley	Dixon	McCumber	Stephenson
Burkett	Dolliver	Nelson	Sutherland
Burnham	du Pont	Nixon	Warner
Burrows	Flint	Oliver	Warren
Burton	Gallinger	Page	Wetmore
Carter	Gamble	Penrose	
Crane	Guggenheim	Perkins	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NOT VOTING—14.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Elkins	*Owen*
Bailey	*Clay*	Frye	*Shively*
Bourne	*Daniel*	*McEnery*	
Clapp	*Davis*	*Money*	

So Mr. Bacon's amendment was rejected.

The committee proposed an amendment to be known as "115½," imposing a duty *of 25 cents a ton on iron ore*, the equivalent of which was estimated to be 10 per cent ad valorem. Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2082, May 13, 1909):

The result was announced—yeas 61, nays 24, as follows:

YEAS—61.

Aldrich	Cullom	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Bacon	*Daniel*	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Simmons*
Bailey	Depew	Jones	Smith, Mich.
Bankhead	Dick	Kean	Smoot
Bradley	Dillingham	Lodge	Stephenson
Brandegee	Dixon	McCumber	*Stone*
Briggs	Elkins	*McEnery*	Sutherland
Bulkeley	*Fletcher*	*Martin*	*Taliaferro*
Burnham	Flint	Nixon	*Taylor*
Burrows	*Foster*	Oliver	*Tillman*
Burton	*Frazier*	Page	Warner
Carter	Frye	*Paynter*	Warren
Chamberlain	Gallinger	Penrose	Wetmore
Clark, Wyo.	Guggenheim	Perkins	
Clay	Hale	Piles	
Crane	Heyburn	Root	

NAYS—24.

Beveridge	*Clarke, Ark.*	du Pont	*Newlands*
Borah	Crawford	Gamble	*Overman*
Bristow	*Culberson*	*Gore*	*Rayner*
Brown	Cummins	*Hughes*	*Shively*
Burkett	Curtis	La Follette	*Smith, Md.*
Clapp	Dolliver	Nelson	*Smith, S. C.*

NOT VOTING—6.

Bourne	*McLaurin*	*Owen*	Richardson
Davis	*Money*		

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

In paragraph 118 as amended are the following provisions:

Round iron, in coils or rods, less than seven-sixteenths of 1 inch in diameter, and bars or shapes of rolled or hammered iron, not specially provided for in this section, six-tenths of 1 cent per pound: *Provided*, That all iron in slabs, blooms, loops, or other forms less finished than iron in bars, and more advanced than pig iron, except castings, shall be subject to duty of four-tenths of 1 cent per pound.

To the paragraph as thus amended Mr. Cummins, of Iowa, offered an amendment to reduce the proposed duty *by striking out the word "six-tenths" and inserting the word "five-tenths" in lieu thereof, and by striking out the word "four-tenths" and inserting "three-tenths" in lieu thereof.*

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2128, May 14):

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays, 42, as follows:

YEAS—35.

Bacon	Clapp	*Gore*	*Paynter*
Bailey	*Clarke, Ark.*	*Hughes*	*Simmons*
Bankhead	*Clay*	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Smith, Md.*
Beveridge	Crawford	La Follette	*Smith, S. C.*
Borah	Cummins	*McLaurin*	*Stone*
Bristow	*Daniel*	*Martin*	*Taliaferro*
Brown	Dolliver	Nelson	*Taylor*
Burkett	*Fletcher*	*Newlands*	*Tillman*
Chamberlain	*Frazier*	*Overman*	

NAYS—42.

Aldrich	Dick	Heyburn	Piles
Bradley	Dillingham	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Brandegee	Dixon	Jones	Scott
Briggs	du Pont	Kean	Smith, Mich.
Bulkeley	Elkins	Lodge	Smoot
Burnham	Flint	*McEnery*	Stephenson
Burrows	Frye	Nixon	Sutherland
Burton	Gallinger	Oliver	Warner
Carter	Gamble	Page	Wetmore
Cullom	Guggenheim	Penrose	
Depew	Hale	Perkins	

NOT VOTING—14.

Bourne	Curtis	*Money*	*Shively*
Clark, Wyo.	*Davis*	*Owen*	Warren
Crane	*Foster*	*Rayner*	
Culberson	McCumber	Richardson	

So Mr. Cummins's amendment was rejected.

Thereupon Mr. McLaurin, of Mississippi, offered to the said paragraph 118 the following amendment:

Notwithstanding anything in this bill contained, trace chains, log chains, lock chains, plows, plow stocks, plow handles, plow beams, colters, singletrees, doubletrees, clevises, clevis pins, lap rings, backbands, bellybands, hames, hame strings, bridles, halters, plow lines, hooks and cuffs for singletrees or doubletrees, axes, ax helves, hoes, hoe helves, hatchets, hatchet helves, hammers, hammer handles, horseshoes, horseshoe nails, spades, shovels, saws, squares, rakes, nails, tacks, staples, staple rings, door hinges and screws, window hinges and screws, and all other kinds or character of farming implements or tools, and all carpenters' tools and blacksmiths' tools, when imported into this country shall be exempt from the payment of a duty.

Upon the question of the adoption of the proposed amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2129, May 14):

The result was announced—yeas 22, nays 52, as follows:

YEAS—22.

Bacon	*Daniel*	*Martin*	*Stone*
Bailey	*Frazier*	*Newlands*	*Taliaferro*
Bankhead	*Gore*	*Overman*	*Taylor*
Chamberlain	*Hughes*	*Paynter*	*Tillman*
Clarke, Ark.	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Simmons*	
Clay	*McLaurin*	*Smith, S. C.*	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—52.

Aldrich	Clapp	Gallinger	Oliver
Borah	Crawford	Gamble	Page
Bradley	Cullom	Guggenheim	Penrose
Brandegee	Cummins	Hale	Perkins
Briggs	Depew	Heyburn	Piles
Bristow	Dick	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Brown	Dillingham	Jones	Scott
Bulkeley	Dixon	Kean	Smith, Mich.
Burkett	Dolliver	La Follette	Smoot
Burnham	du Pont	Lodge	Stephenson
Burrows	Elkins	*McEnery*	Sutherland
Burton	Flint	Nelson	Warren
Carter	Frye	Nixon	Wetmore

NOT VOTING—17.

Beveridge	Curtis	*Money*	*Smith, Md.*
Bourne	*Davis*	*Owen*	Warren
Clark, Wyo.	*Fletcher*	*Rayner*	
Crane	*Foster*	Richardson	
Culberson	McCumber	*Shively*	

So Mr. McLaurin's amendment was rejected.

On the 18th of May there was under consideration by the Senate the following resolution, offered by Mr. Gore, of Oklahoma:

Whereas it has been repeatedly asserted and generally admitted in the Senate during the debate on the pending tariff bill that current prices in the United States are unreasonable and exorbitant; and

Whereas there is a radical and irreconcilable division of opinion as to who is responsible for these extortionate prices; and

Whereas there are those who believe that the manufacturers are primarily responsible and others who believe that the wholesale and retail dealers are responsible; and

Whereas it is important that the truth should be known, that the innocent should be vindicated and the guilty alone charged with the blame and responsibility: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Finance or any subcommittee thereof, consisting of representatives of both political parties, are hereby instructed to investigate and report to the Senate at the earliest possible date—

First. The import prices of various articles of general and ordinary consumption.

Second. The wholesale prices of said articles.

Third. The retail prices of said articles.

Fourth. The prices of similar articles of domestic production as fixed, charged, and received by the manufacturers thereof and the wholesale and retail dealers therein.

On the motion to refer these resolutions to the Finance Committee the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, May 18, p. 2220):

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 29, as follows:

YEAS—50.

Aldrich	Cullom	Gamble	Perkins
Borah	Cummins	Guggenheim	Piles
Brandegee	Curtis	Hale	Root
Briggs	Depew	Heyburn	Scott
Brown	Dick	Johnson, N. Dak.	Smith, Mich.
Bulkeley	Dillingham	Jones	Smoot
Burkett	Dixon	Kean	Stephenson
Burnham	Dolliver	Lodge	Sutherland
Burrows	du Pont	McCumber	Warner
Burton	Elkins	Nelson	Warren
Carter	Flint	Oliver	Wetmore
Clark, Wyo.	Frye	Page	
Crane	Gallinger	Penrose	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—29.

Bacon	*Daniel*	*McLaurin*	*Smith, S. C.*
Bailey	*Fletcher*	*Martin*	*Stone*
Bankhead	*Foster*	*Money*	*Taliaferro*
Bristow	*Frazier*	*Overman*	*Taylor*
Chamberlain	*Gore*	*Owen*	*Tillman*
Clay	*Hughes*	*Paynter*	
Crawford	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Rayner*	
Culberson	La Follette	*Smith, Md.*	

NOT VOTING—12.

Beveridge	Clapp	*McEnery*	Richardson
Bourne	*Clarke, Ark.*	*Newlands*	*Shively*
Bradley	*Davis*	Nixon	*Simmons*

So Mr. Gore's resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Paragraph 151, with the amendments proposed by the committee, is as follows:

Penknives, pocketknives, clasp knives, pruning knives, budding knives, erasers, manicure knives, and all knives by whatever name known, including such as are denominatively mentioned in this section, valued at not more than 40 cents per dozen, 40 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than 40 cents per dozen and not exceeding 50 cents per dozen, 1 cent per piece and 40 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than 50 cents per dozen and not exceeding $1.25 per dozen, 5 cents per piece and 40 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than $1.25 per dozen and not exceeding $3 per dozen, 10 cents per piece and 40 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than $3 per dozen, 20 cents per piece and 40 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That any of the foregoing knives or erasers, if imported in the condition of assembled, but not finished, shall be dutiable at not less than the rate of duty herein imposed upon finished knives and erasers valued at more than $3 per dozen: *Provided further*, That blades, handles, or other parts of any of the foregoing knives or erasers shall be dutiable at not less than the rate herein imposed upon knives and erasers valued at more than 50 cents per dozen and not exceeding $1.25 per dozen. Razors, finished, valued at less than $1 per dozen, 45 per cent ad valorem; valued at $1 and less than $1.50 per dozen, 6 cents each and 40 per cent ad valorem; valued at $1.50 and less than $2 per dozen, 10 cents each and 40 per cent ad valorem; valued at $2 or more per dozen, 12 cents each and 50 per cent ad valorem:

Provided, That blades, handles, and unfinished razors shall pay no less duty than that imposed on finished razors valued at $2 per dozen: *Provided further*, That on and after October 1, 1909, all the articles specified in this paragraph shall, when imported, have the name of the maker or purchaser, and beneath the same the name of the country of origin die sunk conspicuously and indelibly on the shank or tang of at least one or, if practicable, each and every blade thereof. Scissors and shears and blades for the same, finished or unfinished, valued at not more than 50 cents per dozen, 15 cents per dozen and 15 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than 50 cents and not more than $1.75 per dozen, 50 cents per dozen and 15 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than $1.75 per dozen, 75 cents per dozen and 25 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. Stone, of Missouri, moved to strike out from the foregoing paragraph the provision for the duty on razors and to insert the following in lieu thereof, reducing the duty:

Razors and razor blades, finished or unfinished, valued at less than $1.50 per dozen, 50 cents per dozen and 15 per cent ad valorem; valued at $1.50 per dozen and less than $3 per dozen, $1 per dozen and 15 per cent ad valorem; valued at $3 per dozen or more, $1.75 per dozen and 20 per cent ad valorem.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment to thus strike out and insert the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2227, May 18):

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—36.

Bacon	*Culberson*	*Hughes*	*Paynter*
Bailey	Cummins	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Rayner*
Beveridge	*Daniel*	La Follette	*Simmons*
Bristow	Dolliver	*McLaurin*	*Smith, Md.*
Brown	*Fletcher*	*Martin*	*Smith, S. C.*
Chamberlain	*Foster*	*Money*	*Stone*
Clapp	*Frazier*	Nelson	*Taliaferro*
Clay	Gamble	*Overman*	*Taylor*
Crawford	*Gore*	*Owen*	*Tillman*

NAYS—43.

Aldrich	Cullom	Hale	Piles
Brandegee	Curtis	Heyburn	Root
Briggs	Dick	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Bulkeley	Dillingham	Jones	Smith, Mich.
Burkett	Dixon	Kean	Smoot
Burnham	du Pont	Lodge	Stephenson
Burrows	Elkins	McCumber	Sutherland
Burton	Flint	Oliver	Warner
Carter	Frye	Page	Warren
Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Penrose	Wetmore
Crane	Guggenheim	Perkins	

NOT VOTING—12.

Bankhead	Bradley	Depew	Nixon
Borah	*Clarke, Ark.*	*McEnery*	Richardson
Bourne	*Davis*	*Newlands*	*Shively*

So Mr. Stone's amendment was rejected.

Thereupon Mr. Bacon, of Georgia, moved to amend by striking out all of the foregoing paragraph 151 and inserting the following in lieu thereof, reducing the duty:

Penknives, pocketknives, clasp knives, pruning knives, budding knives, erasers, and all knives by whatever name known, including such as are denominatively mentioned in this section, or parts thereof, wholly or partly manufactured, razors and razor blades, finished or unfinished, 40 per cent ad valorem.

Scissors and shears, and blades for the same, finished or unfinished, 30 per cent ad valorem.

Upon the adoption of the question of the amendment to thus strike out and insert, the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2228, May 18):

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 51, as follows:

YEAS—28.

Bacon	*Fletcher*	*McLaurin*	*Simmons*
Bailey	*Foster*	*Martin*	*Smith, Md.*
Chamberlain	*Frazier*	*Money*	*Smith, S. C.*
Clapp	*Gore*	*Overman*	*Stone*
Clay	*Hughes*	*Owen*	*Taliaferro*
Culberson	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Paynter*	*Taylor*
Daniel	La Follette	*Rayner*	*Tillman*

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—51.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Penrose
Beveridge	Crane	Gamble	Perkins
Borah	Crawford	Guggenheim	Piles
Brandegee	Cullom	Hale	Root
Briggs	Cummins	Heyburn	Scott
Bristow	Curtis	Johnson, N. Dak.	Smith, Mich.
Brown	Dick	Jones	Smoot
Bulkeley	Dillingham	Kean	Stephenson
Burkett	Dolliver	Lodge	Sutherland
Burnham	du Pont	McCumber	Warner
Burrows	Elkins	Nelson	Warren
Burton	Flint	Oliver	Wetmore
Carter	Frye	Page	

NOT VOTING—12.

Bankhead	*Clarke, Ark.*	Dixon	Nixon
Bourne	*Davis*	*McEnery*	Richardson
Bradley	Depew	Newlands	*Shively*

So Mr. Bacon's amendment was rejected.

Paragraph 153 as amended is as follows:

153. Table, butchers', carving, cooks', hunting, kitchen, bread, butter, vegetable, fruit, cheese, carpenters' bench, curriers', drawing, farriers', fleshing, hay, tanners', plumbers', painters', palette, artists', and shoe knives, forks, and steels, finished or unfinished; if imported with handles of mother-of-pearl, shell, ivory, silver, nickeled silver, or other metal than iron or steel, 14 cents each; with handles of deerhorn, 10 cents each; with handles of hard rubber, solid bone, celluloid, or any pyroxyline material, 4 cents each; with handles of any other material than those above mentioned, 1 cent each, and in addition, on all the above articles, 15 per cent ad valorem; any of the knives, forks, or steels, enumerated in this paragraph, if imported without handles, 40 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That none of the above-named articles shall pay a less rate of duty than 40 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That all the articles specified in this paragraph when imported on and after October 1, 1909, shall have the name of the maker or purchaser and beneath the same the name of the country of origin indelibly stamped or branded thereon in a place that shall not be covered thereafter.

Mr. Bacon, of Georgia, proposed to reduce the duty by striking out all of the foregoing paragraph, 153, and by inserting the following in lieu thereof:

Table, butchers', carving, cooks', hunting, kitchen, bread, butter, vegetable, fruit, cheese, carpenters' bench, curriers', drawing, farriers', fleshing, hay, tanners', plumbers', painters', pallette, artists', and shoe knives, forks, and steels, finished or unfinished, 30 per cent ad valorem.

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment to thus strike out and insert, the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2229, May 18):

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 53, as follows:

YEAS—23.

Bacon	*Fletcher*	*Money*	*Smith, Md.*
Bailey	*Foster*	*Overman*	*Smith, S. C.*
Chamberlain	*Frazier*	*Owen*	*Taliaferro*
Clay	*Hughes*	*Paynter*	*Taylor*
Culberson	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Rayner*	*Tillman*
Daniel	*McLaurin*	*Simmons*	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—53.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Penrose
Beveridge	Crane	Gamble	Perkins
Borah	Crawford	Guggenheim	Piles
Brandegee	Cullom	Hale	Root
Briggs	Cummins	Heyburn	Scott
Bristow	Curtis	Johnson, N. Dak.	Smith, Mich.
Brown	Dick	Jones	Smoot
Bulkeley	Dillingham	Kean	Stephenson
Burkett	Dixon	La Follette	Sutherland
Burnham	Dolliver	Lodge	Warren
Burrows	du Pont	McCumber	Wetmore
Burton	Elkins	Nelson	
Carter	Flint	Oliver	
Clapp	Frye	Page	

NOT VOTING—15.

Bankhead	*Davis*	*Martin*	*Shively*
Bourne	Depew	*Newlands*	*Stone*
Bradley	*Gore*	Nixon	Warner
Clarke, Ark.	*McEnery*	Richardson	

So Mr. Bacon's amendment was rejected.

To paragraph 168, imposing a duty on umbrella and parasol ribs and stretchers, Mr. Penrose, of Pennsylvania, moved to *strike out the duty of 35 per cent ad valorem, as proposed in the paragraph, and to insert 50 per cent ad valorem in lieu thereof.*

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment to thus strike out and insert the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2232, May 18):

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 37, as follows:

YEAS—44.

Aldrich	Cullom	Hale	Perkins
Borah	Depew	Heyburn	Piles
Brandegee	Dick	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Briggs	Dillingham	Jones	Scott
Bulkeley	Dixon	Kean	Smith, Mich.
Burkett	du Pont	Lodge	Smoot
Burnham	Elkins	McCumber	Stephenson
Burrows	Flint	Nixon	Sutherland
Carter	Frye	Oliver	Warner
Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Page	Warren
Crane	Guggenheim	Penrose	Wetmore

NAYS—37.

Bacon	Crawford	*Hughes*	*Simmons*
Bailey	*Culberson*	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Smith, Md.*
Bankhead	Cummins	La Follette	*Smith, S. C.*
Beveridge	*Daniel*	*McLaurin*	*Stone*
Bristow	Dolliver	*Money*	*Taliaferro*
Brown	*Fletcher*	Nelson	*Taylor*
Burton	*Foster*	*Overman*	*Tillman*
Chamberlain	*Frazier*	*Owen*	
Clapp	Gamble	*Paynter*	
Clay	*Gore*	*Rayner*	

NOT VOTING—10.

Bourne	Curtis	*Martin*	*Shively*
Bradley	*Davis*	*Newlands*	
Clarke, Ark.	*McEnery*	Richardson	

So the amendment was agreed to.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

To paragraph 194, imposing a duty of 30 per cent on linotype and all typesetting machines, Mr. Paynter, of Kentucky, proposed to reduce the said proposed duty by adding to said paragraph the following proviso:

Provided, On linotype and all typesetting machines, 10 per cent ad valorem.

On the question of the adoption of the proposed amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2270, May 19):

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—35.

Bacon	*Culberson*	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Rayner*
Bailey	Cummins	La Follette	*Simmons*
Borah	*Daniel*	*McLaurin*	*Smith, Md.*
Bristow	Dolliver	*Martin*	*Smith, S. C.*
Brown	*Fletcher*	Nelson	*Stone*
Burkett	*Foster*	*Newlands*	*Taliaferro*
Chamberlain	*Frazier*	*Overman*	*Taylor*
Clapp	*Gore*	*Owen*	*Tillman*
Clay	*Hughes*	*Paynter*	

NAYS—43.

Aldrich	Curtis	Hale	Perkins
Brandegee	Dick	Heyburn	Piles
Briggs	Dillingham	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Bulkeley	Dixon	Jones	Scott
Burnham	du Pont	Kean	Smith, Mich.
Burrows	Elkins	Lodge	Smoot
Burton	Flint	McCumber	Stephenson
Carter	Frye	Nixon	Sutherland
Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Oliver	Warner
Crane	Gamble	Page	Wetmore
Cullom	Guggenheim	Penrose	

NOT VOTING—13.

Bankhead	*Clarke, Ark.*	*McEnery*	Warren
Beveridge	Crawford	*Money*	
Bourne	*Davis*	Richardson	
Bradley	Depew	*Shively*	

So Mr. Paynter's amendment was rejected.

To the same paragraph 194 Mr. McLaurin, of Mississippi, offered an amendment to strike out the words "printing presses, sewing machines, and typewriters," and to add at the end of the paragraph the following:

Notwithstanding anything in this bill contained, printing presses, sewing machines, and typewriters, when imported into this country, shall be exempt from the payment of duty.

Upon the question of the adoption of this proposed amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2274, May 19):

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 53, as follows:

YEAS—23.

Bacon	*Gore*	*Money*	*Smith, Md.*
Bailey	*Hughes*	*Newlands*	*Smith, S. C.*
Chamberlain	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Overman*	*Taliaferro*
Culberson	La Follette	*Paynter*	*Taylor*
Fletcher	*McLaurin*	*Rayner*	*Tillman*
Frazier	*Martin*	*Simmons*	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—53.

Aldrich	*Clay*	Gallinger	Perkins
Beveridge	Crane	Gamble	Piles
Borah	Crawford	Guggenheim	Root
Brandegee	Cullom	Hale	Scott
Briggs	Cummins	Heyburn	Smith, Mich.
Bristow	Curtis	Johnson, N. Dak.	Smoot
Brown	Dick	Jones	Stephenson
Bulkeley	Dillingham	Kean	Sutherland
Burkett	Dixon	Lodge	Warner
Burnham	Dolliver	Nelson	Warren
Burrows	du Pont	Nixon	Wetmore
Burton	Elkins	Oliver	
Carter	Flint	Page	
Clapp	Frye	Penrose	

NOT VOTING—15.

Bankhead	*Clarke, Ark.*	*Foster*	Richardson
Bourne	*Daniel*	McCumber	*Shively*
Bradley	*Davis*	*McEnery*	*Stone*
Clark, Wyo.	Depew	*Owen*	

So Mr. McLaurin's amendment was rejected.

To the said paragraph 194 Mr. Newlands proposed an amendment to reduce the duty on linotype and all typesetting machines, machine tools, printing presses, sewing machines, typewriters, and all steam engines, *by striking out "30 per cent ad valorem" and inserting "20 per cent ad valorem" in lieu thereof.*

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment to thus strike out and insert the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2286, May 19):

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—29.

Bacon	Cummins	La Follette	*Smith, Md.*
Bailey	*Daniel*	*McLaurin*	*Smith, S. C.*
Beveridge	Dolliver	*Money*	*Stone*
Bristow	*Fletcher*	Nelson	*Taylor*
Brown	*Frazier*	*Newlands*	*Tillman*
Chamberlain	*Gore*	*Overman*	
Clapp	*Hughes*	*Rayner*	
Clay	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Simmons*	

NAYS—43.

Aldrich	Crane	Gallinger	Penrose
Borah	Crawford	Gamble	Perkins
Brandegee	Cullom	Hale	Piles
Briggs	Curtis	Heyburn	Root
Bulkeley	Dick	Johnson, N. Dak.	Smoot.
Burkett	Dillingham	Jones	Stephenson
Burnham	Dixon	Kean	Sutherland
Burrows	du Pont	Lodge	Warner
Burton	Elkins	Nixon	Warren
Carter	Flint	Oliver	Wetmore
Clark, Wyo.	Frye	Page	

NOT VOTING—19.

Bankhead	*Davis*	*McEnery*	Scott
Bourne	Depew	*Martin*	*Shively*
Bradley	*Foster*	*Owen*	Smith, Mich.
Clarke, Ark.	Guggenheim	*Paynter*	*Taliaferro*
Culberson	McCumber	Richardson	

So Mr. Newlands's amendment was rejected.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

To paragraph 195, proposing a duty of 45 per cent ad valorem on—

195. Articles or wares not specially provided for in *this section*, composed wholly or in part of iron, steel, lead, copper, nickel, pewter, zinc, gold, silver, platinum, aluminum, or other metal, and whether partly or wholly manufactured.

Mr. Dolliver, to *strike out the words "in part," and insert the words "in chief value" in lieu thereof.* Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment to thus strike out and insert the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2288, May 19):

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 40, as follows:

YEAS—30.

Bacon	*Clay*	*Hughes*	*Simmons*
Bailey	Crawford	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Smith, Md.*
Beveridge	Cummins	La Follette	*Smith, S. C.*
Bristow	*Daniel*	*McLaurin*	*Stone*
Brown	Dolliver	Nelson	*Taylor*
Burkett	*Fletcher*	*Newlands*	*Tillman*
Chamberlain	*Frazier*	*Overman*	
Clapp	*Gore*	*Rayner*	

NAYS—40.

Aldrich	Crane	Gallinger	Page
Borah	Cullom	Gamble	Penrose
Brandegee	Curtis	Hale	Perkins
Briggs	Dick	Heyburn	Piles
Bulkeley	Dillingham	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Burnham	Dixon	Jones	Smoot
Burrows	du Pont	Kean	Stephenson
Burton	Elkins	Lodge	Sutherland
Carter	Flint	Nixon	Warner
Clark, Wyo.	Frye	Oliver	Wetmore

NOT VOTING—21.

Bankhead	Depew	*Money*	Smith, Mich.
Bourne	*Foster*	*Owen*	*Taliaferro*
Bradley	Guggenheim	*Paynter*	Warren
Clarke, Ark.	McCumber	Richardson	
Culberson	*McEnery*	Scott	
Davis	*Martin*	*Shively*	

So Mr. Dolliver's amendment was rejected.

To paragraph 21 of the bill imposing a duty of one-half of 1 cent per pound on extracts of quebacho (for tanning), Mr. La Follette offered an amendment *reducing the proposed duty to one-fourth of 1 cent per pound.*

Upon the question of the adoption of this proposed amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2305, May 20):

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 38, as follows:

YEAS—29.

Bacon	*Chamberlain*	Gamble	*Rayner*
Bailey	Clapp	*Gore*	Smith Mich
Bankhead	*Clay*	*Hughes*	*Smith, S. C.*
Beveridge	*Culberson*	La Follette	Stephenson
Borah	Cummins	McCumber	*Tillman*
Bristow	Dolliver	*McLaurin*	
Brown	*Fletcher*	Nelson	
Burkett	*Frazier*	*Paynter*	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—38.

Aldrich	Depew	Hale	Penrose
Bourne	Dick	Heyburn	Piles
Brandegee	Dixon	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Bulkeley	du Pont	Jones	*Simmons*
Burnham	Elkins	Kean	*Smith, Md.*
Burrows	Flint	Lodge	Smoot
Burton	*Foster*	*Martin*	Warner
Crane	Frye	Nixon	Wetmore
Cullom	Gallinger	Oliver	
Daniel	Guggenheim	Page	

NOT VOTING—24.

Bradley	Curtis	*Newlands*	*Shively*
Briggs	*Davis*	*Overman*	*Stone*
Carter	Dillingham	*Owen*	Sutherland
Clark, Wyo.	*Johnston, Ala.*	Perkins	*Taliaferro*
Clarke, Ark.	*McEnery*	Richardson	*Taylor*
Crawford	*Money*	Scott	Warren

So Mr. La Follette's amendment was rejected.

To paragraph 51 of the bill as it came from the House, imposing a duty of 2⅜ cents per pound upon white lead, and white pigment containing lead, dried or in pulp, or ground or mixed with oil, the Finance Committee of the Senate offered an amendment *to increase the duty from two and three-eighths cents per pound to two and three-fourths cents per pound.*

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment thus proposed by the Finance Committee the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2322, May 20):

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 32, as follows:

YEAS—41.

Aldrich	Depew	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Borah	Dick	Jones	Scott
Bourne	Dillingham	Kean	Smith, Mich.
Brandegee	Dixon	Lodge	Smoot
Bulkeley	du Pont	McCumber	Stephenson
Burrows	Elkins	*McEnery*	Warner
Burton	Frye	Nixon	Warren
Carter	Gallinger	Oliver	Wetmore
Clark, Wyo.	Guggenheim	Page	
Crane	Hale	Penrose	
Cullom	Heyburn	Piles	

NAYS—32.

Bacon	Clapp	*Frazier*	Nelson
Bailey	*Clay*	Gamble	*Newlands*
Bankhead	Crawford	*Gore*	*Paynter*
Beveridge	Cummins	*Hughes*	*Rayner*
Bristow	*Daniel*	La Follette	*Simmons*
Brown	Dolliver	*McLaurin*	*Stone*
Burkett	*Fletcher*	*Martin*	*Taliaferro*
Chamberlain	*Foster*	*Money*	*Tillman*

NOT VOTING—18.

Bradley	Curtis	*Owen*	*Smith, S. C.*
Briggs	*Davis*	Perkins	Sutherland
Burnham	Flint	Richardson	*Taylor*
Clarke, Ark.	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Shively*	
Culberson	*Overman*	*Smith, Md.*	

So the amendment of the committee was agreed to.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

To paragraph 58 of the bill, imposing a duty of 1½ cents per pound on bichromate and chromate of potash, the Finance Committee offered an amendment *increasing the duty from one and one-half cents per pound to two and one-fourth cents per pound.*

Upon the question of the adoption of the proposed amendment to thus increase the duty the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2325, May 20):

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 20, as follows:

YEAS—40.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Penrose
Beveridge	Crane	Gamble	Piles
Bourne	Cullom	Guggenheim	Root
Brandegee	Depew	Hale	Scott
Brown	Dick	Heyburn	Smith, Mich.
Bulkeley	Dillingham	Johnson, N. Dak.	Smoot
Burkett	Dixon	Kean	Stephenson
Burrows	du Pont	Lodge	Warner
Burton	Elkins	Nixon	Warren
Carter	Frye	Page	Wetmore

NAYS—20.

Bacon	Cummins	Jones	*Newlands*
Bailey	Dolliver	La Follette	*Paynter*
Bristow	*Fletcher*	*McLaurin*	*Rayner*
Clay	*Gore*	*Martin*	*Stone*
Crawford	*Hughes*	Nelson	*Taliaferro*

NOT VOTING—31.

Bankhead	*Culberson*	McCumber	*Shively*
Borah	Curtis	*McEnery*	*Simmons*
Bradley	*Daniel*	*Money*	*Smith, Md.*
Briggs	*Davis*	Oliver	*Smith, S. C.*
Burnham	Flint	*Overman*	Sutherland
Chamberlain	*Foster*	*Owen*	*Taylor*
Clapp	*Frazier*	Perkins	*Tillman*
Clarke, Ark.	*Johnston, Ala.*	Richardson	

So the amendment of the committee was agreed to.

Paragraph 94 of the bill contained the following provision:

Carbons for electric lighting, 35 per cent ad valorem.

The chairman of the Finance Committee, Mr. Aldrich, proposed to insert the following in lieu thereof:

Carbons, for electric lighting, made entirely from petroleum coke, 35 cents per hundred feet; if composed chiefly of lampblack or retort carbon, 65 cents per hundred feet.

The specific duty proposed in this amendment was, as stated in the debate, the ad valorem equivalent of 45 per cent increase over the existing rate.

Upon the question of the adoption of this amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2350, May 21):

YEAS—43.

Aldrich	Cullom	Guggenheim	Penrose
Bourne	Depew	Hale	Root
Brandegee	Dick	Heyburn	Scott
Briggs	Dillingham	Johnson, N. Dak.	Smith, Mich.
Bulkeley	Dixon	Jones	Smoot
Burnham	du Pont	Kean	Stephenson
Burrows	Elkins	Lodge	Sutherland
Burton	Flint	McCumber	Warner
Carter	Frye	Nixon	Warren
Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Oliver	Wetmore
Crane	Gamble	Page	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—36.

Bacon	*Clay*	*Gore*	*Owen*
Bailey	Crawford	*Hughes*	*Paynter*
Bankhead	Cummins	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Rayner*
Beveridge	Curtis	La Follette	*Simmons*
Bristow	*Daniel*	*McLaurin*	*Smith, Md.*
Brown	Dolliver	*Martin*	*Stone*
Burkett	*Fletcher*	*Money*	*Taliaferro*
Chamberlain	*Foster*	Nelson	*Taylor*
Clapp	*Frazier*	*Newlands*	*Tillman*

NOT VOTING—12.

Borah	*Culberson*	*Overman*	Richardson
Bradley	*Davis*	Perkins	*Shively*
Clarke, Ark.	*McEnery*	Piles	*Smith, S. C.*

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

May 24, the Senate having under consideration the lumber schedule of the bill, Mr. Johnston, of Alabama, proposed the following amendment:

Nothing contained in this act shall prevent the admission free of duty of the following articles: Lumber of all kinds, laths, shingles, doors, and door locks and hinges, window frames, window sashes, bricks, lime, cement, slate roofing, nails, carpenters' tools, common window glass not exceeding 16 by 24 inches, tin plate for roofs, linseed oil, and white lead

Upon the question of the proposed amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2435, May 24):

The result was announced—yeas 13, nays 64, as follows:

YEAS—13.

Bacon	*Frazier*	*Overman*	*Tillman*
Bankhead	*Gore*	*Paynter*	
Clay	*Hughes*	*Rayner*	
Culberson	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Taylor*	

NAYS—64.

Aldrich	Crane	Frye	Nixon
Beveridge	Crawford	Gallinger	Oliver
Borah	Cullom	Gamble	Page
Bradley	Cummins	Guggenheim	Penrose
Brandegee	Curtis	Hale	Perkins
Briggs	*Daniel*	Heyburn	Piles
Bristow	Depew	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Brown	Dick	Jones	Scott
Burkett	Dillingham	Kean	*Shively*
Burnham	Dixon	La Follette	*Simmons*
Burrows	Dolliver	Lodge	*Smith, Md.*
Burton	du Pont	McCumber	Smoot
Carter	Elkins	*McEnery*	Stephenson
Chamberlain	*Fletcher*	*Martin*	Sutherland
Clapp	Flint	*Money*	Warner
Clark, Wyo.	*Foster*	Nelson	Wetmore

NOT VOTING—14.

Bailey	*Davis*	Richardson	*Taliaferro*
Bourne	*McLaurin*	Smith, Mich.	Warren
Bulkeley	*Newlands*	*Smith, S. C.*	
Clarke, Ark.	*Owen*	*Stone*	

So the amendment of Mr. Johnston, of Alabama, to the amendment was rejected.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

To the same schedule, on May 24, Mr. McCumber proposed the following amendment:

Sawed lumber, not specially provided for in this section, $1 per 1,000 feet board measure; but when lumber of any sort is planed or finished, in addition to the rates herein provided there shall be levied and paid for each side so planed or finished, 50 cents per 1,000 feet board measure; and if planed on one side and tongued and grooved, $1 per 1,000 feet board measure; and if planed on two sides and tongued and grooved, $1.50 per 1,000 feet board measure: and in estimating board measure under this schedule no deduction shall be made on board measure on account of planing, tonguing, and grooving.

Upon the question of the adoption of the proposed amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2435, May 24):

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 56, as follows:

YEAS—25.

Beveridge	Crawford	*Gore*	*Paynter*
Bristow	*Culberson*	*Hughes*	*Rayner*
Brown	Cummins	Johnson, N. Dak.	*Shively*
Burkett	Curtis	La Follette	*Stone*
Burton	du Pont	McCumber	
Clapp	*Frazier*	Nelson	
Clay	Gamble	*Newlands*	

NAYS—56.

Aldrich	Cullom	Hale	Perkins
Bacon	*Daniel*	Heyburn	Piles
Bailey	Depew	*Johnston, Ala.*	Root
Bankhead	Dick	Jones	Scott
Borah	Dillingham	Kean	*Simmons*
Bradley	Dixon	Lodge	*Smith, Md.*
Brandegee	Dolliver	*McEnery*	Smoot
Briggs	Elkins	*Martin*	Stephenson
Burnham	*Fletcher*	*Money*	Sutherland
Burrows	Flint	Nixon	*Taliaferro*
Carter	*Foster*	Oliver	*Taylor*
Chamberlain	Frye	*Overman*	*Tillman*
Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Page	Warner
Crane	Guggenheim	Penrose	Wetmore

NOT VOTING—10.

Bourne	*Davis*	Richardson	Warren
Bulkeley	*McLaurin*	Smith, Mich.	
Clarke, Ark.	*Owen*	*Smith, S. C.*	

So Mr. McCumber's amendment was rejected.

May 27, the Senate having under consideration the sugar schedule, Mr. Bristow offered an amendment to paragraph 213 of the bill *striking out the words "not above No. 16 Dutch standard in color"* and also the words *"and on sugar above No. 16 Dutch standard in color."*

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2504, May 27):

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 47, as follows:

YEAS—36.

Bacon	Crawford	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Paynter*
Bailey	*Culberson*	Jones	*Rayner*
Bankhead	Cummins	La Follette	*Shively*
Beveridge	*Daniel*	*Martin*	*Simmons*
Bristow	Dolliver	*Money*	*Smith, Md.*
Brown	*Fletcher*	Nelson	*Smith, S. C.*
Chamberlain	*Frazier*	*Newlands*	*Taliaferro*
Clapp	*Gore*	*Overman*	*Taylor*
Clay	Johnson, N. Dak.	*Owen*	*Tillman*

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—47.

Aldrich	Crane	Gallinger	Penrose
Borah	Cullom	Gamble	Perkins
Bourne	Curtis	Guggenheim	Piles
Bradley	Depew	Hale	Root
Brandegee	Dick	Heyburn	Scott
Briggs	Dillingham	Kean	Smoot
Bulkeley	Dixon	Lodge	Stephenson
Burkett	du Pont	McCumber	Sutherland
Burnham	Elkins	*McEnery*	Warner
Burrows	Flint	Nixon	Warren
Burton	*Foster*	Oliver	Wetmore
Carter	Frye	Page	

NOT VOTING—8.

Clark, Wyo.	*Davis*	*McLaurin*	Smith, Mich.
Clarke, Ark.	*Hughes*	Richardson	*Stone*

So Mr. Bristow's amendment was rejected.

Thereupon Mr. Bristow proposed an amendment to paragraph 213 to lower the duty on sugar by *striking out the word "ninety" and inserting "eighty-two and one-half" in lieu thereof*, so that the paragraph if amended would read *"one cent and eighty-two and one-half one-hundredths of one cent per pound."*

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2505, May 27):

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 53, as follows:

YEAS—32.

Bacon	Crawford	*Martin*	*Shively*
Bailey	*Culberson*	*Money*	*Simmons*
Bankhead	*Daniel*	Nelson	*Smith, Md.*
Beveridge	*Fletcher*	*Newlands*	*Smith, S. C.*
Bristow	*Frazier*	*Overman*	*Stone*
Chamberlain	*Gore*	*Owen*	*Taliaferro*
Clapp	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Paynter*	*Taylor*
Clay	La Follette	*Rayner*	*Tillman*

NAYS—53.

Aldrich	Crane	Gallinger	Penrose
Borah	Cullom	Gamble	Perkins
Bourne	Cummins	Guggenheim	Piles
Bradley	Curtis	Hale	Root
Brandegee	Depew	Heyburn	Scott
Briggs	Dick	*Hughes*	Smoot
Brown	Dillingham	Johnson, N. Dak.	Stephenson
Bulkeley	Dixon	Jones	Sutherland
Burkett	Dolliver	Kean	Warner
Burnham	du Pont	Lodge	Warren
Burrows	Elkins	McCumber	Wetmore
Burton	Flint	*McEnery*	
Carter	*Foster*	Oliver	
Clark, Wyo.	Frye	Page	

NOT VOTING—6.

Clarke, Ark.	*McLaurin*	Richardson	Smith, Mich.
Davis	Nixon		

So Mr. Bristow's amendment was rejected.

May 27, the Senate having under consideration the amendment proposed by Mr. Bailey, imposing a general income tax, Mr. Aldrich moved to postpone the consideration of the amendment until June 10.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Upon the question of agreeing to that motion the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2519, May 27):

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 33, as follows:

YEAS—50.

Aldrich	Crane	Gamble	Penrose
Beveridge	Crawford	Guggenheim	Perkins
Bradley	Cullom	Hale	Piles
Brandegee	Curtis	Heyburn	Root
Briggs	Depew	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Brown	Dick	Jones	Smoot
Bulkeley	Dillingham	Kean	Stephenson
Burkett	Dixon	Lodge	Sutherland
Burnham	du Pont	McCumber	Warner
Burrows	Elkins	*McEnery*	Warren
Burton	Flint	Nelson	Wetmore
Carter	Frye	Oliver	
Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Page	

NAYS—33.

Bacon	Cummins	La Follette	*Smith, Md.*
Bailey	*Daniel*	*Money*	*Smith, S. C.*
Bankhead	Dolliver	*Newlands*	*Stone*
Borah	*Fletcher*	*Overman*	*Taliaferro*
Bristow	*Foster*	*Owen*	*Taylor*
Chamberlain	*Frazier*	*Paynter*	*Tillman*
Clapp	*Gore*	*Rayner*	
Clay	*Hughes*	*Shively*	
Culberson	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Simmons*	

NOT VOTING—8.

Bourne	*Davis*	*Martin*	Richardson
Clarke, Ark.	*McLaurin*	Nixon	Smith, Mich.

So Mr. Aldrich's motion was agreed to.

Paragraph 227 of the bill imposed a duty on barley of 24 cents per bushel. The Finance Committee offered an amendment *increasing the proposed duty from 24 to 30 cents per bushel.* Upon the question of the adoption of this amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2645, May 29):

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 28, as follows:

YEAS—48.

Aldrich	Clapp	Frye	Nelson
Borah	Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Oliver
Bourne	Crane	Gamble	Page
Brandegee	Crawford	Guggenheim	Penrose
Briggs	Cullom	Hale	Perkins
Bristow	Dick	Heyburn	Piles
Brown	Dillingham	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Bulkeley	Dixon	Jones	Smoot
Burkett	du Pont	Kean	Stephenson
Burnham	Elkins	La Follette	Warner
Burrows	Flint	Lodge	Warren
Carter	*Foster*	McCumber	Wetmore

NAYS—28.

Bacon	*Daniel*	*Johnston, Ala.*	Root
Bankhead	Depew	*Martin*	*Simmons*
Beveridge	Dolliver	*Money*	*Smith, Md.*
Burton	*Fletcher*	*Newlands*	*Smith, S. C.*
Clay	*Frazier*	*Overman*	*Stone*
Culberson	*Gore*	*Paynter*	*Taliaferro*
Cummins	*Hughes*	*Rayner*	*Tillman*

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NOT VOTING—15.

Bailey	Curtis	Nixon	Smith, Mich.
Bradley	*Davis*	*Owen*	Sutherland
Chamberlain	*McEnery*	Richardson	*Taylor*
Clarke, Ark.	*McLaurin*	*Shively*	

So the amendment of the committee was agreed to.

Paragraph 273 of the bill imposed a duty on lemons of 1¼ cents per pound. The Finance Committee proposed an amendment *increasing the duty to one and one-half cents per pound.* Upon the question of the adoption of this amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2670, May 31):

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 28, as follows:

YEAS—44.

Aldrich	Carter	*Foster*	Nixon
Borah	Clark, Wyo.	Frye	Page
Bourne	Crane	Gallinger	Penrose
Bradley	Cullom	Gamble	Perkins
Brandegee	Dick	Hale	Piles
Briggs	Dillingham	Heyburn	Scott
Brown	Dolliver	Johnson, N. Dak.	Smoot
Bulkeley	du Pont	Jones	Sutherland
Burnham	Elkins	Kean	Warner
Burrows	*Fletcher*	Lodge	Warren
Burton	Flint	Nelson	Wetmore

NAYS—28.

Bacon	*Clay*	*Gore*	*Rayner*
Bailey	Crawford	*Hughes*	Root
Bankhead	*Culberson*	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Smith, Md.*
Beveridge	Cummins	La Follette	*Smith, S. C.*
Bristow	Curtis	*Martin*	*Stone*
Burkett	*Daniel*	*Money*	*Taylor*
Clarke, Ark.	*Frazier*	*Overman*	*Tillman*

NOT VOTING—19.

Chamberlain	Guggenheim	Oliver	*Simmons*
Clapp	McCumber	*Owen*	Smith, Mich.
Davis	*McEnery*	*Paynter*	Stephenson
Depew	*McLaurin*	Richardson	*Taliaferro*
Dixon	*Newlands*	*Shively*	

So the amendment of the committee was agreed to.

Paragraph 281 of the bill as it came from the House imposed a duty of 1½ cents per pound upon fresh beef and other fresh meats.

Upon an amendment offered by the Finance Committee, this duty was increased to 2 cents per pound.

Mr. Bacon, of Georgia, moved to reconsider the action of the Senate in adopting this amendment, stating that the purpose of the motion to reconsider was, if such motion prevailed, to offer an amendment *reducing the rate of duty on fresh beef and other fresh meats to a point below the one and one-half cents per pound as found in the bill as it came from the House.*

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Upon the question of agreeing to the motion to reconsider for the purpose stated, the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2688, May 31, 1909):

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 40, as follows:

YEAS—32.

Bacon	*Clay*	Gamble	*Overman*
Bailey	*Culberson*	*Gore*	*Rayner*
Bankhead	Cummins	*Hughes*	*Shively*
Beveridge	*Daniel*	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Simmons*
Bristow	Dolliver	*Martin*	*Smith, Md.*
Brown	*Fletcher*	*Money*	*Smith, S. C.*
Burton	*Frazier*	Nelson	*Taliaferro*
Clarke, Ark.	Gallinger	*Newlands*	*Tillman*

NAYS—40.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Elkins	Penrose
Borah	Crane	Flint	Perkins
Bradley	Crawford	Frye	Piles
Brandegee	Cullom	Hale	Root
Briggs	Curtis	Heyburn	Scott
Bulkeley	Depew	Johnson, N. Dak.	Smoot
Burkett	Dick	Kean	Stephenson
Burnham	Dillingham	Lodge	Warner
Burrows	Dixon	*McEnery*	Warren
Carter	du Pont	Page	Wetmore

NOT VOTING—19.

Bourne	Guggenheim	Nixon	Smith, Mich.
Chamberlain	Jones	Oliver	*Stone*
Clapp	La Follette	*Owen*	Sutherland
Davis	McCumber	*Paynter*	*Taylor*
Foster	*McLaurin*	Richardson	

So the motion to reconsider was rejected.

The cotton schedule being under consideration, the Finance Committee proposed an amendment to paragraph 313 increasing the duty by inserting the following words:

313. Cotton cloth, valued at not over 7 cents per square yard, and bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, and not exceeding 50 threads to the square inch, counting the warp and filling, 1 cent per square yard; if bleached, and valued at not over 9 cents per square yard, one and one-fourth cents per square yard; if dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, and valued at not over 12 cents per square yard, 2 cents per square yard.

Upon the question of the adoption of this amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2837, June 5):

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 30, as follows:

YEAS—41.

Aldrich	Crane	Guggenheim	Perkins
Borah	Cullom	Hale	Piles
Bradley	Curtis	Heyburn	Root
Brandegee	Dick	Johnson, N. Dak.	Smoot
Briggs	Dillingham	Jones	Stephenson
Bulkeley	du Pont	Kean	Sutherland
Burnham	Elkins	Lodge	Warner
Burrows	Flint	McCumber	Wetmore
Burton	*Foster*	*McEnery*	
Carter	Gallinger	Page	
Clark, Wyo.	Gamble	Penrose	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—30.

Bacon	Crawford	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Paynter*
Bailey	*Culberson*	La Follette	*Shively*
Beveridge	Cummins	*Martin*	*Simmons*
Bristow	Dolliver	*Money*	*Smith, Md.*
Brown	*Fletcher*	Nelson	*Stone*
Burkett	*Frazier*	*Newlands*	*Tillman*
Clapp	*Gore*	*Overman*	
Clay	*Hughes*	*Owen*	

NOT VOTING—20.

Bankhead	*Davis*	Nixon	Smith, Mich.
Bourne	Depew	Oliver	*Smith, S. C.*
Chamberlain	Dixon	*Rayner*	*Taliaferro*
Clarke, Ark.	Frye	Richardson	*Taylor*
Daniel	*McLaurin*	Scott	Warren

So the amendment of the committee was agreed to.

The Finance Committee proposed a further amendment to said paragraph 313 increasing the duty by inserting the following words in said paragraph:

Valued at over 7 and not over 9 cents per square yard, 2¼ cents per square yard; valued at over 9 and not over 10 cents per square yard, 3 cents per square yard; valued at over 10 and not over 12½ cents per square yard, 4⅜ cents per square yard; valued at over 12½ and not over 14 cents per square yard, 5½ cents per square yard; valued at over 14 cents per square yard, 7 cents per square yard, but not less than 25 per cent ad valorem.

On the question of the adoption of this amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2844, June 5):

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 28, as follows:

YEAS—39.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Guggenheim	Penrose
Borah	Crane	Hale	Perkins
Bradley	Cullom	Heyburn	Piles
Brandegee	Curtis	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Briggs	Dick	Jones	Smoot
Bulkeley	Dillingham	Kean	Stephenson
Burnham	du Pont	Lodge	Sutherland
Burrows	Elkins	McCumber	Warner
Burton	*Foster*	*McEnery*	Wetmore
Carter	Gallinger	Page	

NAYS—28.

Bacon	Crawford	*Gore*	*Overman*
Bailey	*Culberson*	*Hughes*	*Owen*
Bristow	Cummins	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Paynter*
Brown	Dolliver	La Follette	*Shively*
Burkett	*Fletcher*	*Money*	*Smith, Md.*
Clapp	*Frazier*	Nelson	*Stone*
Clay	Gamble	*Newlands*	*Tillman*

NOT VOTING—24.

Bankhead	*Davis*	*Martin*	*Simmons*
Beveridge	Depew	Nixon	Smith, Mich.
Bourne	Dixon	Oliver	*Smith, S. C.*
Chamberlain	Flint	*Rayner*	*Taliaferro*
Clarke, Ark.	Frye	Richardson	*Taylor*
Daniel	*McLaurin*	Scott	Warren

So the amendment of the committee was agreed to.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

The Finance Committee proposed a further amendment to said paragraph 313 increasing the duty by inserting the following words in said paragraph:

Valued at over 9 and not over 11 cents per square yard, two and three-fourths cents per square yard; valued at over 11 and not over 12 cents per square yard, four and one-quarter cents per square yard; valued at over 12 and not over 15 cents per square yard, five and one-fourth cents per square yard; valued at over 15 and not over 16 cents per square yard, six and one-half cents per square yard; valued at over 16 cents per square yard, 8 cents per square yard, but not less than 25 per cent ad valorem.

On the question of the adoption of this amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2845, June 5):

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 29, as follows:

YEAS—39.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Guggenheim	Penrose
Borah	Crane	Hale	Perkins
Bradley	Cullom	Heyburn	Piles
Brandegee	Curtis	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Briggs	Dick	Jones	Smoot
Bulkeley	Dillingham	Kean	Stephenson
Burnham	du Pont	Lodge	Sutherland
Burrows	Elkins	McCumber	Warner
Burton	*Foster*	*McEnery*	Wetmore
Carter	Gallinger	Page	

NAYS—29.

Bacon	*Culberson*	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Shively*
Bailey	Cummins	La Follette	*Simmons*
Bristow	Dolliver	*Money*	*Smith, Md.*
Brown	*Fletcher*	Nelson	*Stone*
Burkett	*Frazier*	*Newlands*	*Tillman*
Clapp	Gamble	*Overman*	
Clay	*Gore*	*Owen*	
Crawford	*Hughes*	*Paynter*	

NOT VOTING—23.

Bankhead	*Davis*	*Martin*	Smith, Mich.
Beveridge	Depew	Nixon	*Smith, S. C.*
Bourne	Dixon	Oliver	*Taliaferro*
Chamberlain	Flint	*Rayner*	*Taylor*
Clarke, Ark.	Frye	Richardson	Warren
Daniel	*McLaurin*	Scott	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Finance Committee offered similar amendments to paragraphs 314, 315, 316, and 317, involving the same questions. For convenience, the vote was taken on these four paragraphs en bloc, and upon the question of agreeing to the several amendments to the several paragraphs the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2846, June 5):

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 28, as follows:

YEAS—39.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Page
Borah	Crane	Guggenheim	Penrose
Bradley	Cullom	Hale	Perkins
Brandegee	Curtis	Heyburn	Piles
Briggs	Depew	Johnson, N. Dak.	Smoot
Bulkeley	Dick	Jones	Stephenson
Burnham	Dillingham	Kean	Sutherland
Burrows	du Pont	Lodge	Warner
Burton	Elkins	McCumber	Wetmore
Carter	*Foster*	*McEnery*	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—28.

Bacon	Crawford	*Gore*	*Owen*
Bailey	*Culberson*	*Hughes*	*Paynter*
Bristow	Cummins	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Shively*
Brown	Dolliver	La Follette	*Simmons*
Burkett	*Fletcher*	Nelson	*Smith, Md.*
Clapp	*Frazier*	*Newlands*	*Stone*
Clay	Gamble	*Overman*	*Tillman*

NOT VOTING—24.

Bankhead	*Davis*	*Money*	Scott
Beveridge	Dixon	Nixon	Smith, Mich.
Bourne	Flint	Oliver	*Smith, S. C.*
Chamberlain	Frye	*Rayner*	*Taliaferro*
Clarke, Ark.	*McLaurin*	Richardson	*Taylor*
Daniel	*Martin*	Root	Warren

So the amendments to paragraphs 314, 315, 316, and 317 were agreed to.

The Finance Committee proposed an amendment to paragraph 319, increasing the duty, by which amendment a duty was imposed upon "cotton window Hollands" of 3 cents per square yard and 20 per cent ad valorem.

Upon the question of the adoption of this amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2874, June 7):

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 26, as follows:

YEAS—41.

Aldrich	Cullom	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Borah	Curtis	Jones	Scott
Bradley	Depew	Kean	Smith, Mich.
Brandegee	Dick	Lodge	Smoot
Briggs	Elkins	McCumber	Stephenson
Burnham	Flint	*McEnery*	Sutherland
Burrows	*Foster*	Oliver	Warner
Burton	Gallinger	Page	Wetmore
Carter	Guggenheim	Penrose	
Clark, Wyo.	Hale	Perkins	
Crane	Heyburn	Piles	

NAYS—26.

Bacon	*Culberson*	*Hughes*	*Paynter*
Bailey	Cummins	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Simmons*
Beveridge	Dolliver	La Follette	*Stone*
Bristow	*Fletcher*	*McLaurin*	*Taliaferro*
Brown	*Frazier*	Nelson	*Taylor*
Burkett	Gamble	*Newlands*	
Clay	*Gore*	*Overman*	

NOT VOTING—24.

Bankhead	Crawford	Frye	Richardson
Bourne	*Daniel*	*Martin*	*Shively*
Bulkeley	*Davis*	*Money*	*Smith, Md.*
Chamberlain	Dillingham	Nixon	*Smith, S. C.*
Clapp	Dixon	*Owen*	*Tillman*
Clarke, Ark.	du Pont	*Rayner*	Warren

So the amendment of the committee was agreed to.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

The Senate having under consideration paragraph 321, imposing cumulative duties additional to duties otherwise imposed, Mr. Dolliver offered to amend the paragraph *by striking from the same the following words:*

On all cotton cloth mercerized or subjected to any similar process, 1 cent per square yard.

On the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2898, June 7, 1909):

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 38, as follows:

YEAS—32.

Bacon	*Culberson*	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Overman*
Bailey	Cummins	Jones	*Owen*
Beveridge	Dolliver	La Follette	*Paynter*
Bristow	*Fletcher*	*McLaurin*	*Shively*
Brown	*Frazier*	*Martin*	*Simmons*
Burkett	Gamble	*Money*	*Smith, Md.*
Clapp	*Gore*	Nelson	*Stone*
Clay	*Hughes*	*Newlands*	*Taliaferro*

NAYS—38.

Aldrich	Cullom	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Bradley	Curtis	Kean	Scott
Brandegee	Depew	Lodge	Smith, Mich.
Briggs	Dixon	McCumber	Smoot
Burnham	Elkins	*McEnery*	Stephenson
Burrows	Flint	Oliver	Warner
Burton	Gallinger	Page	Warren
Carter	Guggenheim	Penrose	Wetmore
Clark, Wyo.	Hale	Perkins	
Crane	Heyburn	Piles	

NOT VOTING—21.

Bankhead	Crawford	*Foster*	Sutherland
Borah	*Daniel*	Frye	*Taylor*
Bourne	*Davis*	Nixon	*Tillman*
Bulkeley	Dick	*Rayner*	
Chamberlain	Dillingham	Richardson	
Clarke, Ark.	du Pont	*Smith, S. C.*	

So Mr. Dolliver's amendment was rejected.

To paragraph 326 Mr. Lodge offered the following amendment, increasing the duty on cheap cotton gloves:

Cotton gloves, knitted or woven, valued at more than $1.20 and not more than $6 per dozen pairs, 50 cents per dozen pairs and 45 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than $6 per dozen pairs, 55 per cent ad valorem.

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2912, June 7):

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 24, as follows:

YEAS—41.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Guggenheim	Piles
Borah	Crane	Hale	Root
Bradley	Crawford	Heyburn	Smith, Mich.
Brandegee	Depew	Johnson, N. Dak.	Smoot
Briggs	Dick	Kean	Stephenson
Brown	Dixon	Lodge	Warner
Burkett	du Pont	*McEnery*	Warren
Burnham	Elkins	Oliver	Wetmore
Burrows	Flint	Page	
Burton	Gallinger	Penrose	
Carter	Gamble	Perkins	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—24.

Bacon	Cummins	La Follette	*Overman*
Bailey	Dolliver	*McLaurin*	*Paynter*
Bristow	*Fletcher*	*Martin*	*Shively*
Clapp	*Gore*	*Money*	*Simmons*
Clay	*Hughes*	Nelson	*Smith, Md.*
Culberson	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Newlands*	*Stone*

NOT VOTING—26.

Bankhead	Curtis	Jones	*Smith, S. C.*
Beveridge	*Daniel*	McCumber	Sutherland
Bourne	*Davis*	Nixon	*Taliaferro*
Bulkeley	Dillingham	*Owen*	*Taylor*
Chamberlain	*Foster*	*Rayner*	*Tillman*
Clarke, Ark.	*Frazier*	Richardson	
Cullom	Frye	Scott	

So the amendment of the committee was agreed to.

Paragraph 368 in the woolen schedule imposed a duty of 25 cents per pound on top waste and roving waste and 20 cents a pound on slubbing waste, ring waste, and garnetted waste.

The Finance Committee offered an amendment *imposing 30 cents per pound on all the articles enumerated in the paragraph.*

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2967, June 9):

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 30, as follows:

YEAS—40.

Aldrich	Carter	Gamble	Piles
Borah	Clark, Wyo.	Guggenheim	Root
Bourne	Crane	Heyburn	Scott
Bradley	Crawford	Johnson, N. Dak.	Smith, Mich
Brandegee	Cullom	Kean	Smoot
Briggs	Dick	Lodge	Stephenson
Bulkeley	Dixon	McCumber	Sutherland
Burnham	du Pont	Page	Warner
Burrows	Flint	Penrose	Warren
Burton	Gallinger	Perkins	Wetmore

NAYS—30.

Bacon	Cummins	La Follette	*Rayner*
Beveridge	*Davis*	*Martin*	*Simmons*
Bristow	Dolliver	*Money*	*Smith, Md.*
Brown	*Fletcher*	Nelson	*Stone*
Burkett	*Foster*	*Newlands*	*Taliaferro*
Clapp	*Gore*	*Overman*	*Taylor*
Clay	*Hughes*	*Owen*	
Culberson	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Paynter*	

NOT VOTING—21.

Bailey	Depew	Jones	*Shively*
Bankhead	Dillingham	*McEnery*	*Smith, S. C.*
Chamberlain	Elkins	*McLaurin*	*Tillman*
Clarke, Ark.	*Frazier*	Nixon	
Curtis	Frye	Oliver	
Daniel	Hale	Richardson	

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

Paragraph 369 of the House bill was as follows:

Shoddy, 20 cents per pound; noils, wool extract, yarn waste, thread waste, and all other wastes composed wholly or in part of wool and not specially provided for in this section, 18 cents per pound.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

The Senate Finance Committee proposed an amendment *increasing the duty on shoddy to 25 cents per pound and increasing the duty on all other articles enumerated in the paragraph to 20 cents a pound.*

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2972, June 9):

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 31, as follows:

YEAS—42.

Aldrich	Crane	Guggenheim	Root
Borah	Crawford	Heyburn	Scott
Bradley	Cullom	Johnson, N. Dak.	Smith, Mich.
Brandegee	Curtis	Kean	Smoot
Briggs	Dick	Lodge	Stephenson
Bulkeley	Dillingham	McCumber	Sutherland
Burnham	Dixon	*McEnery*	Warner
Burrows	du Pont	Page	Warren
Burton	Flint	Penrose	Wetmore
Carter	Gallinger	Perkins	
Clark, Wyo.	Gamble	Piles	

NAYS—31.

Bacon	Cummins	La Follette	*Paynter*
Beveridge	*Davis*	*McLaurin*	*Rayner*
Bristow	Dolliver	*Martin*	*Simmons*
Brown	*Fletcher*	*Money*	*Smith, Md.*
Burkett	*Foster*	Nelson	*Stone*
Clapp	*Gore*	*Newlands*	*Taliaferro*
Clay	*Hughes*	*Overman*	*Taylor*
Culberson	*Jonhston, Ala.*	*Owen*	

NOT VOTING—18.

Bailey	*Daniel*	Hale	*Shively*
Bankhead	Depew	Jones	*Smith, S. C.*
Bourne	Elkins	Nixon	*Tillman*
Chamberlain	*Frazier*	Oliver	
Clarke, Ark.	Frye	Richardson	

So the amendment of the Committee on Finance was agreed to.

To paragraph 372 Mr. Dolliver offered a substitute reducing the duty, as follows:

372. Wools advanced from a scoured state, known as tops, valued at not more than 40 cents per pound, 30 cents per pound; valued at more than 40 cents per pound, 35 cents per pound; and in addition thereto to all the foregoing, 20 per cent ad valorem.

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 2978, June 9):

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 42, as follows:

YEAS—29.

Bacon	*Davis*	*McLaurin*	*Simmons*
Bristow	Dolliver	*Martin*	*Smith, Md.*
Brown	*Fletcher*	*Money*	*Stone*
Burkett	*Foster*	Nelson	*Taliaferro*
Clapp	*Gore*	*Newlands*	*Taylor*
Clay	*Hughes*	*Overman*	
Culberson	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Paynter*	
Cummins	La Follette	*Rayner*	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—42.

Aldrich	Crane	Guggenheim	Root
Borah	Crawford	Heyburn	Scott
Bradley	Cullom	Johnson, N. Dak.	Smith, Mich.
Brandegee	Curtis	Kean	Smoot
Briggs	Dick	Lodge	Stephenson
Bulkeley	Dillingham	McCumber	Sutherland
Burnham	Dixon	*McEnery*	Warner
Burrows	du Pont	Page	Warren
Burton	Flint	Penrose	Wetmore
Carter	Gallinger	Perkins	
Clark, Wyo.	Gamble	Piles	

NOT VOTING—20.

Bailey	*Clarke, Ark.*	Frye	*Owen*
Bankhead	*Daniel*	Hale	Richardson
Beveridge	Depew	Jones	*Shively*
Bourne	Elkins	Nixon	*Smith, S. C.*
Chamberlain	*Frazier*	Oliver	*Tillman*

So Mr. Dolliver's amendment was rejected.

Mr. Dolliver proposed a reduction of the duty by an amendment, to strike out paragraph 373 and in lieu thereof to insert the following:

372. On yarns made wholly or in part of wool, valued at not more than 40 cents per pound, 27½ cents per pound on the wool contained therein; valued at more than 40 cents per pound, 38½ cents per pound on the wool contained therein; and in addition thereto to all the foregoing 35 per cent ad valorem.

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3010, June 10):

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—31.

Bacon	*Culberson*	*Hughes*	*Paynter*
Beveridge	Cummins	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Rayner*
Bristow	*Davis*	La Follette	*Simmons*
Brown	Dolliver	*Martin*	*Smith, Md.*
Burkett	*Fletcher*	*Money*	*Stone*
Chamberlain	*Foster*	Nelson	*Taliaferro*
Clapp	*Frazier*	*Newlands*	*Taylor*
Clay	*Gore*	*Overman*	

NAYS—43.

Aldrich	Crane	Guggenheim	Piles
Borah	Crawford	Heyburn	Root
Bourne	Cullom	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Bradley	Curtis	Kean	Smith, Mich.
Brandegee	Depew	Lodge	Smoot
Briggs	Dick	McCumber	Stephenson
Bulkeley	Dillingham	*McEnery*	Sutherland
Burnham	Dixon	Oliver	Warner
Burrows	Flint	Page	Warren
Burton	Gallinger	Penrose	Wetmore
Clark, Wyo.	Gamble	Perkins	

NOT VOTING—17.

Bailey	du Pont	*McLaurin*	*Smith, S. C.*
Bankhead	Elkins	Nixon	*Tillman*
Carter	Frye	*Owen*	
Clarke, Ark.	Hale	Richardson	
Daniel	Jones	*Shively*	

So Mr. Dolliver's amendment was rejected.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

To paragraph 374 Mr. Dolliver offered the following as a substitute therefor, reducing the duty:

374. Cloths, knit fabrics, women's and children's dress goods, coat linings, Italian cloths, bunting and goods of similar character or description, and all manufactures made wholly or in part of wool, not specially provided for in this section, valued at not more than 40 cents per pound, 33 cents per pound on the wool contained therein; valued above 40 cents per pound, 44 cents per pound on the wool contained therein; and in addition thereto, on all the foregoing, 50 per cent ad valorem: Provided, That all manufactures in part of wool not specially provided for in this schedule, when composed in chief value of a material other than wool, shall be subject to the rate at which the same would be chargeable under this section if composed wholly of the material thereof of chief value, and in addition thereto shall be subject to a duty of 44 cents per pound on the wool contained therein.

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3013, June 10):

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 42, as follows:

YEAS—30.

Bacon	*Culberson*	*Hughes*	*Rayner*
Beveridge	Cummins	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Simmons*
Bristow	*Davis*	La Follette	*Smith, Md.*
Brown	Dolliver	*McLaurin*	*Stone*
Burkett	*Fletcher*	*Martin*	*Taliaferro*
Chamberlain	*Foster*	*Money*	*Taylor*
Clapp	*Frazier*	Nelson	
Clay	*Gore*	*Overman*	

NAYS—42.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Perkins
Borah	Crane	Gamble	Piles
Bourne	Crawford	Heyburn	Root
Bradley	Cullom	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Brandegee	Curtis	Kean	Smoot
Briggs	Depew	Lodge	Stephenson
Bulkeley	Dick	McCumber	Sutherland
Burnham	Dillingham	*McEnery*	Warner
Burrows	Dixon	Oliver	Warren
Burton	du Pont	Page	
Carter	Flint	Penrose	

NOT VOTING—19.

Bailey	Frye	Nixon	Smith, Mich.
Bankhead	Guggenheim	*Owen*	*Smith, S. C.*
Clarke, Ark.	Hale	*Paynter*	*Tillman*
Daniel	Jones	Richardson	Wetmore
Elkins	*Newlands*	*Shively*	

So Mr. Dolliver's amendment was rejected.

To paragraph 374 Mr. Dolliver offered the following as a substitute therefor, reducing the duty:

374. Woolen or worsted cloths, woolen or worsted shawls, and all manufactures of every description made wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the goat, alpaca, or other animals not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, valued at not exceeding 40 cents per pound, 35 cents per pound and in addition thereto 35 per cent ad valorem; valued at above 40 cents per pound and not exceeding 60 cents per pound, 35 cents per pound and 40 per cent ad valorem; valued above 60 cents per pound, 45 cents per pound and in addition thereto 40 per cent ad valorem.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3014, June 10):

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—30.

Bacon	Cummins	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Rayner*
Beveridge	*Davis*	La Follette	*Simmons*
Bristow	Dolliver	*Martin*	*Smith, Md.*
Brown	*Fletcher*	*Money*	*Stone*
Burkett	*Foster*	Nelson	*Taliaferro*
Chamberlain	*Frazier*	*Newlands*	*Taylor*
Clapp	*Gore*	*Overman*	
Clay	*Hughes*	*Paynter*	

NAYS—43.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Gamble	Penrose
Borah	Crane	Guggenheim	Perkins
Bourne	Crawford	Heyburn	Piles
Bradley	Cullom	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Brandegee	Curtis	Kean	Scott
Briggs	Depew	Lodge	Smoot
Bulkeley	Dick	McCumber	Stephenson
Burnham	Dillingham	*McEnery*	Sutherland
Burrows	Dixon	Nixon	Warner
Burton	du Pont	Oliver	Warren
Carter	Gallinger	Page	

NOT VOTING—18.

Bailey	Elkins	*McLaurin*	*Smith, S. C.*
Bankhead	Flint	*Owen*	*Tillman*
Clarke, Ark.	Frye	Richardson	Wetmore
Culberson	Hale	*Shively*	
Daniel	Jones	Smith, Mich.	

So Mr. Dolliver's amendment was rejected.

To paragraph 375 Mr. Dolliver offered the following as a substitute therefor, reducing the duty:

375. Blankets and flannels for underwear, composed wholly or in part of wool, valued at not more than 40 cents per pound, 22 cents per pound on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 30 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than 40 cents and not more than 50 cents per pound, 33 cents per pound on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 35 per cent ad valorem. Blankets composed wholly or in part of wool, valued at more than 50 cents per pound, 33 cents per pound on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 40 per cent ad valorem. Flannels composed wholly or in part of wool, valued at above 50 cents per pound, shall be classified and pay the same duties as women's and children's dress goods.

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3014, June 10):

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—31.

Bacon	Cummins	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Owen*
Beveridge	*Davis*	La Follette	*Paynter*
Bristow	Dolliver	*McLaurin*	*Rayner*
Brown	*Fletcher*	*Martin*	*Simmons*
Burkett	*Foster*	*Money*	*Smith, Md.*
Chamberlain	*Frazier*	Nelson	*Taliaferro*
Clapp	*Gore*	*Newlands*	*Taylor*
Clay	*Hughes*	*Overman*	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—43.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Gamble	Perkins
Borah	Crane	Guggenheim	Piles
Bourne	Crawford	Heyburn	Root
Bradley	Cullom	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Brandegee	Curtis	Kean	Smith, Mich.
Briggs	Depew	Lodge	Smoot
Bulkeley	Dick	McCumber	Stephenson
Burnham	Dillingham	*McEnery*	Sutherland
Burrows	Dixon	Oliver	Warner
Burton	du Pont	Page	Warren
Carter	Gallinger	Penrose	

NOT VOTING—17.

Bailey	Elkins	Nixon	*Tillman*
Bankhead	Flint	Richardson	Wetmore
Clarke, Ark.	Frye	*Shively*	
Culberson	Hale	*Smith, S. C.*	
Daniel	Jones	*Stone*	

So Mr. Dolliver's amendment was rejected.

Thereupon Mr. Dolliver offered an additional amendment to paragraph 375 as a substitute therefor, reducing the duty, as follows:

375. Flannels, blankets, and hats, composed wholly or in part of wool, the hair of the goat, alpaca, or other animals, valued at not exceeding 30 cents per pound, 10 cents per pound; valued at above 30 cents per pound and not exceeding 40 cents per pound, 12 cents per pound; valued at above 40 cents per pound and not exceeding 60 cents per pound, 18 cents per pound; and in addition thereto, upon all the above-named articles, 35 per cent ad valorem; valued at above 60 cents per pound, 45 cents per pound, and in addition thereto 40 per cent ad valorem.

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3015, June 10):

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—29.

Bacon	*Clay*	La Follette	*Rayner*
Bankhead	Cummins	*McLaurin*	*Simmons*
Beveridge	*Davis*	*Martin*	*Smith, Md.*
Bristow	Dolliver	Nelson	*Taliaferro*
Brown	*Frazier*	*Newlands*	*Taylor*
Burkett	*Gore*	*Overman*	
Chamberlain	*Hughes*	*Owen*	
Clapp	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Paynter*	

NAYS—43.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Gamble	Perkins
Borah	Crane	Guggenheim	Piles
Bourne	Crawford	Heyburn	Root
Bradley	Cullom	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Brandegee	Curtis	Kean	Smith, Mich.
Briggs	Depew	Lodge	Smoot
Bulkeley	Dick	*McEnery*	Stephenson
Burnham	Dillingham	Nixon	Sutherland
Burrows	du Pont	Oliver	Warner
Burton	Flint	Page	Warren
Carter	Gallinger	Penrose	

NOT VOTING—19.

Bailey	Elkins	Jones	*Smith, S. C.*
Clarke, Ark.	*Fletcher*	McCumber	*Stone*
Culberson	*Foster*	*Money*	*Tillman*
Daniel	Frye	Richardson	Wetmore
Dixon	Hale	*Shively*	

So Mr. Dolliver's amendment was rejected.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

To paragraph 376 Mr. Dolliver offered the following as a substitute therefor, reducing the duty:

376. Women's and children's dress goods, coat linings, Italian cloths, and goods of similar character or description, of which the warp consists wholly of cotton or other vegetable fiber, and the remainder of the fabric composed wholly or in part of wool, valued at not more than 20 cents per square yard, 11 cents per square yard and 25 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than 20 cents per square yard, 11 cents per square yard and 35 per cent ad valorem: Provided, That on all the foregoing weighing over 4 ounces per square yard the duty shall be the same as is imposed by this schedule on cloths.

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3022, June 10, 1909):

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 41, as follows:

YEAS—30.

Bacon	*Clay*	*Hughes*	*Overman*
Bankhead	*Culberson*	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Owen*
Beveridge	Cummins	La Follette	*Paynter*
Bristow	*Davis*	*McLaurin*	*Rayner*
Brown	Dolliver	*Martin*	*Taliaferro*
Burkett	*Fletcher*	*Money*	*Taylor*
Chamberlain	*Foster*	Nelson	
Clapp	*Gore*	*Newlands*	

NAYS—41.

Aldrich	Crawford	Guggenheim	Perkins
Bradley	Cullom	Heyburn	Root
Brandegee	Curtis	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Briggs	Depew	Jones	Smith, Mich.
Bulkeley	Dick	Kean	Smoot
Burnham	Dillingham	Lodge	Stephenson
Burrows	Dixon	McCumber	Sutherland
Burton	du Pont	Nixon	Warner
Carter	Flint	Oliver	
Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Page	
Crane	Gamble	Penrose	

NOT VOTING—20.

Bailey	Elkins	Piles	*Smith, S. C.*
Borah	*Frazier*	Richardson	*Stone*
Bourne	Frye	*Shively*	*Tillman*
Clarke, Ark.	Hale	*Simmons*	Warren
Daniel	*McEnery*	*Smith, Md.*	Wetmore

So Mr. Dolliver's amendment was rejected.

To paragraph 379 Mr. Dolliver offered the following as a substitute therefor, reducing the duty:

379. Webbings, gorings, bandings, beltings, bindings, braids, galloons, edgings, insertings, flouncings, fringes, gimps, cords, cords and tassels, ribbons, ornaments, laces, trimmings, and articles made wholly or in part of lace, embroideries and all articles embroidered by hand or machinery, head nets, nettings, buttons or barrel buttons or buttons of other forms for tassels or ornaments, and manufactures of wool ornamented with beads or spangles of whatever material composed, any of the foregoing made of wool or of which wool is a component material, whether containing india rubber or not, 50 cents per pound on the wool contained therein and in addition thereto 60 per cent ad valorem: Provided, That if the duties upon any article held to be dutiable under Schedule K of this section shall exceed 100 per cent ad valorem, duty shall be assessed thereon at 100 per cent ad valorem.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3032, June 10):

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—32.

Bacon	*Culberson*	*Hughes*	*Owen*
Bankhead	Cummins	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Paynter*
Beveridge	*Davis*	La Follette	*Rayner*
Bristow	Dolliver	*McLaurin*	*Simmons*
Brown	*Fletcher*	*Martin*	*Smith, Md.*
Burkett	*Foster*	Nelson	*Stone*
Chamberlain	*Frazier*	*Newlands*	*Taliaferro*
Clapp	*Gore*	*Overman*	*Taylor*

NAYS—43.

Aldrich	Crane	Gamble	Penrose
Borah	Crawford	Guggenheim	Perkins
Bradley	Cullom	Heyburn	Root
Brandegee	Curtis	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Briggs	Depew	Jones	Smith, Mich.
Bulkeley	Dick	Kean	Smoot
Burnham	Dillingham	McCumber	Stephenson
Burrows	Dixon	*McEnery*	Sutherland
Burton	du Pont	Nixon	Warner
Carter	Flint	Oliver	Warren
Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Page	

NOT VOTING—16.

Bailey	*Daniel*	Lodge	*Shively*
Bourne	Elkins	*Money*	*Smith, S. C.*
Clarke, Ark.	Frye	Piles	*Tillman*
Clay	Hale	Richardson	Wetmore

So Mr. Dolliver's amendment was rejected.

To the woolen schedule Mr. Dolliver offered an amendment, to be known as 391¾, reducing the duty, as follows:

Page 135, after line 12, insert the following:

"391¾. All invoices of manufactured or partly manufactured articles subject to duty under this schedule shall specify separately the quantity of wool contained in every such article, and duty shall not be assessed upon a less quantity of wool than so stated in the invoice, and any such article concerning which the invoice does not specify the quantity of wool shall be assessed as if composed wholly of wool. This schedule shall take effect ninety days after the passage of this act, and until that time Schedule K of the act approved July 24, 1897, entitled 'An act to provide revenue for the Government and to encourage the industries of the United States,' shall remain in full force and effect."

Provided, That in no event shall the duty on any of the foregoing articles in paragraphs 368, 369, or 370 exceed 60 per cent ad valorem.

Provided, That in no case shall the duty upon wools, wool wastes, noils, or any of the foregoing articles in the previous paragraphs of this schedule exceed 60 per cent ad valorem.

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3039, June 10, 1909):

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 39, as follows:

YEAS—27.

Bacon	*Chamberlain*	*Foster*	Nelson
Bailey	Clapp	*Frazier*	*Newlands*
Bankhead	*Clay*	*Gore*	*Overman*
Beveridge	Cummins	*Hughes*	*Paynter*
Bristow	*Davis*	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Simmons*
Brown	Dolliver	La Follette	*Stone*
Burkett	*Fletcher*	*Martin*	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—39.

Aldrich	Crane	Gamble	Penrose
Borah	Crawford	Guggenheim	Perkins
Bradley	Cullom	Heyburn	Root
Brandegee	Curtis	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Bulkeley	Dick	Jones	Smoot
Burnham	Dillingham	Kean	Stephenson
Burrows	Dixon	Lodge	Sutherland
Burton	du Pont	*McEnery*	Warner
Carter	Elkins	Oliver	Warren
Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Page	

NOT VOTING—25.

Bourne	Frye	Piles	*Taliaferro*
Briggs	Hale	*Rayner*	*Taylor*
Clarke, Ark.	McCumber	Richardson	*Tillman*
Culberson	*McLaurin*	*Shively*	Wetmore
Daniel	*Money*	*Smith, Md.*	
Depew	Nixon	Smith, Mich.	
Flint	*Owen*	*Smith, S. C.*	

So Mr. Dolliver's amendment was rejected.

To paragraph 365 Mr. Dolliver offered the following as a substitute therefor, reducing the duty:

365. The duty upon all wools and hair of the first and second classes shall be based upon the shrinkage which would result in scouring such wools under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe; if shrinking 65 per cent or more, 11 cents per pound; if shrinking less than 65 per cent and not more than 55 per cent, 13 cents per pound; if shrinking less than 55 per cent and not more than 45 per cent, 16 cents per pound; if shrinking less than 45 per cent and not more than 35 per cent, 20 cents per pound; if shrinking less than 35 per cent and not more than 25 per cent, 24 cents per pound; if shrinking less than 25 per cent and not more than 15 per cent, 27 cents per pound; if shrinking less than 15 per cent, 36 cents per pound.

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3054, June 10):

The result was announced—yeas 21, nays 37, as follows:

YEAS—21.

Bacon	Clapp	*Gore*	*Newlands*
Bankhead	*Clay*	*Hughes*	*Overman*
Beveridge	Cummins	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Simmons*
Bristow	*Davis*	La Follette	
Brown	Dolliver	*Martin*	
Burkett	*Fletcher*	Nelson	

NAYS—37.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Gamble	Root
Borah	Crane	Heyburn	Scott
Bradley	Crawford	Johnson, N. Dak.	Smoot
Brandegee	Cullom	Jones	Stephenson
Bulkeley	Dick	Kean	Sutherland
Burnham	Dillingham	Lodge	Warner
Burrows	Dixon	Oliver	Warren
Burton	du Pont	Page	
Carter	Elkins	Penrose	
Chamberlain	Gallinger	Perkins	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NOT VOTING—33.

Bailey	*Foster*	Nixon	*Smith, S. C.*
Bourne	*Frazier*	*Owen*	*Stone*
Briggs	Frye	*Paynter*	*Taliaferro*
Clarke, Ark.	Guggenheim	Piles	*Taylor*
Culberson	Hale	*Rayner*	*Tillman*
Curtis	McCumber	Richardson	Wetmore
Daniel	*McEnery*	*Shively*	
Depew	*McLaurin*	*Smith, Md.*	
Flint	*Money*	Smith, Mich.	

So Mr. Dolliver's amendment was rejected.

Mr. La Follette offered the following amendments to the several paragraphs of the wool schedule (Schedule K) reducing the rates of duty proposed in the said paragraphs of the bill:

Amend paragraph 356 by striking out the word "three," in line 23, on page 124, and insert the word "two."

Amend paragraph 357 by striking out the same and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "357. Class 1, all wool not hereinafter included in class 2."

Strike out paragraph 358.

Amend paragraph 359 by striking out the word "three," in line 14, on page 125, and insert in lieu thereof the word "two."

Amend paragraph 361 by inserting after the word "duty," in line 9, on page 126, the words "as class 1;" and by striking out all of the balance of line 9 and all of line 10.

Amend paragraph 362 by striking out the same and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Paragraph 362. The duty on wools of the first class shall be 45 per cent ad valorem."

Strike all of paragraph 363.

Amend paragraph 364 by striking out all of line 9, on page 127, after the word "be," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Thirty-five per cent ad valorem;" also by striking out all of lines 10 to 20, inclusive, on said page 127.

Strike out all of paragraphs 365 and 366.

Strike out all of paragraph 367.

Amend the committee amendment to paragraph 368 by striking out the words "30 cents per pound," in line 10, on page 129, and insert in lieu thereof the words "45 per cent ad valorem."

Amend paragraph 369 by striking out the words "25 cents per pound," in line 11, on page 129, and the words "20 cents per pound," in line 14, and inserting after the word "section," in line 14, the words "45 per cent ad valorem."

Amend paragraph 370 by striking out all of line 15, on page 129, after the word "flocks," and all of line 16, and insert in lieu thereof the words "45 per cent ad valorem."

Amend paragraph 371 to read as follows:

"371. Tops, 50 per cent ad valorem."

Amend paragraph 373 by striking out all of the paragraph after the word "pound," in line 26, on page 129, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "55 per cent."

Amend paragraph 374 by striking out the words "or in part of wool," in line 9, on page 130, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "of wool, or of which wool is the component material of chief value."

Also amend the paragraph by striking out all of the paragraph after the word "section," and inserting in lieu thereof the words "65 per cent ad valorem."

Strike out all of paragraphs 375, 376, 377, 378, and 379.

Amend paragraph 380 by striking out all of the paragraph after the word "description," in line 11, on page 133, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "60 per cent ad valorem."

Amend paragraph 381 by striking out all of the paragraph after the word "description," in line 15, on page 133, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "60 per cent ad valorem."

Amend paragraph 382 by striking out all of the paragraph after the word "description," in line 18, on page 133, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "60 per cent ad valorem."

Amend paragraph 383 by striking out all of the paragraph after the word "description," in line 23, on page 133, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "60 per cent ad valorem."

Amend paragraph 384 by striking out all of the paragraph after the word "otherwise," in line 1, on page 134, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "60 per cent ad valorem."

Amend paragraph 385 by striking out all of the paragraph after the word "carpets," in line 4, on page 134, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "60 per cent ad valorem."

Amend paragraph 386 by striking out all of the paragraph after the word "carpets," in line 6, on page 134, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "60 per cent ad valorem."

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Amend paragraph 387 by striking out all of the paragraph after the word "rugs," in line 11, on page 134, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "60 per cent ad valorem."

Amend paragraph 388 by striking out all of the paragraph after the word "otherwise," in lines 15 and 16, on page 134, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "60 per cent ad valorem."

By unanimous consent the vote was taken upon these several amendments, and was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3073, June 11):

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 44, as follows:

YEAS—32.

Bacon	Clapp	*Hughes*	*Owen*
Bailey	*Clay*	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Paynter*
Bankhead	Cummins	La Follette	*Rayner*
Beveridge	*Davis*	*Martin*	*Simmons*
Bristow	Dolliver	*Money*	*Smith, Md.*
Brown	*Foster*	Nelson	*Stone*
Burkett	*Frazier*	*Newlands*	*Taliaferro*
Chamberlain	*Gore*	*Overman*	*Tillman*

NAYS—44.

Aldrich	Crawford	Gallinger	Penrose
Borah	Cullom	Gamble	Perkins
Bourne	Curtis	Guggenheim	Piles
Brandegee	Depew	Heyburn	Root
Bulkeley	Dick	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Burnham	Dillingham	Kean	Smoot
Burrows	Dixon	Lodge	Stephenson
Burton	du Pont	*McEnery*	Sutherland
Carter	Elkins	Nixon	Warner
Clark, Wyo.	Flint	Oliver	Warren
Crane	Frye	Page	Wetmore

NOT VOTING—15.

Bradley	*Daniel*	McCumber	Smith, Mich.
Briggs	*Fletcher*	*McLaurin*	*Smith, S. C.*
Clarke, Ark.	Hale	Richardson	*Taylor*
Culberson	Jones	*Shively*	

So Mr. La Follette's amendments were rejected.

Mr. Bacon offered an amendment to paragraphs 356 to 372, inclusive, reducing the rates of duty proposed in the said paragraphs of the bill, by striking out the said paragraphs and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

The duty upon all wools, hair of the camel, goat, alpaca, and other like animals, and upon shoddy, noils, wool extract, woolen rags, mungo, and flocks, yarn waste, thread waste, and all other waste composed wholly or in part of wool, shall be 30 per cent ad valorem.

The vote upon the proposed amendment to thus strike out and insert was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3123, June 12, 1909):

The result was announced—yeas 21, nays 50, as follows:

YEAS—21.

Bacon	*Foster*	*Money*	*Stone*
Bailey	*Frazier*	*Overman*	*Taliaferro*
Bankhead	*Gore*	*Paynter*	*Tillman*
Clay	*Hughes*	*Rayner*	
Culberson	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Simmons*	
Davis	*Martin*	*Smith, Md.*	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—50.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Flint	Penrose
Borah	Crane	Frye	Perkins
Bourne	Crawford	Gallinger	Piles
Brandegee	Cullom	Guggenheim	Root
Bristow	Cummins	Heyburn	Scott
Brown	Curtis	Johnson, N. Dak.	Smoot
Bulkeley	Depew	Kean	Stephenson
Burkett	Dick	La Follette	Sutherland
Burnham	Dillingham	Lodge	Warner
Burrows	Dixon	McCumber	Warren
Burton	Dolliver	Nelson	Wetmore
Carter	du Pont	Nixon	
Clapp	Elkins	Page	

NOT VOTING—20.

Beveridge	*Daniel*	*McEnery*	Richardson
Bradley	*Fletcher*	*McLauren*	*Shively*
Briggs	Gamble	*Newlands*	Smith, Mich.
Chamberlain	Hale	Oliver	*Smith, S. C.*
Clarke, Ark.	Jones	*Owen*	*Taylor*

So Mr. Bacon's amendment was rejected.

Mr. Bacon then offered an amendment proposing to amend the bill further by striking out paragraph 373 and succeeding paragraphs to 389, inclusive, and by inserting the several paragraphs in lieu thereof, reducing the duty, as follows:

373. On yarns made wholly or in part of wool, valued at not more than 30 cents per pound, the duty per pound shall be two and one-half times the duty imposed by this section on 1 pound of unwashed wool of the first class, and in addition thereto 25 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than 30 cents per pound, the duty per pound shall be three and one-half times the duty imposed by this section on 1 pound of unwashed wool of the first class, and in addition thereto, upon all the foregoing, 40 per cent ad valorem. (In equivalent, maximum 143.02 per cent ad valorem.)

And insert in lieu thereof the following:

"*373. On yarns made wholly or in part of wool, 40 per cent ad valorem.*"

Amend further by striking out paragraph 374, on page 130, which is as follows:

"374. On cloths, knit fabrics, and all manufactures of every description made wholly or in part of wool, not specially provided for in this section, valued at not more than 40 cents per pound, the duty per pound shall be three times the duty imposed by this section on a pound of unwashed wool of the first class; valued at above 40 cents per pound and not above 70 cents per pound, the duty per pound shall be four times the duty imposed by this section on 1 pound of unwashed wool of the first class, and in addition thereto, upon all the foregoing, 50 per cent ad valorem; valued at over 70 cents per pound, the duty per pound shall be four times the duty imposed by this section on 1 pound of unwashed wool of the first class and 55 per cent ad valorem." (In equivalent, maximum 141 per cent ad valorem.)

And insert the following in lieu thereof:

"*374. On knit fabrics, and all fabrics made on knitting machines or frames, not including wearing apparel, and on shawls made wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the camel, goat, alpaca, or other animals, valued at not exceeding 40 cents per pound, 35 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than 40 cents per pound, forty per cent ad valorem.*"

Amend further by striking out paragraph 375, on page 130, which is as follows:

"375. On blankets, and flannels for underwear composed wholly or in part of wool, valued at not more than 40 cents per pound, the duty per pound shall be the same as the duty imposed by this section on 2 pounds of unwashed wool of the first class, and in addition thereto 30 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than 40 cents and not more than 50 cents per pound, the duty per pound shall be three times the duty imposed by this section on 1 pound of unwashed wool of the first class, and in addition thereto 35 per cent ad valorem. On blankets composed wholly or in part of wool, valued at more than 50 cents per pound, the duty per pound shall be three times the duty imposed by this section on 1 pound of unwashed wool of the first class, and in addition thereto 40 per cent ad valorem. Flannels composed wholly or in part of wool, valued

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

at above 50 cents per pound, shall be classified and pay the same duty as women's and children's dress goods, coat linings, Italian cloths, and goods of similar character and description provided by this section: *Provided*, That on blankets over 3 yards in length the same duties shall be paid as on cloths." (In equivalent, maximum 165.42 per cent ad valorem.)

And insert the following in lieu thereof:

"*375. On blankets, hats of wool, flannels for underwear and felts for printing machines, composed wholly or in part of wool, the hair of the camel, goat, alpaca, or other animals, valued at not more than 30 cents per pound, 25 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than 30 and not more than 40 cents per pound, 30 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than 40 cents per pound, 35 per cent ad valorem: Provided, That on blankets over 3 yards in length the same duties shall be paid as on woolen and worsted cloths.*"

Amend further by striking out paragraph 376, on page 131, and paragraph 377, on page 132, which are as follows:

"376. On women's and children's dress goods, coat linings, Italian cloths, and goods of similar description and character of which the warp consists wholly of cotton or other vegetable material, with the remainder of the fabric composed wholly or in part of wool, valued at not exceeding 15 cents per square yard, the duty shall be 7 cents per square yard; valued at more than 15 cents per square yard, the duty shall be 8 cents per square yard; and in addition thereto on all the foregoing valued at not above 70 cents per pound, 50 per cent ad valorem; valued above 70 cents per pound, 55 per cent ad valorem." (In equivalent, maximum 115.53 per cent ad valorem.)

"377. On women's and children's dress goods, coat linings, Italian cloths, bunting, and goods of similar description or character composed wholly or in part of wool, and not specially provided for in this section, the duty shall be 11 cents per square yard; and in addition thereto on all the foregoing valued at not above 70 cents per pound, 50 per cent ad valorem; valued above 70 cents per pound, 55 cent per ad valorem: *Provided*, That on all the foregoing weighing over 4 ounces per square yard, the duty shall be the same as imposed by this schedule on cloths." (In equivalent, maximum 118 per cent ad valorem.)

And insert the following in lieu thereof:

"*On women's and children's dress goods, coat linings, Italian cloths, bunting, or goods of similar description or character, and on all manufactures composed wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the camel, goat, alpaca, or other animals, valued at not over 50 cents per pound, 35 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than 50 cents per pound, 50 per cent ad valorem.*"

Amend further by striking out paragraph 378, on page 132, which is as follows:

"378. On clothing, ready-made, and articles of wearing apparel of every description, wool hats, shawls whether knitted or woven, and knitted articles of every description made up or manufactured wholly or in part, felts not woven, and not specially provided for in this section, composed wholly or in part of wool, the duty per pound shall be four times the duty imposed by this section on 1 pound of unwashed wool of the first class, and in addition thereto 60 per cent ad valorem." (In equivalent, maximum 95.98 per cent ad valorem.)

And insert the following in lieu thereof:

"*378. On clothing, ready-made, and articles of wearing apparel of every description, made up or manufactured wholly or in part, not specially provided for in this act, felts not specially provided for in this act, all the foregoing composed wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the camel, goat, alpaca, or other animals, valued at above $1.50 per pound, 50 per cent ad valorem; valued at less than $1.50 per pound, 35 per cent ad valorem. On cloaks, dolmans, jackets, talmas, ulsters, or other outside garments for ladies' and children's apparel, and goods of similar description or used for like purposes, and on knit wearing apparel, composed wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the camel, goat, alpaca, or other animals, made up or manufactured wholly or in part, 40 per cent ad valorem.*"

Amend further by striking out paragraph 379, on page 132, which is as follows:

"379. Webbings, gorings, suspenders, braces, bandings, beltings, bindings, braids, galloons, edgings, insertings, flouncings, fringes, gimps, cords, cords and tassels, ribbons, ornaments, laces, trimmings, and articles made wholly or in part of lace, embroideries and all articles embroidered by hand or machinery, head nets, nettings, buttons or barrel buttons, or buttons of other forms for tassels or ornaments, and manufactures of wool ornamented with beads or spangles of whatever material composed, any of the foregoing made of wool or of which wool is a component material, whether containing india rubber or not, 50 cents per pound and 60 per cent ad valorem." (In equivalent, maximum 80.83 per cent ad valorem.)

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

And insert the following in lieu thereof:

"*379. On webbings, gorings, suspenders, braces, beltings, bindings, braids, galloons, fringes, gimps, cords, cords and tassels, dress trimmings, laces, embroideries, head nets, nettings and veilings, buttons or barrel buttons, or buttons of other forms for tassels or ornaments, any of the foregoing which are elastic or nonelastic, made of wool, worsted, the hair of the camel, goat, alpaca, or other animals, or of which wool, worsted, the hair of the camel, goat, alpaca, or other animals is a component material, 45 per cent ad valorem.*"

Amend further by striking out paragraph 380, on page 133, which is as follows:

"380. Aubusson, Axminster, moquette, and chenille carpets, figured or plain, and all carpets or carpeting of like character or description, 60 cents per square yard and in addition thereto 40 per cent ad valorem." (In equivalent, 66.34 per cent ad valorem.)

And insert the following in lieu thereof:

"*380. Aubusson, Axminster, moquette, and chenille carpets, figured or plain, carpets woven whole for rooms, and all carpets or carpeting of like character or descriptions, 40 per cent ad valorem.*"

Amend further by striking out paragraph 381, on page 133, which is as follows:

"381. Saxony, Wilton, and Tournay velvet carpets, figured or plain, and all carpets or carpeting of like character or description, 60 cents per square yard and in addition thereto 40 per cent ad valorem." (In equivalent, 72.67 per cent ad valorem.)

And insert the following in lieu thereof:

"*381. Saxony, Wilton, and Tournay velvet carpets, figured or plain, and all carpets or carpeting of like character or description, 40 per cent ad valorem.*"

Amend further by striking out paragraph 382, on page 133, which is as follows:

"382. Brussels carpets, figured or plain, and all carpets or carpeting of like character or description, 44 cents per square yard and in addition thereto 40 per cent ad valorem." (In equivalent, 75.81 per cent ad valorem.)

And insert the following in lieu thereof:

"*382. Brussels carpets, figured or plain, and all carpets or carpeting of like character or description, 40 per cent ad valorem.*"

Amend further by striking out paragraph 383, on page 133, which is as follows:

"383. Velvet and tapestry velvet carpets, figured or plain, printed on the warp or otherwise, and all carpets or carpeting of like character or description, 40 cents per square yard and in addition thereto 40 per cent ad valorem." (In equivalent, 58.86 per cent ad valorem.)

And insert the following in lieu thereof:

"*383. Velvet and tapestry velvet carpets, figured or plain, printed on the warp or otherwise, and all carpets or carpeting of like character or description, 40 per cent ad valorem.*"

Amend further by striking out paragraph 384, on page 133, which is as follows:

"384. Tapestry Brussels carpets, figured or plain, and all carpets or carpeting of like character or description, printed on the warp or otherwise, 28 cents per square yard, and in addition thereto 40 per cent ad valorem." (In equivalent, 60.73 per cent ad valorem.)

And insert the following in lieu thereof:

"*384. Tapestry Brussels carpets, figured or plain, and all carpets or carpeting of like character or description, printed on the warp or otherwise, 40 per cent ad valorem.*"

Amend further by striking out paragraph 385, on page 134, which is as follows:

"385. Treble ingrain, three-ply, and all chain Venetian carpets, 22 cents per square yard, and in addition thereto 40 per cent ad valorem." (In equivalent, 66.72 per cent ad valorem.)

And insert the following in lieu thereof:

"*385. Treble ingrain, three-ply, and all chain Venetian carpets, 30 per cent ad valorem.*"

Amend further by striking out paragraph 386, on page 134, which is as follows:

"386. Wool Dutch and two-ply ingrain carpets, 18 cents per square yard, and in addition thereto 40 per cent ad valorem." (In equivalent, 58.63 per cent ad valorem.)

And insert in lieu thereof:

"*386. Wool Dutch and two-ply ingrain carpets, 30 per cent ad valorem.*"

Amend further by striking out paragraph 387, on page 134, which is as follows:

"387. Carpets of every description, woven whole for rooms, and oriental, Berlin, Aubusson, Axminster, and similar rugs, 10 cents per square foot and 40 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That in the measurement of all mats, rugs, carpets, and similar articles, of whatever material composed, the selvage, if any, shall be included." (In equivalent, 60.01 per cent ad valorem.)

And insert the following in lieu thereof:

"*387. Carpets of every description woven whole for rooms, and oriental, Berlin, and other similar rugs, 40 per cent ad valorem.*"

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Amend further by striking out paragraph 388, on page 134, which is as follows:

"388. Druggets and bockings, printed, colored, or otherwise, 22 cents per square yard and in addition thereto 40 per cent ad valorem." (In equivalent, 70.86 per cent ad valorem.)

And insert the following in lieu thereof:

"*388. Druggets and bockings, printed, colored, or otherwise, felt carpeting, figured or plain, 30 per cent ad valorem.*"

Amend further by striking out paragraph 389, on page 134, which is as follows:

"389. Carpets and carpeting of wool, flax, or cotton, or composed in part of any of them, not specially provided for in this section, and mats, matting, and rugs of cotton, 50 per cent ad valorem."

And insert the following in lieu thereof:

"*389. Carpets and carpeting, of wool, flax, or cotton, composed in part of either, not specially provided for in this act, 30 per cent ad valorem.*"

Upon the question of the adoption to thus strike out and insert, the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3126, June 12):

The result was announced—yeas 20, nays 50, as follows:

YEAS—20.

Bacon	*Davis*	*Martin*	*Simmons*
Bailey	*Frazier*	*Money*	*Smith, Md.*
Bankhead	*Gore*	*Overman*	*Stone*
Clay	*Hughes*	*Paynter*	*Taliaferro*
Culberson	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Rayner*	*Tillman*

NAYS—50.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Frye	Penrose
Borah	Crane	Gallinger	Perkins
Bourne	Crawford	Guggenheim	Piles
Brandegee	Cummins	Heyburn	Root
Bristow	Curtis	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Brown	Depew	Kean	Smoot
Bulkeley	Dick	La Follette	Stephenson
Burkett	Dillingham	Lodge	Sutherland
Burnham	Dixon	*McEnery*	Warner
Burrows	Dolliver	Nelson	Warren
Burton	du Pont	Nixon	Wetmore
Carter	Elkins	Oliver	
Clapp	Flint	Page	

NOT VOTING—21.

Beveridge	*Daniel*	McCumber	Smith, Mich.
Bradley	*Fletcher*	*McLaurin*	*Smith, S. C.*
Briggs	*Foster*	*Newlands*	*Taylor*
Chamberlain	Gamble	*Owen*	
Clarke, Ark.	Hale	Richardson	
Cullom	Jones	*Shively*	

So Mr. Bacon's amendments were rejected.

Mr. Gore offered an amendment proposing to reduce the duty on blankets by adding the following proviso to paragraph 375:

Provided, however, That in no case shall the duty on blankets exceed 75 per cent ad valorem.

Upon the question of the adoption of this amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3078, June 11, 1909):

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—29.

Bacon	*Culberson*	*Martin*	*Simmons*
Bailey	*Davis*	*Money*	*Smith, Md.*
Bankhead	Dolliver	Nelson	*Stone*
Bristow	*Frazier*	*Newlands*	*Taliaferro*
Brown	*Gore*	*Overman*	*Tillman*
Burkett	*Hughes*	*Owen*	
Clapp	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Paynter*	
Clay	La Follette	*Rayner*	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—43.

Aldrich	Crawford	Frye	Perkins
Borah	Cullom	Gallinger	Piles
Bourne	Cummins	Guggenheim	Root
Brandegee	Curtis	Heyburn	Scott
Bulkeley	Depew	Johnson, N. Dak.	Smoot
Burnham	Dick	Kean	Stephenson
Burrows	Dillingham	Lodge	Sutherland
Burton	Dixon	*McEnery*	Warner
Carter	du Pont	Nixon	Warren
Clark, Wyo.	Elkins	Page	Wetmore
Crane	Flint	Penrose	

NOT VOTING—19.

Beveridge	*Daniel*	Jones	*Shively*
Bradley	*Fletcher*	McCumber	Smith, Mich.
Briggs	*Foster*	*McLaurin*	*Smith, S. C.*
Chamberlain	Gamble	Oliver	*Taylor*
Clarke, Ark.	Hale	Richardson	

So Mr. Gore's amendment was rejected.

Mr. Cummins offered an amendment to the amendment proposed by Mr. Bailey, of Texas, imposing a general income tax, which amendment was accepted by Mr. Bailey as a modification of his original amendment. Mr. Aldrich, of Rhode Island, moved to postpone further consideration of the amendment until the 18th day of June. Upon the motion to postpone, the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3081, June 11, 1909):

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 34, as follows:

YEAS—45.

Aldrich	Crane	Frye	Perkins
Beveridge	Crawford	Gallinger	Root
Bradley	Cullom	Guggenheim	Scott
Brandegee	Curtis	Heyburn	Smoot
Brown	Depew	Johnson, N. Dak.	Stephenson
Bulkeley	Dick	Kean	Sutherland
Burkett	Dillingham	Lodge	Warner
Burnham	Dixon	Nelson	Warren
Burrows	Dolliver	Nixon	Wetmore
Burton	du Pont	Oliver	
Carter	Elkins	Page	
Clark, Wyo.	Flint	Penrose	

NAYS—34.

Bacon	*Culberson*	La Follette	*Rayner*
Bailey	Cummins	*McEnery*	*Simmons*
Bankhead	*Davis*	*Martin*	*Smith, Md.*
Borah	*Fletcher*	*Money*	*Stone*
Bourne	*Foster*	*Newlands*	*Taliaferro*
Bristow	*Frazier*	*Overman*	*Taylor*
Chamberlain	*Gore*	*Owen*	*Tillman*
Clapp	*Hughes*	*Paynter*	
Clay	*Johnston, Ala.*	Piles	

NOT VOTING—12.

Briggs	Gamble	McCumber	*Shively*
Clarke, Ark.	Hale	*McLaurin*	Smith, Mich.
Daniel	Jones	Richardson	*Smith, S. C.*

So the motion of Mr. Aldrich to postpone was agreed to.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Mr. Cummins moved to recommit Schedule K to the committee, with instructions as follows:

To again consider the same and report a schedule as follows, to wit:

"1. With the duties on wool unchanged.

"2. With so-called 'compensatory duties' to the woolen manufacturers that will measure the difference between the price which domestic manufacturers pay for wool and the price paid by their chief foreign competitors.

"3. A further duty upon imported woolen manufactures that will represent the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad, with a fair manufacturers' profit added, less the compensatory duties already given to domestic manufacturers because of the higher price they are compelled to pay for wool."

Upon the question of the adoption of the motion to recommit with instructions the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3082, June 11, 1909):

The result was announced—yeas 8, nays 59, as follows:

YEAS—8.

Beveridge	Brown	Clapp	Dolliver
Bristow	Burkett	Cummins	Nelson

NAYS—59.

Aldrich	Crawford	*Gore*	*Paynter*
Bacon	*Culberson*	Guggenheim	Penrose
Bankhead	Cullom	Heyburn	Piles
Bourne	Curtis	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Bradley	*Davis*	Kean	Scott
Brandegee	Depew	Lodge	*Simmons*
Bulkeley	Dick	*McEnery*	Smoot
Burnham	Dillingham	*McLaurin*	Stephenson
Burrows	Dixon	*Martin*	*Stone*
Burton	du Pont	*Money*	Sutherland
Carter	Elkins	Nixon	*Taliaferro*
Chamberlain	Flint	Oliver	*Tillman*
Clark, Wyo.	*Foster*	*Overman*	Warren
Clay	Frye	*Owen*	Wetmore
Crane	Gallinger	Page	

NOT VOTING—24.

Bailey	*Frazier*	La Follette	*Shively*
Borah	Gamble	McCumber	*Smith, Md.*
Briggs	Hale	*Newlands*	Smith, Mich.
Clarke, Ark.	*Hughes*	Perkins	*Smith, S. C.*
Daniel	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Rayner*	*Taylor*
Fletcher	Jones	Richardson	Warner

So the motion of Mr. Cummins was rejected.

The Finance Committee proposed an amendment to increase the duty from 20 to 30 cents per pound on wool waste by striking out paragraph 368 of the House bill and inserting the following in lieu thereof:

368. Top waste, slubbing waste, roving waste, ring waste, and garnetted waste, 30 cents per pound.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment to thus strike out and insert, the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3121, June 12):

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 30, as follows:

YEAS—40.

Aldrich	Carter	Gamble	Piles
Borah	Clark, Wyo.	Guggenheim	Root
Bourne	Crane	Heyburn	Scott
Bradley	Crawford	Johnson, N. Dak.	Smith, Mich.
Brandegee	Cullom	Kean	Smoot
Briggs	Dick	Lodge	Stephenson
Bulkeley	Dixon	McCumber	Sutherland
Burnham	du Pont	Page	Warner
Burrows	Flint	Penrose	Warren
Burton	Gallinger	Perkins	Wetmore

NAYS—30.

Bacon	Cummins	La Follette	*Rayner*
Beveridge	*Davis*	*Martin*	*Simmons*
Bristow	Dolliver	*Money*	*Smith, Md.*
Brown	*Fletcher*	Nelson	*Stone*
Burkett	*Foster*	*Newlands*	*Taliaferro*
Clapp	*Gore*	*Overman*	*Taylor*
Clay	*Hughes*	*Owen*	
Culberson	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Paynter*	

NOT VOTING—21.

Bailey	Depew	Jones	*Shively*
Bankhead	Dillingham	*McEnery*	*Smith, S. C.*
Chamberlain	Elkins	*McLaurin*	*Tillman*
Clarke, Ark.	*Frazier*	Nixon	
Curtis	Frye	Oliver	
Daniel	Hale	Richardson	

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

The Finance Committee offered an amended paragraph, to be known as No. 711½, *admitting certain works of art free of duty*. Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3137, June 12):

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 14, as follows:

YEAS—53.

Aldrich	Crane	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Beveridge	Crawford	Kean	Scott
Bourne	Cullom	La Follette	*Smith, Md.*
Bradley	*Davis*	Lodge	Smoot
Brandegee	Depew	*Martin*	Stephenson
Briggs	Dick	*Money*	*Stone*
Bristow	Dillingham	*Newlands*	*Taliaferro*
Bulkeley	Dolliver	Nixon	*Tillman*
Burnham	du Pont	Oliver	Warner
Burrows	Elkins	*Overman*	Warren
Burton	Flint	Page	Wetmore
Carter	Frye	Penrose	
Chamberlain	Gallinger	Perkins	
Clay	Guggenheim	*Rayner*	

NAYS—14.

Borah	Cummins	Heyburn	*Paynter*
Brown	Curtis	*Hughes*	Piles
Burkett	Dixon	McCumber	
Clark, Wyo.	*Fletcher*	Nelson	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NOT VOTING—24.

Bacon	*Daniel*	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Shively*
Bailey	*Foster*	Jones	*Simmons*
Bankhead	*Frazier*	*McEnery*	Smith, Mich.
Clapp	Gamble	*McLaurin*	*Smith, S. C.*
Clarke, Ark.	*Gore*	*Owen*	Sutherland
Culberson	Hale	Richardson	*Taylor*

So the paragraph as amended was agreed to.

The Finance Committee proposed an amendment to the bill fixing rates of duty upon importations into the United States from the Philippine Islands. Mr. Bristow of Kansas proposed an amendment to the amendment *excepting sugar from the duty imposed by the committee amendment upon articles imported into the Philippine Islands from foreign countries, and thence reimported into the United States.*

Upon the question of the adoption of this amendment to the committee amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3186, June 14):

The result was announced—yeas 11, nays 49, as follows:

YEAS—11.

Bristow	Cummins	*Fletcher*	*Newlands*
Brown	Davis	*Gore*	*Tillman*
Clapp	Doliver	La Follette	

NAYS—49.

Aldrich	Crane	Johnson, N. Dak.	Perkins
Bacon	Crawford	Jones	Piles
Borah	Cullom	Kean	Root
Bradley	*Daniel*	Lodge	*Simmons*
Brandegee	Depew	McCumber	*Smith, S. C.*
Briggs	Dick	*McEnery*	Smoot
Bulkeley	Dillingham	*Martin*	Stephenson
Burkett	Dixon	Nelson	Sutherland
Burnham	du Pont	Nixon	Warner
Burrows	*Foster*	*Overman*	Wetmore
Burton	Gallinger	Page	
Carter	Guggenheim	*Paynter*	
Clark, Wyo.	Heyburn	Penrose	

NOT VOTING—31.

Bailey	Curtis	*Johnson, Ala.*	*Shively*
Bankhead	Elkins	*McLaurin*	*Smith, Md.*
Beveridge	Flint	*Money*	Smith, Mich.
Bourne	*Frazier*	Oliver	*Stone*
Chamberlain	Frye	*Owen*	*Taliaferro*
Clarke, Ark.	Gamble	*Rayner*	*Taylor*
Clay	Hale	Richardson	Warren
Culberson	*Hughes*	Scott	

So Mr. Bristow's amendment to the amendment of the committee was rejected.

Mr. Stone offered an amendment to the above-stated committee amendment *proposing to declare the policy of the United States as to the retention of the Philippine Islands.*

Upon the question of the adoption of this amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3188, June 14):

The result was announced—yeas 18, nays 44, as follows:

YEAS—18.

Bacon	*Frazier*	*Money*	*Stone*
Bailey	*Gore*	*Newlands*	*Taliaferro*
Clay	*Hughes*	*Overman*	*Tillman*
Davis	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Paynter*	
Fletcher	*McEnery*	*Simmons*	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—44.

Aldrich	*Chamberlain*	Flint	Page
Beveridge	Clapp	Gallinger	Perkins
Brandegee	Crane	Guggenheim	Piles
Briggs	Crawford	Heyburn	Root
Bristow	Depew	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Bulkeley	Dick	Kean	Smoot
Burkett	Dillingham	La Follette	Stephenson
Burnham	Dixon	Lodge	Sutherland
Burrows	Dolliver	Nelson	Warner
Burton	du Pont	Nixon	Warren
Carter	Elkins	Oliver	Wetmore

NOT VOTING—29.

Bankhead	Cullom	Jones	*Shively*
Borah	Cummins	McCumber	*Smith, Md.*
Bourne	Curtis	*McLaurin*	Smith, Mich.
Bradley	*Daniel*	*Martin*	*Smith, S. C.*
Brown	*Foster*	*Owen*	*Taylor*
Clark, Wyo.	Frye	Penrose	
Clarke, Ark.	Gamble	*Rayner*	
Culberson	Hale	Richardson	

So Mr. Stone's amendment to the amendment of the committee was rejected.

Mr. Bulkeley moved to refer the committee amendment relative to the Philippine tariff to the Committee on the Philippines.

Upon the question of the adoption of the motion to refer the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3189, June 14):

The result was announced—yeas 21, nays 40, as follows:

YEAS—21.

Bacon	Clapp	*Gore*	*Newlands*
Bailey	*Clay*	*Hughes*	*Overman*
Brandegee	*Davis*	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Paynter*
Bristow	Dick	La Follette	
Bulkeley	*Fletcher*	*McEnery*	
Chamberlain	*Frazier*	*Martin*	

NAYS—40.

Aldrich	Crane	Heyburn.	Perkins
Beveridge	Crawford	Johnson, N. Dak.	Piles
Borah	Depew	Kean	Root
Briggs	Dixon	Lodge	Scott
Burkett	Dolliver	*Money*	Smoot
Burnham	du Pont	Nelson	Stephenson
Burrows	Elkins	Nixon	Sutherland
Burton	Flint	Oliver	Warner
Carter	Gallinger	Page	Warren
Clark, Wyo.	Guggenheim	Penrose	Wetmore

NOT VOTING—30.

Bankhead	Curtis	McCumber	Smith, Mich.
Bourne	*Daniel*	*McLaurin*	*Smith, S. C.*
Bradley	Dillingham	*Owen*	*Stone*
Brown	*Foster*	*Rayner*	*Taliaferro*
Clarke, Ark.	Frye	Richardson	*Taylor*
Culberson	Gamble	*Shively*	*Tillman*
Cullom	Hale	*Simmons*	
Cummins	Jones	*Smith, Md*	

So Mr. Bulkeley's motion was rejected.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Mr. La Follette offered an amendment to the above-stated Philippine amendment, by which amendment to the amendment *the number of cigars to be admitted free of duty from the Philippine Islands was limited to 60,000,000 per annum.* Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment to the committee amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3364, June 15):

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 38, as follows:

YEAS—27.

Bacon	Cummins	*Hughes*	*Owen*
Borah	*Davis*	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Paynter*
Bristow	Dolliver	La Follette	*Simmons*
Brown	*Fletcher*	*McEnery*	*Smith, S. C.*
Burkett	*Foster*	*Money*	*Taliaferro*
Clapp	*Frazier*	*Newlands*	*Tillman*
Clay	*Gore*	*Overman*	

NAYS—38.

Aldrich	Crawford	Heyburn	Piles
Bourne	Cullom	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Brandegee	Depew	Jones	Scott
Briggs	Dick	Kean	Smoot
Buckley	Dillingham	Lodge	Sutherland
Burnham	du Pont	McCumber	Warner
Burrows	Flint	Nelson	Warren
Burton	Frye	Nixon	Wetmore
Carter	Gallinger	Page	
Crane	Guggenheim	Perkins	

NOT VOTING—26.

Bailey	*Culberson*	*McLaurin*	*Smith, Md.*
Bankhead	Curtis	*Martin*	Smith, Mich.
Beveridge	*Daniel*	Oliver	Stephenson
Bradley	Dixon	Penrose	*Stone*
Chamberlain	Elkins	*Rayner*	*Taylor*
Clark, Wyo.	Gamble	Richardson	
Clarke, Ark.	Hale	*Shively*	

So Mr. La Follette's amendment to the amendment of the Committee on Finance was rejected.

Mr. Fletcher offered an amendment striking out paragraph 471d and inserting the following in lieu thereof:

471d. There shall be levied, collected, and paid upon all articles coming into the United States from the Philippine Islands the rates of duty which are required to be levied, collected, and paid upon like articles imported from foreign countries, except as provided by existing law now in force.

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment to thus strike out and insert, the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3441, June 16):

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—26.

Bacon	*Davis*	La Follette	*Simmons*
Bailey	Dixon	*McEnery*	*Smith, Md.*
Bankhead	*Fletcher*	*Martin*	*Smith, S. C.*
Borah	*Foster*	*Overman*	*Taliaferro*
Bristow	*Gore*	*Owen*	*Tillman*
Chamberlain	*Hughes*	*Paynter*	
Clapp	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Rayner*	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—43.

Aldrich	Carter	Frye	Oliver
Beveridge	Crane	Gallinger	Page
Bourne	Crawford	Gamble	Perkins
Brandegee	Cullom	Guggenheim	Piles
Briggs	Cummins	Heyburn	Root
Brown	Curtis	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Bulkeley	Dick	Jones	Smoot
Burkett	Dillingham	Kean	Sutherland
Burnham	Dolliver	Lodge	Warner
Burrows	du Pont	Nelson	Wetmore
Burton	Elkins	Nixon	

NOT VOTING—22.

Bradley	Depew	*Money*	Stephenson
Clark, Wyo.	Flint	*Newlands*	*Stone*
Clarke, Ark.	*Frazier*	Penrose	*Taylor*
Clay	Hale	Richardson	Warren
Culberson	McCumber	*Shively*	
Daniel	*McLaurin*	Smith, Mich.	

So Mr. Fletcher's amendment was rejected.

Mr. Gore offered an amendment to the above-stated Philippine committee amendment, striking out the words "*Except in any fiscal year sugar in excess of 300,000 gross tons,*" and by inserting in lieu thereof the following words: "*Except sugar in excess of 300,000 gross tons during any one fiscal year: Provided, however, That the free importation of 300,000 gross tons for fiscal year shall not extend beyond July 1, 1911.*"

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment to thus strike out and insert, the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3444, June 16):

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—25.

Bacon	*Davis*	*Martin*	*Smith, Md.*
Bailey	*Fletcher*	*Money*	*Smith, S. C.*
Bankhead	*Gore*	*Overman*	*Taliaferro*
Bristow	*Hughes*	*Owen*	*Tillman*
Chamberlain	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Paynter*	
Clapp	La Follette	*Rayner*	
Cummins	*McEnery*	*Simmons*	

NAYS—43.

Aldrich	Crane	Gallinger	Page
Bourne	Crawford	Gamble	Perkins
Brandegee	Cullom	Guggenheim	Piles
Briggs	Curtis	Heyburn	Root
Brown	Dick	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Bulkeley	Dillingham	Jones	Smoot
Burkett	Dixon	Kean	Sutherland
Burnham	Dolliver	Lodge	Warner
Burrows	du Pont	Nelson	Warren
Burton	Elkins	Nixon	Wetmore
Carter	Frye	Oliver	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NOT VOTING—23.

Beveridge	*Culberson*	Hale	*Shively*
Borah	*Daniel*	McCumber	Smith, Mich.
Bradley	Depew	*McLaurin*	Stephenson
Clark, Wyo.	Flint	*Newlands*	*Stone*
Clarke, Ark.	*Foster*	Penrose	*Taylor*
Clay	*Frazier*	Richardson	

So Mr. Gore's amendment was rejected.

The question recurred on agreeing to the Philippine paragraph as amended, and upon this the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3444, June 16):

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 28, as follows:

YEAS—42.

Aldrich	Crane	Frye	Page
Bourne	Cullom	Gallinger	Perkins
Brandegee	Cummins	Guggenheim	Piles
Briggs	Curtis	Heyburn	Scott
Brown	Dick	Johnson, N. Dak.	Smoot
Bulkeley	Dillingham	Jones	Sutherland
Burkett	Dixon	Kean	Warner
Burnham	Dolliver	Lodge	Warren
Burrows	du Pont	Nelson	Wetmore
Burton	Elkins	Nixon	
Carter	Flint	Oliver	

NAYS—28.

Bacon	*Clay*	La Follette	*Rayner*
Bailey	Crawford	*McEnery*	Root
Bankhead	*Davis*	*Martin*	*Simmons*
Borah	*Fletcher*	*Money*	*Smith, Md.*
Bristow	*Gore*	*Overman*	*Smith, S. C.*
Chamberlain	*Hughes*	*Owen*	*Taliaferro*
Clapp	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Paynter*	*Tillman*

NOT VOTING—21.

Beveridge	Depew	*McLaurin*	Stephenson
Bradley	*Foster*	*Newlands*	*Stone*
Clark, Wyo.	*Frazier*	Penrose	*Taylor*
Clarke, Ark.	Gamble	Richardson	
Culberson	Hale	*Shively*	
Daniel	McCumber	Smith, Mich.	

So the paragraph as amended was agreed to.

Mr. Stone offered an amendment striking out Finance Committee's substitute to paragraph 190, which prescribes the duty on zinc ore, and inserting the following in lieu thereof:

Zinc in blocks or pigs; zinc, old and worn-out, fit only to be manufactured; oxide of zinc in whatever form or combination; and all manufactures made wholly of zinc, or of which zinc is a material component, shall be admitted free of duty.

Upon the question of the adoption of this amendment to thus strike out and insert, the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3447, June 16):

The result was announced—yeas 16, nays 49, as follows:

YEAS—16.

Bacon	*Davis*	*Money*	*Simmons*
Chamberlain	*Fletcher*	*Overman*	*Smith, S. C.*
Clay	*Foster*	*Owen*	*Stone*
Daniel	*Martin*	*Paynter*	*Taliaferro*

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—49.

Aldrich	Clapp	Gallinger	Page
Borah	Clark, Wyo.	Guggenheim	Perkins
Bourne	Crane	Heyburn	Piles.
Brandegee	Crawford	*Hughes*	Root
Briggs	Cummins	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Bristow	Curtis	Jones	Smoot
Brown	Dick	Kean	Sutherland
Bulkeley	Dixon	Lodge	Warner
Burkett	Dolliver	McCumber	Warren
Burnham	du Pont	*McEnery*	Wetmore
Burrows	Elkins	Nelson	
Burton	Flint	Nixon	
Carter	Frye	Oliver	

NOT VOTING—26.

Bailey	Depew	La Follette	*Smith, Md.*
Bankhead	Dillingham	*McLaurin*	Smith, Mich.
Beveridge	*Frazier*	*Newlands*	Stephenson
Bradley	Gamble	Penrose	*Taylor*
Clarke, Ark.	*Gore*	*Rayner*	*Tillman*
Culberson	Hale	Richardson	
Cullom	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Shively*	

So Mr. Stone's amendment to the amendment was rejected.

A message was received from the President of the United States making certain recommendations relative to imposing a tax upon all corporations, and also relative to the proposal of a constitutional amendment authorizing the imposition of an income tax. Mr. Gore, of Oklahoma, moved to refer the message, with instructions, to the Finance Committee. Mr. Aldrich, of Rhode Island, moved to lay the motion on the table. Upon the question of the adoption to lay on the table the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3453, June 16):

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 25, as follows:

YEAS—51.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Frye	Nixon
Borah	Crane	Gallinger	Oliver
Brandegee	Crawford	Gamble	Page
Briggs	Cullom	Guggenheim	Perkins
Bristow	Cummins	Hale	Piles
Brown	Curtis	Heyburn	Root
Bulkeley	Dick	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Burkett	Dillingham	Jones	Smoot
Burnham	Dixon	Kean	Sutherland
Burrows	Dolliver	La Follette	Warner
Burton	du Pont	Lodge	Warren
Carter	Elkins	McCumber	Wetmore
Clapp	Flint	Nelson	

NAYS—25.

Bacon	*Davis*	*Martin*	*Smith, S. C.*
Bailey	*Fletcher*	*Money*	*Stone*
Bankhead	*Foster*	*Newlands*	*Taliaferro*
Chamberlain	*Gore*	*Overman*	*Tillman*
Clay	*Hughes*	*Paynter*	
Culberson	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Rayner*	
Daniel	*McEnery*	*Simmons*	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NOT VOTING—15.

Beveridge	Depew	Penrose	Smith, Mich.
Bourne	*Frazier*	Richardson	Stephenson
Bradley	*McLaurin*	*Shively*	*Taylor*
Clarke, Ark.	*Owen*	*Smith, Md.*	

So the motion to table was agreed to.

To paragraph 408, relating to duties on pictures, cards, labels, and so forth, composed wholly or in chief value of paper lithographically printed, Mr. Bristow, of Kansas, offered an amendment *striking out "three" and inserting "two,"* so that if amended it would read *"two cents a pound and 15 per cent ad valorem."* Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3493, June 17):

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 35, as follows:

YEAS—27.

Bacon	*Chamberlain*	*Davis*	*Money*
Bankhead	Clapp	*Fletcher*	*Newlands*
Beveridge	*Clay*	*Gore*	*Rayner*
Bristow	Crawford	*Hughes*	*Simmons*
Brown	*Culberson*	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Stone*
Burkett	Cummins	La Follette	*Taliaferro*
Burton	Curtis	*Martin*	

NAYS—35.

Aldrich	Crane	Guggenheim	Page
Borah	Cullom	Hale	Penrose
Brandegee	Depew	Heyburn	Piles
Briggs	Dick	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Bulkeley	Dixon	Kean	Scott
Burnham	Dolliver	Lodge	Smoot
Burrows	Flint	McCumber	Sutherland
Carter	Gallinger	Nixon	Warren
Clark, Wyo.	Gamble	Oliver	

NOT VOTING—29.

Bailey	*Foster*	*Owen*	Stephenson
Bourne	*Frazier*	*Paynter*	*Taylor*
Bradley	Frye	Perkins	*Tillman*
Clarke, Ark.	Jones	Richardson	Warner
Daniel	*McEnery*	*Shively*	Wetmore
Dillingham	*McLaurin*	*Smith, Md.*	
du Pont	Nelson	Smith, Mich.	
Elkins	*Overman*	*Smith, S. C.*	

So Mr. Bristow's amendment was rejected.

To paragraph 412, imposing duties upon common window glass, Mr. Bacon, of Georgia, offered an amendment reducing said duties as follows:

97. Unpolished cylinder, crown, and common window glass, not exceeding 150 square inches, 1 cent per pound; above that, and not exceeding 384 square inches, 1¼ cents per pound; above that, and not exceeding 720 square inches, 1¾ cents per pound; above that, and not exceeding 864 square inches, 2 cents per pound.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment to thus strike out and insert the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3501, June 17, 1909):

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 52, as follows:

YEAS—25.

Bacon	*Fletcher*	*Money*	*Smith, S. C.*
Bankhead	*Gore*	*Newlands*	*Stone*
Bristow	*Hughes*	*Overman*	*Taylor*
Chamberlain	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Owen*	*Tillman*
Clay	La Follette	*Paynter*	
Daniel	*McLaurin*	*Rayner*	
Davis	*Martin*	*Simmons*	

NAYS—52.

Aldrich	Clapp	Frye	Oliver
Beveridge	Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Page
Borah	Crane	Gamble	Penrose
Bourne	Crawford	Guggenheim	Perkins
Brandegee	Cullom	Hale	Piles
Briggs	Cummins	Heyburn	Root
Brown	Curtis	Jones	Scott
Bulkeley	Depew	Kean	Smith, Mich.
Burkett	Dick	Lodge	Smoot
Burnham	Dillingham	McCumber	Sutherland
Burrows	Dixon	*McEnery*	Warner
Burton	Dolliver	Nelson	Warren
Carter	Flint	Nixon	Wetmore

NOT VOTING—14.

Bailey	du Pont	Johnson, N. Dak.	Stephenson
Bradley	Elkins	Richardson	*Taliaferro*
Clarke, Ark.	*Foster*	*Shively*	
Culberson	*Frazier*	*Smith, Md.*	

So Mr. Bacon's amendment to the amendment was rejected.

To paragraph 405, imposing duty on printing paper suitable for the printing of books and newspapers, Mr. Brown, of Nebraska, offered an amendment *striking out the words "valued at not above two and one-fourth cents per pound, one-tenth of one cent per pound,"* stating at the time that if the amendment were adopted he would follow it with an amendment *putting such printing paper on the free list.* Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3527, June 18):

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 52, as follows:

YEAS—29.

Bacon	*Culberson*	*McLaurin*	*Shively*
Bankhead	*Daniel*	*Martin*	*Simmons*
Beveridge	*Davis*	*Money*	*Smith, S. C.*
Bristow	*Fletcher*	*Newlands*	*Stone*
Brown	*Frazier*	*Overman*	*Tillman*
Burkett	*Gore*	*Owen*	
Chamberlain	*Hughes*	*Paynter*	
Clay	*McEnery*	*Rayner*	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—52.

Aldrich	Crane	Gallinger	Oliver
Bailey	Crawford	Gamble	Page
Borah	Cullom	Guggenheim	Penrose
Bourne	Cummins	Hale	Perkins
Brandegee	Curtis	Heyburn	Piles
Briggs	Dick	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Bulkeley	Dillingham	Jones	Scott
Burnham	Dixon	Kean	Smith, Mich.
Burrows	Dolliver	La Follette	Smoot
Burton	du Pont	Lodge	Sutherland
Carter	Elkins	Lorimer	Warner
Clapp	Flint	Nelson	Warren
Clark, Wyo.	Frye	Nixon	Wetmore

NOT VOTING—11.

Bradley	*Foster*	Richardson	*Taliaferro*
Clarke, Ark.	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Smith, Md.*	*Taylor*
Depew	McCumber	Stephenson	

So Mr. Brown's amendment was rejected.

The Committee on Finance proposed to amend the above-stated paragraph (405) by *striking out "one-tenth of a cent per pound" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "two-tenths,"* so that if amended it would read as follows: *"Valued at not above two and one-quarter cents per pound, two-tenths of a cent a pound."* To this amendment Mr. La Follette, of Wisconsin, offered the following amendment:

Provided, That this rate shall be effective until July 1, 1912, after which time the rate shall be one-tenth of 1 per cent per pound.

Upon the question of the adoption of this amendment to the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3556, June 18, 1909):

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 44, as follows:

YEAS—31.

Bacon	*Clay*	*Hughes*	*Paynter*
Bankhead	Cummins	La Follette	*Rayner*
Beveridge	Curtis	*McLaurin*	*Shively*
Bristow	*Davis*	*Martin*	*Simmons*
Brown	Dolliver	*Money*	*Smith, S. C.*
Burkett	*Fletcher*	*Newlands*	*Stone*
Chamberlain	*Frazier*	*Overman*	*Tillman*
Clapp	*Gore*	*Owen*	

NAYS—44.

Aldrich	Crawford	Heyburn	Perkins
Borah	Cullom	Jones	Piles
Brandegee	Dick	Kean	Root
Briggs	Dillingham	Lodge	Scott
Bulkeley	Dixon	Lorimer	Smith, Mich.
Burnham	Flint	*McEnery*	Smoot
Burrows	Frye	Nelson	Sutherland
Burton	Gallinger	Nixon	*Taliaferro*
Carter	Gamble	Oliver	Warner
Clark, Wyo.	Guggenheim	Page	Warren
Crane	Hale	Penrose	Wetmore

NOT VOTING—17.

Bailey	*Daniel*	Johnson, N. Dak.	Stephenson
Bourne	Depew	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Taylor*
Bradley	du Pont	McCumber	
Clarke, Ark.	Elkins	Richardson	
Culberson	*Foster*	*Smith, Md.*	

So Mr. La Follette's amendment was rejected.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

The question then recurred on behalf of the amendment offered by Mr. Aldrich in behalf of the committee to paragraph 405, and the vote thereon was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3557, June 18, 1909):

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 32, as follows:

YEAS—44.

Aldrich	Crane	Hale	Penrose
Borah	Crawford	Heyburn	Perkins
Brandegee	Cullom	Johnson, N. Dak.	Piles
Briggs	Dick	Jones	Root
Bulkeley	Dillingham	Kean	Scott
Burnham	Dixon	Lodge	Smoot
Burrows	Flint	Lorimer	Sutherland
Burton	Frye	Nelson	*Taliaferro*
Carter	Gallinger	Nixon	Warner
Clapp	Gamble	Oliver	Warren
Clark, Wyo.	Guggenheim	Page	Wetmore

NAYS—32.

Bacon	Cummins	*Hughes*	*Paynter*
Bankhead	Curtis	La Follette	*Rayner*
Beveridge	*Daniel*	*McLaurin*	*Shively*
Bristow	*Davis*	*Martin*	*Simmons*
Brown	Dolliver	*Money*	Smith, Mich.
Burkett	*Fletcher*	*Newlands*	*Smith, S. C.*
Chamberlain	*Frazier*	*Overman*	*Stone*
Clay	*Gore*	*Owen*	*Tillman*

NOT VOTING—16.

Bailey	*Culberson*	*Foster*	Richardson
Bourne	Depew	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Smith, Md.*
Bradley	du Pont	McCumber	Stephenson
Clarke, Ark.	Elkins	*McEnery*	*Taylor*

So Mr. Aldrich's amendment was agreed to.

To the amendment proposed by the Finance Committee, No. 447½, placing hides on the dutiable list, Mr. McLaurin offered an amendment as follows:

The word "hides" as used in this paragraph shall be understood to include all skins of any kind and all kinds of cattle and calves of any weight or size of such skins, however small.

Upon the question of the adoption of this amendment to the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3690, June 22):

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 48, as follows:

YEAS—31.

Bacon	Crawford	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Overman*
Bailey	*Culberson*	Jones	*Shively*
Bankhead	*Davis*	McCumber	*Simmons*
Borah	Dick	*McLaurin*	*Smith, Md.*
Bradley	*Fletcher*	*Martin*	*Stone*
Chamberlain	*Foster*	*Money*	*Taliaferro*
Clapp	*Gore*	Nelson	*Tillman*
Clay	*Hughes*	*Newlands*	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—48.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Frye	*Owen*
Beveridge	Crane	Gallinger	Page
Brandegee	Cullom	Gamble	Penrose
Briggs	Cummins	Hale	Piles
Bristow	Curtis	Heyburn	Root
Brown	*Daniel*	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Bulkeley	Dillingham	La Follette	Smith, Mich.
Burkett	Dixon	Lodge	Smoot
Burnham	Dolliver	Lorimer	Sutherland
Burrows	du Pont	*McEnery*	Warner
Burton	Elkins	Nixon	Warren
Carter	Flint	Oliver	Wetmore

NOT VOTING—13.

Bourne	Guggenheim	*Rayner*	*Taylor*
Clarke, Ark.	Kean	Richardson	
Depew	*Paynter*	*Smith, S. C.*	
Frazier	Perkins	Stephenson	

So Mr. McLaurin's amendment to the amendment of the committee was rejected.

To the above-stated committee amendment imposing a duty on hides, Mr. Stone, of Missouri, offered an amendment so that the section when amended would read as follows:

447½. Hides of cattle, raw or uncured, whether dry, salted, or pickled, leather made from the hides of cattle; boots and shoes made of leather, or of which leather is the component material of chief value; harness, saddles, and saddlery, finished or unfinished, made of leather, or of which leather is the component material of chief value; bands and belting, made of leather, for use on machinery; all the foregoing shall be admitted free of duty.

Upon the question of the adoption of this amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3691, June 22, 1909):

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 48, as follows:

YEAS—26.

Bacon	*Culberson*	La Follette	*Simmons*
Bailey	Cummins	*McLaurin*	*Smith, Md.*
Bristow	*Daniel*	*Martin*	*Stone*
Chamberlain	*Davis*	*Money*	*Taliaferro*
Clapp	*Fletcher*	*Overman*	*Tillman*
Clay	*Gore*	*Owen*	
Crawford	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Shively*	

NAYS—48.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Oliver
Beveridge	Crane	Gamble	Page
Borah	Cullom	Hale	Penrose
Bradley	Curtis	Heyburn	Piles
Brandegee	Dick	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Brown	Dillingham	Jones	Scott
Bulkeley	Dixon	Lodge	Smith, Mich.
Burkett	Dolliver	Lorimer	Smoot
Burnham	du Pont	McCumber	Sutherland
Burrows	Elkins	*McEnery*	Warner
Burton	Flint	Nelson	Warren
Carter	Frye	Nixon	Wetmore

NOT VOTING—18.

Bankhead	*Foster*	*Newlands*	*Smith, S. C.*
Bourne	*Frazier*	*Paynter*	Stephenson
Briggs	Guggenheim	Perkins	*Taylor*
Clarke, Ark.	*Hughes*	*Rayner*	
Depew	Kean	Richardson	

So Mr. Stone's amendment to the amendment of the committee was rejected.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Upon the question of the adoption of the committee amendment No. 447½, *imposing a 15 per cent duty on hides*, the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3703, June 22, 1909):

The roll call having been concluded, the result was announced—yeas 46, nays 30, as follows:

YEAS—46.

Aldrich	*Culberson*	Guggenheim	Piles
Bailey	Cummins	Hale	Scott
Borah	Curtis	Heyburn	*Smith, Md.*
Bradley	Dick	*Hughes*	Smoot
Brandegee	Dixon	Johnson, N. Dak.	Stone
Bristow	Dolliver	Jones	Sutherland
Brown	Elkins	Lorimer	*Taliaferro*
Bulkeley	*Fletcher*	McCumber	Warner
Burkett	Flint	*McEnery*	Warren
Carter	*Foster*	*Newlands*	Wetmore
Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Nixon	
Crawford	Gamble	Penrose	

NAYS—30.

Bacon	Clapp	*Gore*	Page
Bankhead	*Clay*	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Paynter*
Beveridge	Crane	La Follette	Root
Briggs	Cullom	Lodge	*Shively*
Burnham	*Daniel*	*Martin*	Smith, Mich.
Burrows	*Davis*	Nelson	*Tillman*
Burton	du Pont	*Overman*	
Chamberlain	Frye	*Owen*	

NOT VOTING—16.

Bourne	*Frazier*	Oliver	*Simmons*
Clarke, Ark.	Kean	Perkins	*Smith, S. C.*
Depew	*McLaurin*	*Rayner*	Stephenson
Dillingham	*Money*	Richardson	*Taylor*

So the amendment of the Committee on Finance was agreed to.

To paragraph 197 Mr. McCumber proposed an amendment, as follows:

Sawed lumber, not specially provided for in this section, $1 per thousand feet board measure.

Upon the question of the adoption of this amendment, the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3709, June 23):

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 44, as follows:

YEAS—26.

Bankhead	Clapp	Gamble	Nelson
Beveridge	*Clay*	*Gore*	*Overman*
Bristow	Crawford	*Hughes*	*Paynter*
Brown	Cummins	*Johnston, Ala.*	Smith, Mich.
Burkett	Curtis	La Follette	*Tillman*
Burton	*Davis*	McCumber	
Carter	Dolliver	*McLaurin*	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—44.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Guggenheim	Perkins
Bacon	Crane	Hale	Piles
Bailey	Cullom	Heyburn	Root
Borah	Depew	Jones	Scott
Bradley	Dick	Kean	*Simmons*
Brandegee	Dillingham	Lodge	*Smith, Md.*
Briggs	Dixon	*Martin*	Smoot
Bulkeley	*Fletcher*	*Money*	Sutherland
Burnham	Flint	Oliver	*Taliaferro*
Burrows	*Foster*	Page	*Taylor*
Chamberlain	Gallinger	Penrose	Warren

NOT VOTING—22.

Bourne	*Frazier*	Nixon	Stephenson
Clarke, Ark.	Frye	*Owen*	*Stone*
Culberson	Johnson, N. Dak.	*Rayner*	Warner
Daniel	Lorimer	Richardson	Wetmore
du Pont	*McEnery*	*Shively*	
Elkins	*Newlands*	*Smith, S. C.*	

So Mr. McCumber's amendment to the amendment of the committee was rejected.

Mr. McCumber further offered an amendment to the committee amendment to reduce the duty by striking out the duties prescribed in the committee amendment and inserting the following in lieu thereof:

For one side so planed or finished, 25 cents per 1,000 feet board measure; for planing or finishing on one side and tonguing and grooving or for planing or finishing on two sides, 50 cents per 1,000 feet board measure; for planing or finishing on three sides, 75 cents per 1,000 feet board measure; for planing or finishing on two sides and tonguing and grooving, 75 cents; for planing and finishing on four sides, $1 per 1,000 feet board measure; and in estimating board measure under this schedule no deduction shall be made on board measure on account of planing, tonguing, and grooving.

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment, the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3717, June 23):

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 49, as follows:

YEAS—30.

Bacon	*Clay*	*Gore*	*Overman*
Beveridge	Crawford	*Hughes*	*Owen*
Bristow	Cummins	Johnson, N. Dak.	*Paynter*
Brown	Curtis	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Rayner*
Burkett	*Davis*	La Follette	*Stone*
Burton	Dolliver	McCumber	*Tillman*
Carter	du Pont	*McLaurin*	
Clapp	Gamble	Nelson	

NAYS—49.

Aldrich	Depew	Lodge	*Simmons*
Borah	Dick	Lorimer	*Smith, Md.*
Bourne	Dillingham	*McEnery*	Smith, Mich.
Bradley	Dixon	*Martin*	Smoot
Brandegee	Elkins	*Money*	Sutherland
Briggs	*Fletcher*	Nixon	*Taliaferro*
Bulkeley	*Foster*	Oliver	*Taylor*
Burnham	Frye	Page	Warner
Burrows	Gallinger	Penrose	Warren
Chamberlain	Guggenheim	Perkins	Wetmore
Clark, Wyo.	Hale	Piles	
Crane	Heyburn	Root	
Cullom	Kean	Scott	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NOT VOTING—13.

Bailey	*Daniel*	*Newlands*	Stephenson
Bankhead	Flint	Richardson	
Clarke, Ark.	*Frazier*	*Shively*	
Culberson	Jones	*Smith, S. C.*	

So Mr. McCumber's amendment to the amendment of the committee was rejected.

Upon the question of the adoption of the committee amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3718, June 23, 1909):

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 28, as follows:

YEAS—50.

Aldrich	Crane	Hale	Root
Bacon	*Daniel*	Heyburn	Scott
Bailey	Depew	Kean	*Simmons*
Borah	Dick	Lodge	*Smith, Md.*
Bourne	Dillingham	Lorimer	Smoot
Bradley	Dixon	*McEnery*	Sutherland
Brandegee	du Pont	*Martin*	*Taliaferro*
Briggs	Elkins	Nixon	*Taylor*
Bulkeley	*Fletcher*	Oliver	Warner
Burnham	*Foster*	Page	Warren
Carter	Frye	Penrose	Wetmore
Chamberlain	Gallinger	Perkins	
Clark, Wyo.	Guggenheim	Piles	

NAYS—28

Bankhead	*Clay*	*Gore*	*Overman*
Beveridge	Crawford	*Hughes*	*Owen*
Bristow	Cummins	Johnson, N. Dak.	*Paynter*
Brown	Curtis	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Rayner*
Burkett	*Davis*	La Follette	Smith, Mich.
Burton	Dolliver	McCumber	*Stone*
Clapp	Gamble	Nelson	*Tillman*

NOT VOTING—14.

Burrows	Flint	*Money*	*Smith, S. C.*
Clarke, Ark	*Frazier*	*Newlands*	Stephenson
Culberson	Jones	Richardson	
Cullom	*McLaurin*	*Shively*	

So the amendment as modified was agreed to.

Mr. Taliaferro offered the following amendment:

275. Pineapples in barrels or other packages, one-half of 1 cent per pound; in bulk, $8 per thousand.

On the question of the adoption of this amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3743, June 23):

The result was announced—yeas 34, nays 30, as follows:

YEAS—34.

Bailey	Dick	Heyburn	Scott
Borah	Dixon	Johnson, N. Dak.	*Simmons*
Brandegee	du Pont	Lorimer	*Taliaferro*
Bulkeley	*Fletcher*	*McEnery*	*Taylor*
Burnham	*Foster*	Oliver	Warner
Carter	Frye	Page	Warren
Chamberlain	Gallinger	Penrose	Wetmore
Clapp	Guggenheim	Perkins	
Clay	Hale	Piles	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—30.

Aldrich	Crane	Kean	*Rayner*
Beveridge	Crawford	La Follette	Root
Briggs	Cullom	Lodge	*Smith, Md.*
Bristow	Cummins	McCumber	Smoot
Brown	Curtis	*Martin*	Sutherland
Burkett	*Davis*	Nelson	*Tillman*
Burrows	Gamble	*Overman*	
Burton	*Gore*	*Paynter*	

NOT VOTING—28.

Bacon	*Daniel*	*Hughes*	*Owen*
Bankhead	Depew	*Johnston, Ala.*	Richardson
Bourne	Dillingham	Jones	*Shively*
Bradley	Dolliver	*McLaurin*	Smith, Mich.
Clark, Wyo.	Elkins	*Money*	*Smith, S. C.*
Clarke, Ark.	Flint	*Newlands*	Stephenson
Culberson	*Frazier*	Nixon	*Stone*

So Mr. Taliaferro's amendment to the amendment of the committee was agreed to.

The Finance Committee, as a substitute to paragraph 424, offered an amendment *imposing a duty of 60 cents a ton on coal, bituminous and shale.* Mr. McCumber offered an amendment to the substitute striking out "sixty" and inserting "forty," so that the duty would be 40 cents per ton. Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment to the committee amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3754, June 23, 1909):

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 45, as follows:

YEAS—28.

Bacon	*Clay*	Gamble	Nelson
Bristow	Crawford	*Gore*	*Overman*
Brown	Cummins	*Hughes*	*Paynter*
Burkett	Curtis	Johnson, N. Dak.	*Rayner*
Burton	*Davis*	*Johnston, Ala.*	Root
Carter	Dolliver	La Follette	*Smith, S. C.*
Clapp	*Fletcher*	McCumber	*Stone*

NAYS—45.

Aldrich	*Daniel*	Jones	*Simmons*
Bailey	Depew	Kean	*Smith, Md.*
Borah	Dick	Lodge	Smith, Mich.
Brandegee	Dillingham	Lorimer	Smoot
Briggs	Dixon	*McEnery*	Sutherland
Bulkeley	du Pont	*Martin*	*Taliaferro*
Burnham	Elkins	Oliver	*Tillman*
Burrows	*Foster*	Page	Warner
Chamberlain	Gallinger	Penrose	Wetmore
Clark, Wyo.	Guggenheim	Perkins	
Crane	Hale	Piles	
Cullom	Heyburn	Scott	

NOT VOTING—19.

Bankhead	*Culberson*	*Money*	*Shively*
Beveridge	Flint	*Newlands*	Stephenson
Bourne	*Frazier*	Nixon	*Taylor*
Bradley	Frye	*Owen*	Warren
Clarke, Ark.	*McLaurin*	Richardson	

So the amendment of Mr. McCumber to the amendment of the committee was rejected.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

To paragraph 448, imposing a duty of 15 per cent ad valorem on boots and shoes made of leather, the Finance Committee offered an amendment *increasing the duty to 20 per cent ad valorem.* Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment thus increasing the duty the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3833, June 24):

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 24, as follows:

YEAS—32.

Aldrich	Carter	du Pont	Oliver
Borah	Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Page
Brandegee	Crane	Guggenheim	Penrose
Bulkeley	Depew	Hale	Root
Burkett	Dick	Heyburn	Smoot
Burnham	Dillingham	Johnson, N. Dak.	Sutherland
Burrows	Dixon	Kean	Warner
Burton	Dolliver	Lodge	Wetmore

NAYS—24.

Bacon	Crawford	*Gore*	*Newlands*
Bankhead	Cummins	*Hughes*	*Paynter*
Bristow	Curtis	*Johnson, Ala.*	*Shively*
Chamberlain	*Davis*	La Follette	*Simmons*
Clapp	*Fletcher*	*Martin*	*Stone*
Clay	Gamble	Nelson	*Tillman*

NOT VOTING—36.

Bailey	*Daniel*	*McEnery*	Richardson
Beveridge	Elkins	*McLaurin*	Scott
Bourne	Flint	*Money*	*Smith, Md.*
Bradley	*Foster*	Nixon	Smith, Mich.
Briggs	*Frazier*	*Overman*	*Smith, S. C.*
Brown	Frye	*Owen*	Stephenson
Clarke, Ark.	Jones	Perkins	*Taliaferro*
Culberson	Lorimer	Piles	*Taylor*
Cullom	McCumber	*Rayner*	Warren

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. Bristow proposed an amendment by striking out paragraph 448 as amended and to substitute in lieu thereof the following paragraph placing hides and leather and the manufactured products thereof on the free list:

Hides of cattle, raw or uncured, whether dry, salted, or pickled, harness, saddles, saddlery in sets or in parts, finished or unfinished, band, bend, or belting leather, rough leather, sole leather, dressed upper, and all other leather; calfskins, tanned or untanned and dressed; kangaroo, sheep, and goat skins (including lamb and kid skins), dressed and finished; skins and bookbinders' calfskins, glove leather, leather shoe laces, finished or unfinished, and boots and shoes made of leather shall be admitted into the ports of the United States free of duty: Provided, That articles mentioned in this paragraph, if imported from a country which levies an import duty on like articles imported from the United States, shall be subject to the rate of duty existing prior to the passage of this act.

Mr. Aldrich moved to lay the amendment on the table.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Upon the question of the adoption of the motion to lay the amendment on the table the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3834, June 24):

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 23, as follows:

YEAS—33.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Gamble	Penrose
Brandegee	Crane	Guggenheim	Root
Briggs	Depew	Hale	Smoot
Bulkeley	Dick	Heyburn	Warner
Burkett	Dillingham	Johnson, N. Dak.	Warren
Burnham	Dixon	Kean	Wetmore
Burrows	du Pont	Lodge	
Burton	Flint	Oliver	
Carter	Gallinger	Page	

NAYS—23.

Bacon	Crawford	*Hughes*	*Paynter*
Bankhead	Cummins	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Shively*
Bristow	Curtis	La Follette	*Simmons*
Chamberlain	*Davis*	*Martin*	*Stone*
Clapp	*Fletcher*	Nelson	*Tillman*
Clay	*Gore*	*Newlands*	

NOT VOTING—36.

Bailey	*Daniel*	*McEnery*	Richardson
Beveridge	Dolliver	*McLaurin*	Scott
Borah	Elkins	*Money*	*Smith, Md.*
Bourne	*Foster*	Nixon	Smith, Mich.
Bradley	*Frazier*	*Overman*	*Smith, S. C.*
Brown	Frye	*Owen*	Stephenson
Clarke, Ark.	Jones	Perkins	Sutherland
Culberson	Lorimer	Piles	*Taliaferro*
Cullom	McCumber	*Rayner*	*Taylor*

So Mr. Bristow's amendment was laid on the table.

Mr. Cummins offered an amendment to paragraph 116, *striking therefrom so much thereof as imposed a duty of $2.50 per ton on wrought and cast scrap iron and scrap steel.*

Upon the question of the adoption of this amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3880, June 25, 1909):

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 42, as follows:

YEAS—28.

Bacon	*Culberson*	*Fletcher*	*Money*
Beveridge	Cummins	*Frazier*	Nelson
Bristow	Curtis	Gamble	*Newlands*
Brown	*Daniel*	*Gore*	*Overman*
Chamberlain	*Davis*	*Hughes*	*Smith, Md.*
Clay	Dolliver	La Follette	*Stone*
Crawford	du Pont	*Martin*	*Taliaferro*

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—42.

Aldrich	Crane	*Johnston, Ala.*	Root
Bankhead	Cullom	Jones	Scott
Bradley	Dick	Kean	Smoot
Brandegee	Dillingham	Lodge	Sutherland
Bulkeley	Flint	*McEnery*	*Taylor*
Burkett	*Foster*	Nixon	*Tillman*
Burnham	Gallinger	Oliver	Warner
Burrows	Guggenheim	Page	Warren
Burton	Hale	Penrose	Wetmore
Carter	Heyburn	Perkins	
Clark, Wyo.	Johnson, N. Dak.	Piles	

NOT VOTING—22.

Bailey	Depew	*McLaurin*	*Simmons*
Borah	Dixon	*Owen*	Smith, Mich.
Bourne	Elkins	*Paynter*	*Smith, S. C.*
Briggs	Frye	*Rayner*	Stephenson
Clapp	Lorimer	Richardson	
Clarke, Ark.	McCumber	*Shively*	

So the amendment of Mr. Cummins was rejected.

Mr. Cummins offered further amendment to said paragraph 116, *by striking out $2.50 per ton, the duty imposed in said paragraph on iron in pigs, etc., and wrought and cast scrap iron and scrap steel, and inserting $1 as the rate of duty in lieu thereof.*

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3881, June 25, 1909):

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 45, as follows:

YEAS—26.

Bacon	*Clay*	*Fletcher*	*Newlands*
Beveridge	Crawford	*Frazier*	*Overman*
Borah	*Culberson*	Gamble	*Owen*
Bristow	Cummins	*Gore*	*Paynter*
Brown	Curtis	*Hughes*	*Taliaferro*
Burkett	*Davis*	La Follette	
Chamberlain	Dolliver	Nelson	

NAYS—45.

Aldrich	Daniel	*Johnston, Ala.*	Root
Bankhead	Depew	Jones	Scott
Bradley	Dick	Kean	Smoot
Brandegee	Dillingham	Lodge	Sutherland
Briggs	du Pont	*McEnery*	*Taylor*
Bulkeley	Flint	*Martin*	*Tillman*
Burnham	Frye	Nixon	Warner
Burrows	Gallinger	Oliver	Warren
Burton	Guggenheim	Page	Wetmore
Carter	Hale	Penrose	
Crane	Heyburn	Perkins	
Cullom	Johnson, N. Dak.	Piles	

NOT VOTING—21.

Bailey	Elkins	*Rayner*	*Smith, S. C.*
Bourne	*Foster*	Richardson	Stephenson
Clapp	Lorimer	*Shively*	*Stone*
Clark, Wyo.	McCumber	*Simmons*	
Clarke, Ark.	*McLaurin*	*Smith, Md.*	
Dixon	*Money*	Smith, Mich.	

So Mr. Cummins's amendment was rejected.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

The Finance Committee offered an amendment to paragraph 160 *increasing the duty of one-fourth of 1 cent per pound on wire nails to one-half of 1 cent per pound;* also further amendment to said paragraph *increasing the duty on wire nails of less size from one-half of 1 cent per pound to three-fourths of 1 cent per pound.* Upon the question of the adoption of this amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3885, June 25, 1909):

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 33, as follows:

YEAS—41.

Aldrich	Cullom	Heyburn	Piles
Brandegee	Depew	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Briggs	Dick	Jones	Scott
Bulkeley	Dillingham	Kean	Smoot
Burkett	du Pont	Lodge	Sutherland
Burnham	Elkins	*McEnery*	Warner
Burrows	Flint	Nixon	Warren
Burton	Frye	Oliver	Wetmore
Carter	Gallinger	Page	
Clark, Wyo.	Guggenheim	Penrose	
Crane	Hale	Perkins	

NAYS—33.

Bacon	*Clay*	Gamble	*Paynter*
Bailey	Crawford	*Gore*	*Smith, Md.*
Bankhead	Cummins	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Stone*
Beveridge	Curtis	La Follette	*Taliaferro*
Borah	*Daniel*	*Martin*	*Taylor*
Bristow	*Davis*	*Money*	*Tillman*
Brown	Dolliver	Nelson	
Chamberlain	*Fletcher*	*Overman*	
Clapp	*Frazier*	*Owen*	

NOT VOTING—18.

Bourne	*Foster*	*Newlands*	Smith, Mich.
Bradley	*Hughes*	*Rayner*	*Smith, S. C.*
Clarke, Ark.	Lorimer	Richardson	Stephenson
Culberson	McCumber	*Shively*	
Dixon	*McLaurin*	*Simmons*	

So the committee amendments were agreed to.

To paragraph 181 Mr. Heyburn offered the following amendments:

In the rate of duty prescribed for monazite sand and thorite, to strike out "4" and insert "6 cents per pound," and add thereafter the following words:

"Thorium, oxide of and salts of, and gas mantles treated with chemicals or metallic oxides, 60 per cent ad valorem. Gas-mantle scrap, consisting in chief value of metallic oxide, 20 per cent ad valorem."

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3894, June 25):

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 24, as follows:

YEAS—39.

Aldrich	Cullom	Heyburn	Penrose
Borah	Depew	Johnson, N. Dak.	Piles
Brandegee	Dick	Jones	Root
Briggs	du Pont	Kean	Scott
Bulkeley	Elkins	Lodge	Smoot
Burrows	Flint	McCumber	Sutherland
Burton	Frye	*McEnery*	Warner
Carter	Gallinger	Nixon	Warren
Clark, Wyo.	Guggenheim	Oliver	Wetmore
Crane	Hale	Page	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—24.

Bankhead	Clapp	Dolliver	La Follette
Beveridge	Crawford	*Fletcher*	*Martin*
Bristow	Cummins	*Foster*	*Money*
Brown	Curtis	*Frazier*	Nelson
Burkett	*Daniel*	Gamble	*Paynter*
Chamberlain	*Davis*	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Shively*

NOT VOTING—29.

Bacon	Dillingham	*Owen*	Stephenson
Bailey	Dixon	Perkins	*Stone*
Bourne	*Gore*	*Rayner*	*Taliaferro*
Bradley	*Hughes*	Richardson	*Taylor*
Burnham	Lorimer	*Simmons*	*Tillman*
Clarke, Ark.	*McLaurin*	*Smith, Md.*	
Clay	*Newlands*	Smith, Mich.	
Culberson	*Overman*	*Smith, S. C.*	

So Mr. Heyburn's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. Penrose offered an amendment proposing a duty upon petroleum, as follows:

37½. Petroleum, crude, one-half cent per gallon.

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3908, June 25):

The result was announced—yeas 34, nays 40, as follows:

YEAS—34

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Guggenheim	Perkins
Borah	Cullom	Hale	Scott
Brandegee	Curtis	Heyburn	Smoot
Briggs	Depew	Kean	Sutherland
Bulkeley	Dick	*McEnery*	Warner
Burnham	du Pont	Nixon	Warren
Burrows	Elkins	Oliver	Wetmore
Burton	Flint	*Owen*	
Carter	Frye	Penrose	

NAYS—40.

Bacon	Crawford	*Gore*	*Overman*
Bailey	*Culberson*	*Hughes*	Page
Bankhead	Cummins	Johnson, N. Dak.	*Paynter*
Bristow	*Davis*	*Johnston, Ala.*	Piles
Brown	Dillingham	Jones	Root
Burkett	Dolliver	La Follette	*Shively*
Chamberlain	*Fletcher*	McCumber	Smith, Mich.
Clapp	*Foster*	*Martin*	*Stone*
Clay	*Frazier*	Nelson	*Taliaferro*
Crane	Gamble	*Newlands*	*Tillman*

NOT VOTING—18.

Beveridge	Dixon	*Money*	*Smith, S. C.*
Bourne	Gallinger	*Rayner*	Stephenson
Bradley	Lodge	Richardson	*Taylor*
Clarke, Ark.	Lorimer	*Simmons*	
Daniel	*McLaurin*	*Smith, Md.*	

So Mr. Penrose's amendment was rejected.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Mr. Bacon offered an amendment to place agricultural implements on the free list by inserting the following paragraph:

651½. Plows, tooth and disk harrows, harvesters, forage and feed cutters, reapers, agricultural drills and planters, mowers, horse rakes, cultivators, thrashing machines, and cotton gins: Provided, That articles mentioned in this paragraph, if imported from a country which lays an import duty on like articles imported from the United States, shall be subject to duties existing prior to the passage of this act.

Upon the question of the adoption of the foregoing paragraph the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3939, June 26):

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 45, as follows:

YEAS—26.

Bacon	*Fletcher*	*Martin*	*Smith, Md.*
Bailey	*Foster*	*Money*	*Stone*
Bankhead	*Frazier*	*Newlands*	*Taliaferro*
Bristow	*Gore*	*Overman*	*Taylor*
Chamberlain	*Hughes*	*Owen*	*Tillman*
Clapp	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Paynter*	
Culberson	La Follette	*Shively*	

NAYS—45.

Aldrich	Crane	Gallinger	Penrose
Borah	Crawford	Gamble	Perkins
Bradley	Cullom	Guggenheim	Piles
Brandegee	Curtis	Hale	Scott
Briggs	Depew	Heyburn	Smoot
Brown	Dick	Johnson, N. Dak.	Sutherland
Burkett	Dillingham	Jones	Warner
Burnham	Dolliver	Kean	Warren
Burrows	du Pont	McCumber	Wetmore
Burton	Elkins	Nixon	
Carter	Flint	Oliver	
Clark, Wyo.	Frye	Page	

NOT VOTING—21.

Beveridge	*Daniel*	*McLaurin*	Smith, Mich.
Bourne	*Davis*	Nelson	*Smith, S. C.*
Bulkeley	Dixon	*Rayner*	Stephenson
Clarke, Ark.	Lodge	Richardson	
Clay	Lorimer	Root	
Cummins	*McEnery*	*Simmons*	

So the amendment of Mr. Bacon was rejected.

To paragraph 194, Mr Beveridge offered an amendment *reducing the duty on cash registers from 30 per cent ad valorem to 15 per cent ad valorem.* Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3946, June 26):

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 33, as follows:

YEAS—31.

Bacon	*Culberson*	Gamble	*Money*
Bankhead	Cullom	*Gore*	*Overman*
Beveridge	Cummins	*Hughes*	*Owen*
Bristow	Curtis	Johnson, N. Dak.	*Shively*
Brown	*Davis*	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Smith, Md.*
Burkett	Dolliver	La Follette	Smith, Mich
Chamberlain	*Fletcher*	McCumber	*Tillman*
Clapp	*Frazier*	*McLaurin*	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—33.

Aldrich	Depew	Jones	Scott
Borah	Dick	Kean	Smoot
Brandegee	Dillingham	*McEnery*	Sutherland
Briggs	Elkins	Nixon	Warner
Burnham	Flint	Oliver	Warren
Burrows	Gallinger	Page	Wetmore
Burton	Guggenheim	Penrose	
Carter	Hale	Perkins	
Crane	Heyburn	Root	

NOT VOTING—28.

Bailey	Crawford	Lorimer	Richardson
Bourne	*Daniel*	*Martin*	*Simmons*
Bradley	Dixon	Nelson	*Smith, S. C.*
Bulkeley	du Pont	*Newlands*	Stephenson
Clark, Wyo.	*Foster*	*Paynter*	*Stone*
Clarke, Ark.	Frye	Piles	*Taliaferro*
Clay	Lodge	*Rayner*	*Taylor*

So Mr. Beveridge's amendment was rejected.

Mr. Davis offered the following amendment:

472½. Sawed boards, planks, deals, and all other lumber of white wood, sycamore, basswood, and all sawed lumber of every kind, whether dressed or undressed, finished or unfinished, shall be admitted free of duty.

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3949, June 26):

The result was announced—yeas 18, nays 37, as follows:

YEAS—18.

Beveridge	Crawford	*Gore*	*Shively*
Bristow	Cummins	Johnson, N. Dak.	*Stone*
Brown	*Davis*	La Follette	*Tillman*
Burkett	*Frazier*	Nelson	
Clapp	Gamble	*Owen*	

NAYS—37.

Aldrich	Cullom	Heyburn	Piles
Borah	Depew	Jones	Root
Brandegee	Dick	Kean	*Smith, Md.*
Briggs	Dillingham	*McEnery*	Smoot
Burnham	Dolliver	*Money*	Sutherland
Burrows	Flint	Nixon	Warner
Burton	*Foster*	Oliver	Wetmore
Chamberlain	Frye	Page	
Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Penrose	
Crane	Hale	Perkins	

NOT VOTING—37.

Bacon	Curtis	Lorimer	*Simmons*
Bailey	*Daniel*	McCumber	Smith, Mich.
Bankhead	Dixon	*McLaurin*	*Smith, S. C.*
Bourne	du Pont	*Martin*	Stephenson
Bradley	Elkins	*Newlands*	*Taliaferro*
Bulkeley	*Fletcher*	*Overman*	*Taylor*
Carter	Guggenheim	*Paynter*	Warren
Clarke, Ark.	*Hughes*	*Rayner*	
Clay	*Johnston, Ala.*	Richardson	
Culberson	Lodge	Scott	

So Mr. Davis's amendment was rejected.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

To paragraph 349 Mr. Jones offered the following amendment:

Except jute grain bags, known commercially as standard Calcutta 22 inches by 32 inches grain bags, which shall be admitted free of duty.

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3953, June 26):

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 33, as follows:

YEAS—25.

Bacon	Cummins	Johnson, N. Dak.	Piles
Bankhead	*Davis*	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Shively*
Bristow	*Fletcher*	Jones	*Stone*
Brown	*Foster*	La Follette	*Tillman*
Chamberlain	*Frazier*	Nelson	
Clapp	*Gore*	*Overman*	
Crawford	*Hughes*	*Owen*	

NAYS—33.

Aldrich	Cullom	Heyburn	Smith, Mich.
Brandegee	Depew	Kean	Smoot
Briggs	Bick	*McEnery*	Sutherland
Burnham	Dolliver	Nixon	Warner
Burrows	Flint	Oliver	Warren
Burton	Frye	Page	Wetmore
Carter	Gallinger	Penrose	
Clark, Wyo.	Gamble	Perkins	
Crane	Hale	Root	

NOT VOTING—34.

Bailey	*Culberson*	Lorimer	Scott
Beveridge	Curtis	McCumber	*Simmons*
Borah	*Daniel*	*McLaurin*	*Smith, Md.*
Bourne	Dillingham	*Martin*	*Smith, S. C.*
Bradley	Dixon	*Money*	Stephenson
Bulkeley	du Pont	*Newlands*	*Taliaferro*
Burkett	Elkins	*Paynter*	*Taylor*
Clarke, Ark.	Guggenheim	*Rayner*	
Clay	Lodge	Richardson	

So the amendment of Mr. Jones was rejected.

Mr. Cummins offered the following amendments reducing duties in the metal schedule:

Paragraph 116. It is proposed to strike out paragraph 116 and substitute the following:

"*116. Iron in pigs, iron kentledge, spiegeleisen, and ferromanganese, $1.50 per ton; wrought and cast scrap iron and scrap steel, 50 cents per ton; but nothing shall be deemed scrap iron or scrap steel except waste or refuse iron or steel which, having at one time been advanced in manufacture to the final form for use, and, having been used, has by such use become unfit for further use, and has become fit only to be remanufactured.*"

Paragraph 118. In line 7 of paragraph 118 strike out the word "six-tenths" and insert "four-tenths;" and in line 11 strike out the word "four-tenths" and insert "one-fourth."

Paragraph 119. Strike out the paragraph and substitute the following therefor:

"*119. Beams, girders, joists, angles, channels, car-truck channels, tees, columns and posts or parts or sections of columns and posts, deck and bulb beams, and building forms, together with all other structural shapes of iron or steel, whether plain, punched, or fitted for use, assembled and manufactured, three-tenths of 1 cent per pound.*"

Paragraph 124. Strike out of line 22 the word "seven-fortieths" and insert "six-fortieths;" and to strike out of line 23 the word "two-tenths" and insert "seven-fortieths."

Paragraph 125. Strike from line 2, page 36, the word "five-tenths" and insert "three-tenths;" and strike from line 4 the word "six-tenths" and insert "four-tenths."

Paragraph 129. In line 16, after the word "blanks," insert the words "two-tenths of 1 cent per pound."

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Paragraph 134. Strike out lines 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and the word "pound" in line 8, and substitute therefor the following:

"*134. Round iron or steel wire, not smaller than No. 13 wire gauge, valued at not more than 2½ cents per pound, three-tenths of 1 cent per pound; smaller than No. 13 and not smaller than No. 16 wire gauge, valued at not more than 3½ cents per pound, five-tenths of 1 cent per pound; smaller than No. 16 wire gauge, and valued at not more than 4 cents per pound, three-fourths of 1 cent per pound.*"

It is also proposed to insert after the word "wire," in line 8, on page 41, the words "not herein specially provided for."

Paragraph 160. Strike out the paragraph and the committee amendments thereto and insert the following:

"*160. Wire nails made of wrought iron or steel, not less than 1 inch in length and not lighter than No. 16 wire gauge, two-fifths of 1 cent per pound; less than 1 inch in length and lighter than No. 16 wire gauge, one-half of 1 cent per pound.*"

Insert as a new paragraph, 160½, as follows:

"*160½. Barbed wire for fencing, two-fifths of 1 cent per pound.*"

By consent of the Senate these several amendments were considered and voted upon en bloc.

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendments the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3974, June 28):

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 40, as follows:

YEAS—31.

Bankhead	Cummins	*Gore*	*Owen*
Borah	Curtis	*Hughes*	*Shively*
Bristow	*Davis*	La Follette	*Smith, S. C.*
Brown	Dolliver	*McLaurin*	*Stone*
Chamberlain	*Fletcher*	*Martin*	*Taliaferro*
Clay	*Foster*	*Money*	*Taylor*
Crawford	*Frazier*	Nelson	*Tillman*
Culberson	Gamble	*Overman*	

NAYS—40.

Aldrich	Crane	Johnson, N. Dak.	Perkins
Bradley	Cullom	Jones	Piles
Brandegee	Depew	Kean	Root
Briggs	Dick	Lodge	Scott
Burkett	Dillingham	McCumber	Smith, Mich.
Burham	Dixon	*McEnery*	Smoot
Burrows	Flint	Nixon	Sutherland
Burton	Gallinger	Oliver	Warner
Carter	Guggenheim	Page	Warren
Clark, Wyo.	Heyburn	Penrose	Wetmore

NOT VOTING—21.

Bacon	*Clarke, Ark.*	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Simmons*
Bailey	*Daniel*	Lorimer	*Smith, Md.*
Beveridge	du Pont	*Newlands*	Stephenson
Bourne	Elkins	*Paynter*	
Burkley	Frye	*Rayner*	
Clapp	Hale	Richardson	

So the amendments of Mr. Cummins were rejected.

Mr. Gore offered the following amendment:

653½. All text-books imported for use in the public schools of any State, Territory, district, or municipality in the United States, or imported for use in any college or university maintained in whole or in part by local or federal taxation, shall be admitted free of duty. And the Secretary of the Treasury is so authorized to prescribe suitable rules and regulations to carry this provision into effect.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3982, June 28, 1909):

The result was announced—yeas 17, nays 45, as follows:

YEAS—17.

Bankhead	*Foster*	*Martin*	*Taylor*
Chamberlain	*Frazier*	*Money*	*Tillman*
Clay	*Gore*	*Overman*	
Davis	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Shively*	
Fletcher	*McEnery*	*Taliaferro*	

NAYS—45.

Aldrich	Burton	Gamble	Perkins
Beveridge	Carter	Guggenheim	Piles
Borah	Crane	Heyburn	Root
Bourne	Cullom	Kean	Scott
Bradley	Curtis	La Follette	Smoot
Brandegee	Depew	Lodge	Sutherland
Briggs	Dick	McCumber	Warner
Bristow	Dillingham	Nelson	Warren
Brown	Dixon	Nixon	Wetmore
Burkett	Dolliver	Oliver	
Burnham	du Pont	Page	
Burrows	Gallinger	Penrose	

NOT VOTING—30.

Bacon	Cummins	Jones	*Simmons*
Bailey	*Daniel*	Lorimer	*Smith, Md.*
Bulkeley	Elkins	*McLaurin*	Smith, Mich.
Clapp	Flint	*Newlands*	*Smith, S. C.*
Clark, Wyo.	Frye	*Owen*	Stephenson
Clarke, Ark.	Hale	*Paynter*	*Stone*
Crawford	*Hughes*	*Rayner*	
Culberson	Johnson, N. Dak.	Richardson	

So Mr. Gore's amendment was rejected.

Mr. Bacon offered an amendment placing salt on the free list by adding the following paragraph to the free list, to be known as paragraph 662½:

Salt in bags, sacks, barrels, or other packages, or in bulk: Provided, That if salt is imported from any country, whether independent or a dependency, which imposes a duty upon salt exported from the United States, then there shall be levied, paid, and collected upon such salt the rate of duty existing prior to the passage of this act.

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3983, June 28):

The result was announced—yeas 18, nays 42, as follows:

YEAS—18.

Bacon	*Davis*	*Martin*	*Taliaferro*
Bankhead	*Fletcher*	*Money*	*Taylor*
Clay	*Frazier*	*Overman*	*Tillman*
Culberson	*Gore*	*Owen*	
Daniel	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Shively*	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—42.

Aldrich	Crane	Gallinger	Penrose
Beveridge	Cullom	Gamble	Perkins
Borah	Curtis	Guggenheim	Root
Bradley	Depew	Heyburn	Scott
Brandegee	Dick	Kean	Smoot
Briggs	Dillingham	Lodge	Sutherland
Burkett	Dixon	McCumber	Warner
Burnham	Dolliver	*McEnery*	Warren
Burrows	du Pont	Nelson	Wetmore
Burton	Flint	Oliver	
Carter	*Foster*	Page	

NOT VOTING—32.

Bailey	*Clarke, Ark.*	Jones	*Rayner*
Bourne	Crawford	La Follette	Richardson
Bristow	Cummins	Lorimer	*Simmons*
Brown	Elkins	*McLaurin*	*Smith, Md.*
Bulkeley	Frye	*Newlands*	Smith, Mich.
Chamberlain	Hale	Nixon	*Smith, S. C.*
Clapp	*Hughes*	*Paynter*	Stephenson
Clark, Wyo.	Johnson, N. Dak.	Piles	*Stone*

So Mr. Bacon's amendment was rejected.

Mr. Bacon then offered an amendment to paragraph 291, to *strike out so much of the paragraph as remitted the duties on imported salt used in curing fish taken by vessels licensed to engage in fisheries, and so forth, and also so much of the paragraph as remitted the duties on imported salt used by exporters in curing meats in the United States.* The paragraph proposed to be stricken out is as follows:

Provided, That imported salt in bond may be used in curing fish taken by vessels licensed to engage in the fisheries and in curing fish on the shores of the navigable waters of the United States under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe; and upon proof that the salt has been used for either of the purposes stated in this proviso, the duties on the same shall be remitted: Provided further, That exporters of meats, whether packed or smoked, which have been cured in the United States with imported salt, shall, upon satisfactory proof, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe, that such meats have been cured with imported salt, have refunded to them from the Treasury the duties paid on the salt so used in curing such exported meats, in amounts not less than $100.

Upon the question of the adoption of this amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3984, June 28, 1909):

The result was announced—yeas 17, nays 39, as follows:

YEAS—17.

Bacon	*Daniel*	*Hughes*	*Owen*
Bankhead	*Davis*	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Taylor*
Bristow	*Foster*	La Follette	
Clay	*Frazier*	*Martin*	
Culberson	*Gore*	*Overman*	

NAYS—39.

Aldrich	Crane	Gallinger	Penrose
Beveridge	Crawford	Gamble	Perkins
Bradley	Cullom	Guggenheim	Root
Brandegee	Curtis	Heyburn	Scott
Briggs	Depew	Kean	Smoot
Burkett	Dick	Lodge	Sutherland
Burnham	Dixon	McCumber	Warner
Burrows	du Pont	*McEnery*	Warren
Burton	Flint	Oliver	Wetmore
Carter	Frye	Page	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NOT VOTING—36.

Bailey	Cummins	*McLaurin*	*Shively*
Borah	Dillingham	*Money*	*Simmons*
Bourne	Dolliver	Nelson	*Smith, Md.*
Brown	Elkins	*Newlands*	Smith, Mich.
Bulkeley	*Fletcher*	Nixon	*Smith, S. C.*
Chamberlain	Hale	*Paynter*	Stephenson
Clapp	Jonhson, N. Dak.	Piles	*Stone*
Clark, Wyo.	Jones	*Rayner*	*Taliaferro*
Clarke, Ark.	Lorimer	Richardson	*Tillman*

So Mr. Bacon's amendment was rejected.

Mr. Culberson proposed the following amendment placing hoop or band iron for baling cotton or any other commodity on the free list, as follows:

583½. Hoop or band iron, or hoop or band steel, cut to lengths, or wholly or partly manufactured into hoops or ties, coated or not coated with paint or any other preparation, with or without buckles or fastenings, for baling cotton or any other commodity.

Upon the question of the adoption of this amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 3992, June 28, 1909):

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 38, as follows:

YEAS—31.

Bacon	*Culberson*	Johnson, N. Dak.	*Overman*
Bankhead	Cummins	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Owen*
Beveridge	*Daniel*	La Follette	*Smith, S. C.*
Bristow	*Davis*	*McEnery*	*Stone*
Brown	du Pont	*Martin*	*Taliaferro*
Clapp	*Fletcher*	*Money*	*Taylor*
Clay	*Foster*	Nelson	*Tillman*
Crawford	*Frazier*	*Newlands*	

NAYS—38.

Aldrich	Crane	Gamble	Perkins
Borah	Cullom	Guggenheim	Root
Brandegee	Curtis	Heyburn	Scott
Briggs	Depew	Jones	Smoot
Burkett	Dick	Kean	Sutherland
Burnham	Dillingham	Lodge	Warner
Burrows	Dixon	Nixon	Warren
Burton	Flint	Oliver	Wetmore
Carter	Frye	Page	
Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Penrose	

NOT VOTING—23.

Bailey	Dolliver	McCumber	*Shively*
Bourne	Elkins	*McLaurin*	*Simmons*
Bradley	*Gore*	*Paynter*	*Smith, Md.*
Bulkeley	Hale	Piles	Smith, Mich.
Chamberlain	*Hughes*	*Rayner*	Stephenson
Clarke, Ark.	Lorimer	Richardson	

So Mr. Culberson's amendment was rejected.

Mr. Tillman offered an amendment *placing a duty of 10 cents per pound upon tea*, as follows:

258½. Tea, 10 cents per pound.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 4027, June 29, 1909):

The result was announced—yeas 18, nays 55, as follows:

YEAS—18.

Bailey	Dick	Heyburn	Smith, Mich.
Bradley	du Pont	Nixon	*Tillman*
Bulkeley	Elkins	Perkins	Wetmore
Burnham	Frye	Root	
Carter	Gallinger	Scott	

NAYS—55.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	*Gore*	Oliver
Bacon	*Clay*	*Hughes*	*Overman*
Bankhead	Crawford	Johnson, N. Dak.	*Owen*
Beveridge	*Culberson*	*Johnston, Ala*	Page
Borah	Cullom	Jones	Penrose
Bourne	Cummins	Kean	*Shively*
Brandegee	Curtis	La Follette	*Simmons*
Bristow	*Daniel*	Lodge	*Smith, S. C.*
Brown	*Davis*	Lorimer	Smoot
Burkett	Dillingham	McCumber	*Stone*
Burrows	Dixon	*McLaurin*	Sutherland
Burton	*Fletcher*	*Martin*	*Taylor*
Chamberlain	Flint	Nelson	Warner
Clapp	*Foster*	*Newlands*	

NOT VOTING—19.

Briggs	*Frazier*	*Money*	*Smith, Md.*
Clarke, Ark.	Gamble	*Paynter*	Stephenson
Crane	Guggenheim	Piles	*Taliaferro*
Depew	Hale	*Rayner*	Warren
Dolliver	*McEnery*	Richardson	

So Mr. Tillman's amendment was rejected.

Mr. Aldrich offered an amendment imposing a tax commonly known as the "corporation tax," which is found on page 4029 of the Record, the said amendment being an amendment to the substitute offered by Mr. Lodge for the income-tax amendment offered by Mr. Bailey.

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment offered by Mr. Aldrich, the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 4115, July 2, 1909):

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 31, as follows:

YEAS—45.

Aldrich	Cullom	Guggenheim	Perkins
Bradley	Curtis	Heyburn	Piles
Brandegee	Depew	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Briggs	Dick	Jones	Scott
Brown	Dillingham	Kean	Smoot
Burkett	Dixon	Lodge	Sutherland
Burnham	du Pont	Lorimer	Warner
Burrows	Elkins	McCumber	Warren
Burton	Flint	Nelson	Wetmore
Carter	Frye	Nixon	
Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Page	
Crawford	Gamble	Penrose	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—31.

Bacon	*Culberson*	*Gore*	*Overman*
Bailey	Cummins	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Owen*
Bankhead	*Daniel*	La Follette	*Rayner*
Borah	*Davis*	*McEnery*	*Shively*
Bristow	Dolliver	*McLaurin*	*Stone*
Bulkeley	*Fletcher*	*Martin*	*Taliaferro*
Chamberlain	*Foster*	*Money*	*Taylor*
Clapp	*Frazier*	*Newlands*	

NOT VOTING—16.

Beveridge	Crane	*Paynter*	Smith, Mich
Bourne	Hale	Richardson	*Smith, S. C.*
Clarke, Ark.	*Hughes*	*Simmons*	Stephenson
Clay	Oliver	*Smith, Md.*	*Tillman*

So the amendment of Mr. Aldrich to the substitute of Mr. Lodge was agreed to.

The question then recurred upon the corporation-tax amendment offered by Mr. Aldrich as a substitute for the general income-tax amendment offered by Mr. Bailey. Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment offered by Mr. Aldrich as a substitute the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 4116, July 2, 1909):

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 31, as follows:

YEAS—45.

Aldrich	Cullom	Guggenheim	Perkins
Bradley	Curtis	Heyburn	Piles
Brandegee	Depew	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Briggs	Dick	Jones	Scott
Brown	Dillingham	Kean	Smoot
Burkett	Dixon	Lodge	Sutherland
Burnham	du Pont	Lorimer	Warner
Burrows	Elkins	McCumber	Warren
Burton	Flint	Nelson	Wetmore
Carter	Frye	Nixon	
Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Page	
Crawford	Gamble	Penrose	

NAYS—31.

Bacon	*Culberson*	*Gore*	*Overman*
Bailey	Cummins	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Owen*
Bankhead	*Daniel*	La Follette	*Rayner*
Borah	*Davis*	*McEnery*	*Shively*
Bristow	Dolliver	*McLaurin*	*Stone*
Bulkeley	*Fletcher*	*Martin*	*Taliaferro*
Chamberlain	*Foster*	*Money*	*Taylor*
Clapp	*Frazier*	*Newlands*	

NOT VOTING—16.

Beveridge	Crane	*Paynter*	Smith, Mich.
Bourne	Hale	Richardson	*Smith, S. C.*
Clarke, Ark.	*Hughes*	*Simmons*	Stephenson
Clay	Oliver	*Smith, Md.*	*Tillman*

So Mr. Aldrich's substitute for Mr. Bailey's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. Bacon then offered as an amendment to the substitute as it had been adopted the following as a proviso thereto:

Insert at the conclusion of the first paragraph of section 4:

"*Provided, That the provisions of this section shall not apply to any corporation or association organized and operated for religious, charitable, or educational purposes, no part of the profit of which inures to the benefit of any private stockholder or individual, but all of the profit of which is in good faith devoted to the said religious, charitable, or educational purpose.*

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

"Provided further, That the provisions of this section shall not apply to incorporations or associations of fraternal orders or organizations designed and operated exclusively for mutual benefit or for the mutual assistance of its members.

"Provided further, That the provisions of this section shall not apply to any insurance or other corporations or associations organized and operated exclusively for the mutual benefit of its members in which there are no joint-stock shares entitled to dividends or individual profit to the holders thereof.

"Provided further, That the provisions of this section shall not apply to any corporation or association designed and operated solely for mercantile business the gross sales of which do not exceed $250,000 per annum."

Mr. Aldrich moved to lay the amendment on the table. Upon the question of the adoption of the motion to lay the amendment on the table the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 4117, July 2):

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 32, as follows:

YEAS—42.

Aldrich	Curtis	Guggenheim	Perkins
Bradley	Depew	Heyburn	Piles
Brown	Dick	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Burkett	Dillingham	Jones	Scott
Burnham	Dixon	Kean	Smoot
Burrows	du Pont	Lodge	Sutherland
Burton	Elkins	Lorimer	Warner
Carter	Flint	McCumber	Warren
Clark, Wyo.	Frye	Nelson	Wetmore
Crawford	Gallinger	Page	
Cullom	Gamble	Penrose	

NAYS—32.

Bacon	Clapp	*Frazier*	*Newlands*
Bailey	*Culberson*	*Gore*	*Overman*
Bankhead	Cummins	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Owen*
Borah	*Daniel*	La Follette	*Rayner*
Brandegee	*Davis*	*McEnery*	*Shively*
Bristow	Dolliver	*McLaurin*	*Stone*
Bulkeley	*Fletcher*	*Martin*	*Taliaferro*
Chamberlain	*Foster*	*Money*	*Taylor*

NOT VOTING—18.

Beveridge	Crane	*Paynter*	*Smith, S. C.*
Bourne	Hale	Richardson	Stephenson
Briggs	*Hughes*	*Simmons*	*Tillman*
Clarke, Ark.	Nixon	*Smith, Md.*	
Clay	Oliver	Smith, Mich.	

So Mr. Bacon's amendment to the amendment was laid on the table.

Mr. Bacon then offered an amendment, to be inserted at the conclusion of the substitute as adopted, as follows:

The SECRETARY. At the conclusion of the amendment insert the following, to be known as paragraph 9:

Paragraph 9. That every corporation, joint-stock company and association, and every person in the United States holding the bonds, debentures, or other evidences of indebtedness of any corporation or association organized under the laws of either the United States or of any State or Territory of the United States shall, upon the right to hold and possess said bonds and to collect the principal and interest of said bonds, be subject to pay annually a special excise tax equivalent to 2 per cent upon the annual interest payable upon said bonds.

That every corporation, joint-stock company and association having outstanding bonds upon which interest is payable annually, semiannually, or quarterly, or at less intervals of time, shall on the 1st day of October of each year make out and transmit to the collector of internal revenue for the district in which said corporation, company, or association shall be situated a report of the said outstanding bonds, the denominations of said bonds, the aggre-

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

gate amount of the same, the rate of interest payable on the same, and the dates when said interest is due and payable, which report shall be transmitted forthwith by the collector to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. It shall further be the duty of every such corporation, company, and association when such interest becomes due and payable to deduct and retain the proportion of said amount payable to each of the holders of said bonds, the amount of excise tax payable by said bondholder under the provisions of this section, and to thereafter pay the same to the said collector of internal revenue under the rules and regulations which shall be prescribed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue; and the receipt of the said collector of internal revenue for the said amounts thus paid to him by said corporation, company, or association shall be received by said bondholder, to the extent named therein, in payment of the amount due upon the bond or bonds so held by him.

Mr. Aldrich moved to lay the amendment on the table.

Upon the question of the adoption of the motion to lay the amendment on the table the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 4118, July 2):

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 34, as follows:

YEAS—41.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Perkins
Bradley	Cullom	Guggenheim	Root
Brandegee	Curtis	Heyburn	Scott
Briggs	Depew	Johnson, N. Dak.	Smoot
Brown	Dick	Kean	Sutherland
Bulkeley	Dillingham	Lodge	Warner
Burkett	Dixon	Lorimer	Warren
Burnham	du Pont	McCumber	Wetmore
Burrows	Elkins	Nelson	
Burton	Flint	Page	
Carter	Frye	Penrose	

NAYS—34.

Bacon	Cummins	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Owen*
Bailey	*Daniel*	Jones	Piles
Bankhead	*Davis*	La Follette	*Rayner*
Borah	Dolliver	*McEnery*	*Shively*
Bristow	*Fletcher*	*McLaurin*	*Stone*
Chamberlain	*Foster*	*Martin*	*Taliaferro*
Clapp	*Frazier*	*Money*	*Taylor*
Crawford	Gamble	*Newlands*	
Culberson	*Gore*	*Overman*	

NOT VOTING—17.

Beveridge	Hale	Richardson	Stephenson
Bourne	*Hughes*	*Simmons*	*Tillman*
Clarke, Ark.	Nixon	*Smith, Md.*	
Clay	Oliver	Smith, Mich.	
Crane	*Paynter*	*Smith, S. C.*	

So Mr. Bacon's amendment to the amendment was laid on the table.

The question then recurred on the question of the adoption of the amendment offered by Mr. Aldrich (imposing corporation tax) as it had been amended.

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment as amended the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 4121, July 2, 1909):

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

The result was announced—yeas 59, nays 11, as follows:

YEAS—59.

Aldrich	Cullom	Gamble	Page
Bailey	Curtis	Guggenheim	Penrose
Bankhead	*Daniel*	Johnson, N. Dak.	Perkins
Bradley	*Davis*	*Johnston, Ala.*	Piles
Brandegee	Depew	Jones	*Rayner*
Briggs	Dick	Kean	Root
Brown	Dillingham	Lodge	Scott
Burkett	Dixon	Lorimer	Smoot
Burnham	duPont	McCumber	Sutherland
Burrows	Elkins	*McEnery*	*Taliaferro*
Burton	*Fletcher*	*McLaurin*	*Taylor*
Carter	Flint	*Martin*	Warner
Clark, Wyo.	*Foster*	*Money*	Warren
Crawford	Frye	Nelson	Wetmore
Culberson	Gallinger	*Newlands*	

NAYS—11.

Borah	*Chamberlain*	Dolliver	La Follette
Bristow	Clapp	Heyburn	*Shively*
Bulkeley	Cummins	*Hughes*	

NOT VOTING—22.

Bacon	*Frazier*	*Owen*	*Smith, S. C.*
Beveridge	*Gore*	*Paynter*	Stephenson
Bourne	Hale	Richardson	*Stone*
Clarke, Ark.	Nixon	*Simmons*	*Tillman*
Clay	Oliver	*Smith, Md.*	
Crane	*Overman*	Smith, Mich.	

So the amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. Aldrich moved to amend the bill by the insertion of a new section providing for the maximum and minimum tariff, which is found on page 4154 of the Record. As an amendment to that part of the amendment relating to the appointment of persons by the President to make required investigations, Mr. Culberson offered an amendment, as follows:

Not exceeding seven, not more than four of whom shall belong to any one political party, who shall each receive a salary of $7,500 per annum.

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment to the amendment, the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 4171, July 3, 1909):

The result was announced—yeas 17, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—17.

Bacon	*Frazier*	*Newlands*	*Taliaferro*
Culberson	*Gore*	*Owen*	*Taylor*
Daniel	*Hughes*	*Shively*	
Davis	La Follette	*Simmons*	
Fletcher	*Martin*	*Stone*	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—43.

Aldrich	Burton	Dolliver	Nelson
Borah	Carter	du Pont	Nixon
Bourne	Clapp	Flint	Page
Bradley	Clark, Wyo.	Frye	Penrose
Brandegee	Crawford	Gallinger	Root
Briggs	Cullom	Gamble	Scott
Bristow	Cummins	Heyburn	Smoot
Brown	Curtis	Johnson, N. Dak.	Sutherland
Burkett	Depew	Jones	Warren
Burnham	Dick	Kean	Wetmore
Burrows	Dillingham	McCumber	

NOT VOTING—32.

Bailey	Dixon	*McEnery*	*Rayner*
Bankhead	Elkins	*McLaurin*	Richardson
Beveridge	*Foster*	*Money*	*Smith, Md.*
Bulkeley	Guggenheim	Oliver	Smith, Mich.
Chamberlain	Hale	*Overman*	*Smith, S. C.*
Clarke, Ark.	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Paynter*	Stephenson
Clay	Lodge	Perkins	*Tillman*
Crane	Lorimer	Piles	Warner

So Mr. Culberson's amendment to the amendment was rejected.

To the amendment providing for the maximum and minimum tariff, Mr. Gore offered a substitute, which is found on page 4171 of the Record.

Upon the question of the adoption of the substitute for the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 4172, July 3):

The result was announced—yeas 16, nays 39, as follows:

YEAS—16.

Bacon	*Davis*	*Hughes*	*Shively*
Bristow	*Fletcher*	La Follette	*Simmons*
Clapp	*Frazier*	*Martin*	*Stone*
Culberson	*Gore*	*Owen*	*Taliaferro*

NAYS—39.

Aldrich	Carter	Dolliver	Nixon
Bourne	Clark, Wyo.	du Pont	Page
Bradley	Crawford	Flint	Penrose
Brandegee	Cullom	Gallinger	Root
Briggs	Cummins	Gamble	Scott
Brown	Curtis	Johnson, N. Dak.	Smoot
Burkett	Depew	Jones	Sutherland
Burnham	Dick	Kean	Warren
Burrows	Dillingham	McCumber	Wetmore
Burton	Dixon	Nelson	

NOT VOTING—37.

Bailey	Elkins	*McLaurin*	*Smith, Md.*
Bankhead	*Foster*	*Money*	Smith, Mich.
Beveridge	Frye	*Newlands*	*Smith, S. C.*
Borah	Guggenheim	Oliver	Stephenson
Bulkeley	Hale	*Overman*	*Taylor*
Chamberlain	Heyburn	*Paynter*	*Tillman*
Clarke, Ark.	*Johnston, Ala.*	Perkins	Warner
Clay	Lodge	Piles	
Crane	Lorimer	*Rayner*	
Daniel	*McEnery*	Richardson	

So Mr. Gore's amendment was rejected.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Mr. Dolliver offered an amendment to the amendment creating a customs commission, which is found on page 4172 of the Record.

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 4176, July 3):

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 28, as follows:

YEAS—23.

Bacon	Cummins	*Gore*	*Shively*
Bourne	Curtis	*Hughes*	*Simmons*
Bristow	Dolliver	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Stone*
Burkett	*Fletcher*	Jones	*Taliaferro*
Clapp	*Frazier*	La Follette	*Taylor*
Crawford	Gamble	Nelson	

NAYS—28.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Heyburn	Penrose
Bradley	Cullom	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Briggs	Depew	Kean	Scott
Burnham	Dick	McCumber	Smoot
Burrows	Dillingham	*McEnery*	Sutherland
Burton	Dixon	Nixon	Warren
Carter	Gallinger	Page	Wetmore

NOT VOTING—41.

Bailey	*Culberson*	Lorimer	*Rayner*
Bankhead	*Daniel*	*McLaurin*	Richardson
Beveridge	*Davis*	*Martin*	*Smith, Md.*
Borah	du Pont	*Money*	Smith, Mich.
Brandegee	Elkins	*Newlands*	*Smith, S. C.*
Brown	Flint	Oliver	Stephenson
Bulkeley	*Foster*	*Overman*	*Tillman*
Chamberlain	Frye	*Owen*	Warner
Clarke, Ark.	Guggenheim	*Paynter*	
Clay	Hale	Perkins	
Crane	Lodge	Piles	

So Mr. Dolliver's amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The question then recurred on the amendment offered by Mr. Aldrich, providing *for the maximum and minimum tariff*.

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 4185, July 3):

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 18, as follows:

YEAS—36.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Flint	Nelson
Bourne	Cullom	Frye	Nixon
Bradley	Cummins	Gallinger	Page
Briggs	Curtis	Gamble	Penrose
Brown	Depew	Heyburn	Perkins
Burkett	Dick	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Burnham	Dillingham	Jones	Smoot
Burrows	Dixon	Kean	Sutherland
Carter	Dolliver	McCumber	Wetmore

NAYS—18.

Bacon	*Davis*	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Shively*
Bristow	Fletcher	La Follette	*Simmons*
Burton	*Frazier*	*McEnery*	*Stone*
Crawford	*Gore*	*McLaurin*	
Culberson	*Hughes*	*Newlands*	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NOT VOTING—38.

Bailey	Crane	*Money*	Smith, Mich.
Bankhead	*Daniel*	Oliver	*Smith, S. C.*
Beveridge	du Pont	*Overman*	Stephenson
Borah	Elkins	*Owen*	*Taliaferro*
Brandegee	*Foster*	*Paynter*	*Taylor*
Bulkeley	Guggenheim	Piles	*Tillman*
Chamberlain	Hale	*Rayner*	Warner
Clapp	Lodge	Richardson	Warren
Clarke, Ark.	Lorimer	Scott	
Clay	*Martin*	*Smith, Md.*	

So the amendment of Mr. Aldrich was agreed to.

The Senate having under consideration the joint resolution for amendment to the Constitution authorizing Congress to impose a general income tax, Mr. Bailey offered an amendment providing that the ratification of the amendment should be submitted to conventions called for the purpose instead of to the legislatures of the States, as provided in the resolution.

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment offered by Mr. Bailey the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 4226, July 5, 1909):

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 46, as follows:

YEAS—30.

Bacon	Cummins	Jones	*Shively*
Bailey	*Davis*	La Follette	*Simmons*
Bankhead	*Fletcher*	*McEnery*	*Smith, S. C.*
Borah	*Foster*	*Money*	*Stone*
Bristow	*Frazier*	*Newlands*	*Taliaferro*
Chamberlain	*Gore*	*Overman*	*Taylor*
Clapp	*Hughes*	*Owen*	
Culberson	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Rayner*	

NAYS—46.

Aldrich	Crane	Gallinger	Penrose
Beveridge	Crawford	Gamble	Perkins
Bourne	Cullom	Guggenheim	Root
Bradley	Curtis	Heyburn	Scott
Briggs	*Daniel*	Johnson, N. Dak.	Smoot
Brown	Depew	Kean	Stephenson
Burkett	Dick	McCumber	Sutherland
Burnham	Dillingham	*Martin*	Warner
Burrows	Dixon	Nelson	Warren
Burton	du Pont	Nixon	Wetmore
Carter	Flint	Oliver	
Clark, Wyo.	Frye	Page	

NOT VOTING—16.

Brandegee	Dolliver	Lorimer	Richardson
Bulkeley	Elkins	*McLaurin*	*Smith, Md.*
Clarke, Ark.	Hale	*Paynter*	Smith, Mich.
Clay	Lodge	Piles	*Tillman*

So Mr. Bailey's first amendment was rejected.

The question then recurred upon the adoption of the joint resolution for the amendment of the Constitution as above stated.

Upon the question of the adoption of the resolution the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 4227, July 5, 1909):

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

The result was announced—yeas 77, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—77.

Aldrich	Crawford	Guggenheim	Penrose
Bacon	*Culberson*	Heyburn	Perkins
Bailey	Cullom	*Hughes*	*Rayner*
Bankhead	Cummins	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Beveridge	Curtis	*Johnston, Ala.*	Scott
Borah	*Daniel*	Jones	*Shively*
Bourne	*Davis*	Kean	*Simmons*
Bradley	Depew	La Follette	*Smith, S. C.*
Briggs	Dick	McCumber	Smoot
Bristow	Dillingham	*McEnery*	Stephenson
Brown	Dixon	*McLaurin*	*Stone*
Burkett	du Pont	*Martin*	Sutherland
Burnham	*Fletcher*	*Money*	*Taliaferro*
Burrows	Flint	Nelson	*Taylor*
Burton	*Foster*	*Newlands*	Warner
Carter	*Frazier*	Nixon	Warren
Chamberlain	Frye	Oliver	Wetmore
Clapp	Gallinger	*Overman*	
Clark, Wyo.	Gamble	*Owen*	
Crane	*Gore*	Page	

NOT VOTING—15.

Brandegee	Dolliver	Lorimer	*Smith, Md.*
Bulkeley	Elkins	*Paynter*	Smith, Mich.
Clarke, Ark.	Hale	Piles	*Tillman*
Clay	Lodge	Richardson	

So the joint resolution was passed, two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in favor thereof.

Mr. Bristow offered an amendment reducing the rate of duty prescribed on writing paper in paragraph 409, as follows:

But not exceeding 15 pounds per ream, 2 cents per pound and 10 per cent ad valorem.

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 4300, July 7):

The result was announced—yeas 34, nays 40, as follows:

YEAS—34.

Bacon	*Chamberlain*	*Hughes*	*Owen*
Bailey	Clapp	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Shively*
Bankhead	Crawford	La Follette	*Simmons*
Beveridge	*Culberson*	*McLaurin*	*Smith, S. C.*
Borah	Cummins	*Martin*	*Stone*
Bristow	*Fletcher*	*Money*	*Taliaferro*
Brown	*Frazier*	Nelson	*Taylor*
Burkett	Gamble	*Newlands*	
Burton	*Gore*	*Overman*	

NAYS—40.

Aldrich	Curtis	Heyburn	Perkins
Bourne	Depew	Johnson, N. Dak.	Piles
Brandegee	Dick	Jones	Scott
Briggs	Dixon	Kean	Smith, Mich.
Bulkeley	Dolliver	Lodge	Smoot
Burnham	du Pont	Lorimer	Stephenson
Burrows	Elkins	Nixon	Sutherland
Carter	Flint	Oliver	Warner
Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Page	Warren
Crane	Hale	Penrose	Wetmore

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NOT VOTING—18.

Bradley	*Davis*	McCumber	Root
Clarke, Ark.	Dillingham	*McEnery*	*Smith, Md.*
Clay	*Foster*	*Paynter*	*Tillman*
Cullom	Frye	*Rayner*	
Daniel	Guggenheim	Richardson	

So Mr. Bristow's amendment was rejected.

Mr. Bacon in the Senate again offered the amendment previously offered in the Committee of the Whole, placing agricultural implements on the free list, by adding the following paragraph to the free list of the bill:

651½. Plows, tooth and disk harrows, harvesters, forage and feed cutters, reapers, agricultural drills and planters, mowers, horserakes, cultivators, thrashing machines, and cotton gins: Provided, That articles mentioned in this paragraph, if imported from a country which lays an import duty on like articles imported from the United States, shall be subject to duties existing prior to the passage of this act.

Upon the question of the adoption of this amendment, the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 4302, July 7, 1909):

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 50, as follows:

YEAS—28.

Bacon	*Daniel*	La Follette	*Shively*
Bailey	*Fletcher*	*McEnery*	*Simmons*
Bankhead	*Foster*	*McLaurin*	*Smith, Md.*
Bristow	*Frazier*	*Martin*	*Smith, S. C.*
Chamberlain	*Gore*	*Money*	*Stone*
Clapp	*Hughes*	*Newlands*	*Taliaferro*
Culberson	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Overman*	*Taylor*

NAYS—50.

Aldrich	Crane	Gamble	Penrose
Beveridge	Crawford	Hale	Perkins
Borah	Cummins	Heyburn	Piles
Brandegee	Curtis	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Briggs	Depew	Jones	Smith, Mich.
Brown	Dick	Kean	Smoot
Bulkeley	Dixon	Lodge	Stephenson
Burkett	Dolliver	Lorimer	Sutherland
Burnham	du Pont	McCumber	Warner
Burrows	Elkins	Nelson	Warren
Burton	Flint	Nixon	Wetmore
Carter	Frye	Oliver	
Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Page	

NOT VOTING—14.

Bourne	Cullom	*Owen*	Root
Bradley	*Davis*	*Paynter*	*Tillman*
Clarke, Ark.	Dillingham	*Rayner*	
Clay	Guggenheim	Richardson	

So Mr. Bacon's amendment was rejected.

In the Senate the question was presented on concurring in the amendment *creating a customs court* as provided in sections 29 and 30.

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment, the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 4345, July 7):

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 26, as follows:

YEAS—50.

Aldrich	Curtis	Jones	Piles
Bacon	Depew	Kean	Scott
Bailey	Dick	Lorimer	*Simmons*
Bankhead	Dixon	McCumber	Smith, Mich.
Bradley	du Pont	*McEnery*	Smoot
Brandegee	Elkins	*Money*	Stephenson
Briggs	Flint	Nelson	Sutherland
Bulkeley	*Foster*	*Newlands*	*Taylor*
Burnham	Frye	Nixon	Warner
Burrows	Gallinger	Oliver	Warren
Burton	Hale	Page	Wetmore
Carter	Heyburn	Penrose	
Crane	Johnson, N. Dak.	Perkins	

NAYS—26.

Beveridge	Clark, Wyo.	*Frazier*	*Martin*
Borah	Crawford	Gamble	*Overman*
Bristow	*Culberson*	*Gore*	*Shively*
Brown	Cummins	*Hughes*	*Smith, S. C.*
Burkett	*Daniel*	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Stone*
Chamberlain	Dolliver	La Follette	
Clapp	*Fletcher*	*McLaurin*	

NOT VOTING—16.

Bourne	*Davis*	*Owen*	Root
Clarke, Ark.	Dillingham	*Paynter*	*Smith, Md.*
Clay	Guggenheim	*Rayner*	*Taliaferro*
Cullom	Lodge	Richardson	*Tillman*

So sections 29 and 30 were concurred in.

Mr. Bailey offered an amendment in the Senate for the corporation-tax amendment, which had been adopted in Committee of the Whole, the amendment which was offered by Mr. Bailey being *for the levy and collection of a general income tax*, which is found on pages 4346, 4347, and 4348 of the Record.

Upon the question of the adoption of the substitute the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 4348, July 7):

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 47, as follows:

YEAS—28.

Bacon	*Culberson*	*Hughes*	*Overman*
Bailey	Cummins	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Shively*
Bankhead	*Daniel*	La Follette	*Simmons*
Borah	*Fletcher*	*McLaurin*	*Smith, S. C.*
Bristow	*Foster*	*Martin*	*Stone*
Chamberlain	*Frazier*	*Money*	*Taliaferro*
Clapp	*Gore*	*Newlands*	*Taylor*

NAYS—47.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Gamble	Penrose
Beveridge	Crane	Hale	Perkins
Bradley	Crawford	Heyburn	Piles
Brandegee	Depew	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Briggs	Dick	Jones	Smith, Mich.
Brown	Dixon	Kean	Smoot
Bulkeley	Dolliver	Lorimer	Stephenson
Burkett	du Pont	McCumber	Sutherland
Burnham	Elkins	Nelson	Warner
Burrows	Flint	Nixon	Warren
Burton	Frye	Oliver	Wetmore
Carter	Gallinger	Page	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NOT VOTING—17.

Bourne	*Davis*	*Owen*	*Smith, Md.*
Clarke, Ark.	Dillingham	*Paynter*	*Tillman*
Clay	Guggenheim	*Rayner*	
Cullom	Lodge	Richardson	
Curtis	*McEnery*	Root	

So Mr. Bailey's amendment was rejected.

Mr. Bacon, in the Senate, offered an amendment to the corporation-tax provision, which had been adopted in the Committee of the Whole, the amendment offered being as follows:

Provided, That the provisions of this section shall not apply to any corporation or association designed and operated solely for mercantile business, the gross sales of which do not exceed $150,000 per annum.

Upon the question of the adoption of this amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 4354, July 7):

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 45, as follows:

YEAS—27.

Bacon	Cummins	*Gore*	*Overman*
Bailey	Curtis	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Shively*
Bankhead	*Daniel*	La Follette	*Simmons*
Borah	Dolliver	*McEnery*	*Stone*
Chamberlain	*Fletcher*	*McLaurin*	*Taliaferro*
Clapp	*Foster*	*Money*	*Taylor*
Culberson	*Frazier*	*Newlands*	

NAYS—45.

Aldrich	Carter	Gamble	Piles
Beveridge	Clark, Wyo.	Hale	Scott
Bradley	Crane	Heyburn	Smith, Mich.
Brandegee	Crawford	Johnson, N. Dak.	Smoot
Briggs	Depew	Kean	Stephenson
Bristow	Dick	Lorimer	Sutherland
Brown	Dixon	McCumber	Warner
Bulkeley	du Pont	Nelson	Warren
Burkett	Elkins	Oliver	Wetmore
Burnham	Flint	Page	
Burrows	Frye	Penrose	
Burton	Gallinger	Perkins	

NOT VOTING—20.

Bourne	Dillingham	*Martin*	Richardson
Clarke, Ark.	Guggenheim	Nixon	Root
Clay	*Hughes*	*Owen*	*Smith, Md.*
Cullom	Jones	*Paynter*	*Smith, S. C.*
Davis	Lodge	*Rayner*	*Tillman*

So Mr. Bacon's amendment was rejected.

Mr. Newlands, in the Senate, offered an amendment to the corporation-tax provision which had been adopted in Committee of the Whole, limiting the tax to the corporations specified in his said amendment, as follows:

Engaged in the business of refining oil or sugar, or in the manufacture of any commodity included in the dutiable list of this act, whose gross receipts exceed $250,000 per annum.

Mr. Aldrich moved to lay the amendment on the table.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

On the question of the adoption of the motion to lay the amendment on the table the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 4355, July 7):

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 24, as follows:

YEAS—46.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Gamble	Penrose
Beveridge	Crane	Hale	Perkins
Bradley	Crawford	Heyburn	Piles
Brandegee	Curtis	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Briggs	Depew	Jones	Smith, Mich.
Brown	Dick	Kean	Smoot
Bulkeley	Dixon	Lorimer	Stephenson
Burkett	du Pont	McCumber	Sutherland
Burnham	Elkins	*McEnery*	Warner
Burrows	Flint	Nelson	Wetmore
Burton	Frye	Oliver	
Carter	Gallinger	Page	

NAYS—24.

Bacon	Cummins	*Hughes*	*Shively*
Bailey	Dolliver	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Simmons*
Bankhead	*Fletcher*	La Follette	*Smith, S. C.*
Bristow	*Foster*	*McLaurin*	*Stone*
Chamberlain	*Frazier*	*Newlands*	*Taliaferro*
Culberson	*Gore*	*Overman*	*Taylor*

NOT VOTING—22.

Borah	*Daniel*	*Money*	Root
Bourne	*Davis*	Nixon	*Smith, Md.*
Clapp	Dillingham	*Owen*	*Tillman*
Clarke, Ark.	Guggenheim	*Paynter*	Warren
Clay	Lodge	*Rayner*	
Cullom	*Martin*	Richardson	

So the amendment submitted by Mr. Newlands was laid on the table.

Mr. McLaurin in the Senate offered an amendment to the corporation-tax provision which had been adopted in the Committee of the Whole *exempting from liability to make returns thereunder of every corporation the capital stock of which does not exceed $50,000 and the net income of which does not exceed $5,000.* Mr. Aldrich moved to lay the amendment on the table.

Upon the question of the adoption of the motion to lay the amendment on the table the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 4356, July 7):

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 24, as follows:

YEAS—46.

Aldrich	Carter	Gallinger	Penrose
Beveridge	Clark, Wyo.	Gamble	Perkins
Bradley	Crane	Hale	Piles
Brandegee	Crawford	Heyburn	Scott
Briggs	Depew	Johnson, N. Dak.	Smith, Mich.
Bristow	Dick	Jones	Smoot
Brown	Dixon	Kean	Stephenson
Bulkeley	Dolliver	Lorimer	Sutherland
Burkett	du Pont	McCumber	Warner
Burnham	Elkins	Nelson	Wetmore
Burrows	Flint	Oliver	
Burton	Frye	Page	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—24.

Bacon	Cummins	*Gore*	*Overman*
Bailey	Curtis	*Hughes*	*Shively*
Bankhead	*Daniel*	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Simmons*
Chamberlain	*Fletcher*	La Follette	*Smith, S. C.*
Clapp	*Foster*	*McLaurin*	*Stone*
Culberson	*Frazier*	*Newlands*	*Taylor*

NOT VOTING—22.

Borah	Dillingham	Nixon	*Smith, Md.*
Bourne	Guggenheim	*Owen*	*Taliaferro*
Clarke, Ark.	Lodge	*Paynter*	*Tillman*
Clay	*McEnery*	*Rayner*	Warren
Cullom	*Martin*	Richardson	
Davis	*Money*	Root	

So Mr. McLaurin's amendment was laid on the table.

Mr. Bacon, for Mr. Clay, in his absence, offered in the Senate an amendment *imposing a tax upon contracts, agreements, and so forth, respecting the purchase or sale of grain, cotton, and other agricultural products, stocks, bonds, and other securities under circumstances named in said amendment, which amendment is to be found on page 4371 of the Record.*

Mr. Aldrich moved to lay the amendment on the table.

Upon the question of the motion to lay the amendment on the table the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 4372, July 8, 1909):

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 34, as follows:

YEAS—44.

Aldrich	Cullom	Gallinger	Oliver
Bradley	Curtis	Gamble	Page
Brandegee	Depew	Hale	Penrose
Briggs	Dick	Heyburn	Perkins
Bulkeley	Dillingham	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Burnham	Dixon	Kean	Smith, Mich.
Burrows	du Pont	Lodge	Smoot
Burton	Elkins	Lorimer	Stephenson
Carter	Flint	McCumber	Sutherland
Clark, Wyo.	*Foster*	*McEnery*	Warner
Crane	Frye	Nixon	Wetmore

NAYS—34.

Bacon	*Culberson*	Jones	*Shively*
Bailey	Cummins	La Follette	*Simmons*
Bankhead	*Daniel*	*McLaurin*	*Smith, Md.*
Bristow	Dolliver	*Martin*	*Smith, S. C.*
Brown	*Fletcher*	*Money*	*Stone*
Burkett	*Frazier*	Nelson	*Taliaferro*
Chamberlain	*Gore*	*Newlands*	*Taylor*
Clapp	*Hughes*	*Overman*	
Crawford	*Johnston, Ala.*	Piles	

NOT VOTING—14.

Beveridge	*Clay*	*Paynter*	*Tillman*
Borah	*Davis*	*Rayner*	Warren
Bourne	Guggenheim	Richardson	
Clarke, Ark.	*Owen*	Root	

So the amendment offered by Mr. Bacon in behalf of Mr. Clay was laid on the table.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

The Senate having under consideration the tobacco amendment offered by Mr. Smoot, Mr. Daniel offered an amendment thereto, reducing the tax, as stated on page 4375 of the Record.

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 4376, July 8, 1909):

The result was announced—yeas 24, nays 53, as follows:

YEAS—24.

Bacon	*Fletcher*	*McLaurin*	*Simmons*
Bailey	*Foster*	*Martin*	*Smith, Md.*
Bankhead	*Frazier*	*Money*	*Smith, S. C.*
Chamberlain	*Gore*	*Newlands*	*Stone*
Culberson	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Overman*	*Taliaferro*
Daniel	*McEnery*	*Shively*	*Taylor*

NAYS—53.

Aldrich	Carter	Frye	Page
Beveridge	Clapp	Gallinger	Penrose
Borah	Clark, Wyo.	Gamble	Perkins
Bourne	Crane	Hale	Piles
Bradley	Crawford	Heyburn	Smith, Mich.
Brandegee	Cummins	Johnson, N. Dak.	Smoot
Briggs	Curtis	Jones	Stephenson
Bristow	Depew	Kean	Sutherland
Brown	Dick	La Follette	Warner
Bulkeley	Dixon	Lorimer	Warren
Burkett	Dolliver	McCumber	Wetmore
Burnham	du Pont	Nelson	
Burrows	Elkins	Nixon	
Burton	Flint	Oliver	

NOT VOTING—15.

Clarke, Ark.	Dillingham	*Owen*	Root
Clay	Guggenheim	*Paynter*	Scott
Cullom	*Hughes*	*Rayner*	*Tillman*
Davis	Lodge	Richardson	

So Mr. Daniel's amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Upon the motion of Mr. Martin sections 14 and 15 were reserved for a separate vote, and upon the question of agreeing to the tobacco amendment excepting sections 14 and 15 the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 4376, July 8):

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 25, as follows:

YEAS—52.

Aldrich	Burton	Elkins	Nixon
Beveridge	Carter	Flint	Oliver
Borah	Clapp	Frye	Page
Bourne	Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Penrose
Bradley	Crane	Gamble	Perkins
Brandegee	Crawford	Hale	Piles
Briggs	Cummins	Heyburn	Smith, Mich.
Bristow	Curtis	Johnson, N. Dak.	Smoot
Brown	Depew	Jones	Stephenson
Bulkeley	Dick	Kean	Sutherland
Burkett	Dixon	La Follette	Warner
Burnham	Dolliver	Lorimer	Warren
Burrows	du Pont	Nelson	Wetmore

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—25.

Bacon	*Foster*	*Martin*	*Smith, S. C.*
Bailey	*Frazier*	*Money*	*Stone*
Bankhead	*Gore*	*Newlands*	*Taliaferro*
Chamberlain	*Hughes*	*Overman*	*Taylor*
Culberson	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Shively*	
Daniel	*McEnery*	*Simmons*	
Fletcher	*McLaurin*	*Smith, Md.*	

NOT VOTING—15.

Clarke, Ark.	Dillingham	*Owen*	Root
Clay	Guggenheim	*Paynter*	Scott
Cullom	Lodge	*Rayner*	*Tillman*
Davis	McCumber	Richardson	

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. Curtis offered an amendment imposing a countervailing duty upon importations of petroleum by a proviso to paragraph 637, as follows:

Provided, That if there be imported into the United States crude petroleum produced in any country which imposes a duty on petroleum exported from the United States, there shall in such cases be levied, paid, and collected a duty upon said petroleum so imported one-half of the duty imposed by such country: Provided further, That importers of crude petroleum shall not be entitled to the drawback provisions of this act.

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 4380, July 8):

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 31, as follows:

YEAS—44.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Hale	Penrose
Borah	Crane	Heyburn	Perkins
Bourne	Curtis	Johnson, N. Dak.	Piles
Bradley	Depew	Jones	Root
Brandegee	Dick	Kean	Scott
Briggs	Dixon	Lorimer	Smoot
Bulkeley	du Pont	*McEnery*	Stephenson
Burnham	Elkins	Nixon	Sutherland
Burrows	Flint	Oliver	Warner
Burton	Frye	*Owen*	Warren
Carter	Gallinger	Page	Wetmore

NAYS—31.

Bacon	*Culberson*	*Hughes*	*Rayner*
Bailey	Cummins	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Shively*
Bristow	*Daniel*	La Follette	*Simmons*
Brown	Dolliver	*McLaurin*	Smith, Mich.
Burkett	*Fletcher*	*Martin*	*Smith, S. C.*
Chamberlain	*Frazier*	Nelson	*Stone*
Clapp	Gamble	*Newlands*	*Taliaferro*
Crawford	*Gore*	*Overman*	

NOT VOTING—17.

Bankhead	*Davis*	McCumber	*Taylor*
Beveridge	Dillingham	*Money*	*Tillman*
Clarke, Ark.	*Foster*	*Paynter*	
Clay	Guggenheim	Richardson	
Cullom	Lodge	*Smith, Md.*	

So the amendment of Mr. Curtis was agreed to.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Mr. Stone in the Senate again offered the amendment placing hides and leather and the products thereof on the free list, which had been previously offered in the Committee of the Whole. The amendment is as follows:

Hides of cattle, raw or uncured, whether dry, salted, or pickled; band, bend, or belting leather, rough leather, sole leather, and all other leather made from the hides or skins of cattle, without regard to size or weight; boots and shoes made of leather or of which leather is the component material of chief value.

Mr. Aldrich moved to lay the amendment on the table.

Upon the question of the adoption of the motion to lay on the table the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 4381, July 8):

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 28, as follows:

YEAS—45.

Aldrich	Carter	Hale	Piles
Borah	Clark, Wyo.	Heyburn	Scott
Bourne	Crane	Johnson, N. Dak.	Smith, Mich.
Bradley	Depew	Jones	Smoot
Brandegee	Dick	Kean	Stephenson
Briggs	Dixon	Lorimer	Sutherland
Brown	du Pont	*McEnery*	Warner
Bulkeley	Elkins	Nelson	Warren
Burkett	Flint	Nixon	Wetmore
Burnham	Frye	Oliver	
Burrows	Galling	Penrose	
Burton	Gamble	Perkins	

NAYS—28.

Bacon	Cummins	*Johnston, Ala.*	Page
Bailey	*Daniel*	La Follette	*Shively*
Bristow	Dolliver	*McLaurin*	*Simmons*
Chamberlain	*Fletcher*	*Martin*	*Smith, S. C.*
Clapp	*Foster*	*Newlands*	*Stone*
Crawford	*Frazier*	*Overman*	*Taliaferro*
Culberson	*Gore*	*Owen*	*Taylor*

NOT VOTING—19.

Bankhead	Curtis	Lodge	Richardson
Beveridge	*Davis*	McCumber	Root
Clarke, Ark.	Dillingham	*Money*	*Smith, Md.*
Clay	Guggenheim	*Paynter*	*Tillman*
Cullom	*Hughes*	*Rayner*	

So Mr. Stone's amendment was laid on the table.

Mr. Burton offered an amendment placing asphaltum and bitumen on the free list by the insertion of a new paragraph in the free list, as follows:

493½. *Asphaltum and bitumen, crude, if not dried nor otherwise advanced in any manner.*

Mr. Aldrich moved to lay the amendment on the table.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

On the question of the adoption of the motion to lay the amendment on the table the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 4386, July 8):

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 29, as follows:

YEAS—37.

Aldrich	Carter	Hale	Perkins
Bailey	Clark, Wyo.	Heyburn	Piles
Beveridge	Crane	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Bourne	Depew	Jones	Smoot
Brandegee	Dick	Kean	Stephenson
Briggs	Dixon	Lodge	Warren
Bristow	du Pont	Lorimer	Wetmore
Brown	Flint	*McEnery*	
Bulkeley	Gallinger	Page	
Burnham	Gamble	Penrose	

NAYS—29.

Bacon	Dolliver	*McLaurin*	Smith, Mich.
Bankhead	*Fletcher*	*Martin*	*Smith, S. C.*
Burkett	*Foster*	*Money*	*Stone*
Burton	*Frazier*	Nelson	*Taliaferro*
Chamberlain	*Gore*	*Overman*	*Taylor*
Clapp	*Hughes*	*Owen*	
Crawford	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Shively*	
Cummins.	La Follette	*Simmons*	

NOT VOTING—26.

Borah	Curtis	McCumber	Root
Bradley	*Daniel*	*Newlands*	*Smith, Md.*
Burrows	*Davis*	Nixon	Sutherland
Clarke, Ark.	Dillingham	Oliver	*Tillman*
Clay	Elkins	*Paynter*	Warner
Culberson	Frye	*Rayner*	
Cullom	Guggenheim	Richardson	

So Mr. Burton's amendment was laid on the table.

Mr. Bacon in the Senate again offered an amendment which had been previously offered in the Committee of the Whole placing hoop and band iron for baling cotton or any other commodity on the free list, as follows:

Hoop or band iron, or hoop or band steel, cut to lengths, or wholly or partly manufactured into hoops or ties, coated or not coated with paints or any other preparation, with or without buckles or fastenings, for baling cotton or any other commodity.

Mr. Aldrich moved to lay the amendment on the table.

Upon the question to lay the amendment on the table the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 4399, July 8):

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 31, as follows:

YEAS—43.

Aldrich	Carter	Gamble	Perkins
Borah	Clark, Wyo.	Hale	Piles
Bourne	Crane	Heyburn	Scott
Bradley	Depew	Jones	Smith, Mich.
Brandegee	Dick	Kean	Smoot
Briggs	Dixon	Lorimer	Stephenson
Bulkeley	du Pont	McCumber	Sutherland
Burkett	Elkins	Nixon	Warner
Burnham	Flint	Oliver	Warren
Burrows	Frye	Page	Wetmore
Burton	Gallinger	Penrose	

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

NAYS—31.

Bacon	Cummins	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Overman*
Bailey	*Daniel*	La Follette	*Shively*
Bankhead	*Fletcher*	*McEnery*	*Simmons*
Bristow	*Foster*	*McLaurin*	*Smith, S. C.*
Chamberlain	*Frazier*	*Martin*	*Stone*
Clapp	*Gore*	*Money*	*Taliaferro*
Crawford	*Hughes*	Nelson	*Taylor*
Culberson	Johnson, N. Dak.	*Newlands*	

NOT VOTING—18.

Beveridge	Curtis	Lodge	Root
Brown	*Davis*	*Owen*	*Smith, Md.*
Clarke, Ark.	Dillingham	*Paynter*	*Tillman*
Clay	Dolliver	*Rayner*	
Cullom	Guggenheim	Richardson	

So Mr. Bacon's amendment was laid on the table.

Mr. La Follette offered an amendment *creating a tariff commission,* which is found on page 4411 of the Record.

Upon the question of the adoption of the amendment the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 4413, July 8):

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 45, as follows:

YEAS—33.

Bacon	*Culberson*	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Shively*
Bailey	Cummins	La Follette	*Simmons*
Bankhead	*Daniel*	*McLaurin*	*Smith, S. C.*
Beveridge	Dolliver	*Martin*	*Stone*
Bristow	*Fletcher*	*Money*	*Taliaferro*
Brown	*Foster*	Nelson	*Taylor*
Burkett	*Frazier*	*Newlands*	
Chamberlain	*Gore*	*Overman*	
Clapp	*Hughes*	*Owen*	

NAYS—45.

Aldrich	Crane	Heyburn	Piles
Borah	Crawford	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Bourne	Depew	Jones	Smith, Mich.
Bradley	Dick	Kean	Smoot
Brandegee	Dixon	Lorimer	Stephenson
Briggs	du Pont	McCumber	Sutherland
Bulkeley	Elkins	*McEnery*	Warner
Burnham	Flint	Nixon	Warren
Burrows	Frye	Oliver	Wetmore
Burton	Gallinger	Page	
Carter	Gamble	Penrose	
Clark, Wyo.	Hale	Perkins	

NOT VOTING—14.

Clarke, Ark.	*Davis*	*Paynter*	*Smith, Md.*
Clay	Dillingham	*Rayner*	*Tillman*
Cullom	Guggenheim	Richardson	
Curtis	Lodge	Root	

So Mr. La Follette's amendment was rejected.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

The question then recurred upon the passage of the bill, and upon this question the vote was as follows (Congressional Record, p. 4416, July 8):

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 34, as follows:

YEAS—45.

Aldrich	Crane	Heyburn	Piles
Borah	Depew	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Bourne	Dick	Jones	Smith, Mich.
Bradley	Dixon	Kean	Smoot
Brandegee	du Pont	Lorimer	Stephenson
Briggs	Elkins	McCumber	Sutherland
Bulkeley	Flint	*McEnery*	Warner
Burnham	Frye	Nixon	Warren
Burrows	Gallinger	Oliver	Wetmore
Burton	Gamble	Page	
Carter	Guggenheim	Penrose	
Clark, Wyo.	Hale	Perkins	

NAYS—34.

Bacon	Crawford	*Hughes*	*Owen*
Bailey	*Culberson*	*Johnston, Ala.*	*Shively*
Bankhead	Cummins	La Follette	*Simmons*
Beveridge	*Daniel*	*McLaurin*	*Smith, S. C.*
Bristow	Dolliver	*Martin*	*Stone*
Brown	*Fletcher*	*Money*	*Taliaferro*
Burkett	*Foster*	Nelson	*Taylor*
Chamberlain	*Frazier*	*Newlands*	
Clapp	*Gore*	*Overman*	

NOT VOTING—13.

Clarke, Ark.	*Davis*	*Rayner*	*Tillman*
Clay	Dillingham	Richardson	
Cullom	Lodge	Root	
Curtis	*Paynter*	*Smith, Md.*	

So the bill was passed.

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis