

circulation of a gold currency is, to a great extent, defeated. If these coins were converted at our mint or branch mints into the eagle, the half-eagle, and quarter-eagle we should speedily have a large supply of American gold coin, and it would very soon be brought into common use as a currency and thus give to it greater stability and greater security to all the business of the country. A considerable amount of foreign gold coin has, during the present year, under the directions of this department, been converted into American gold coin; but the process would be much more rapid if aided by the organization of the constitutional treasury and the establishment of a branch of the mint at the great commercial emporium of the Union. With the mint and branch mints as depositories, the sum remaining in the hands of other receivers of public money, whether of lands or customs, would be inconsiderable, and the Government could be readily protected from all losses of such sums by adequate bonds and the power by law to convict and punish as criminals all who embezzle the public moneys.

It is believed, under such a system, that no defaults would take place, and that the public moneys would be safely kept and disbursed in gold and silver. This Government is made, by the Constitution, the guardian of a specie currency. That currency can only be coined and its value regulated by this Government. It is one of its first duties to supply such a currency by an efficient mint and by general regulations of the coinage; but in vain will it attempt to perform that duty if, when coin is made or regulated in value, this Government dispenses with its use and expels it from circulation, or drives it out of the country by substituting the paper of banks in all the transactions of the Government.

There is nothing which will advance so surely the prosperity of the country as an adequate supply of specie, diffused throughout every portion of the Union and constituting to a great extent the ordinary circulation everywhere among the people. It is a currency that will never break nor fall; it will neither expand nor contract beyond the legitimate business of the country; it will lead to no extravagant speculations at one time, to be followed by certain depression at another; nor will labor ever be robbed of its reward by the depreciation of such currency. There is no danger that we shall have too much gold and silver in actual circulation, or too small an amount of bank paper, or that any injury ever will be inflicted upon the business of the country by a diminution of the circulation of the paper of banks and the substitution in its place to that extent of gold and silver. Even their most ardent advocates must admit that banks are subject to periodical expansions and contractions, and that this evil would be increased by giving them the funds of the Government to loan and by receiving and disbursing nothing but their paper.

It is believed that the permanent interest of every class of the people will be advanced by the establishment of the constitutional treasury, and that the manufacturers especially will derive great benefit from its adoption. It will give stability to all their operations and insure them to a great extent against those fluctuations, expansions, and contractions of the currency so prejudicial to their interests. By guarding against inflations of the currency it will have a tendency to check periodical excesses of foreign importations purchased in fact upon credit; while loans from banks, or dangerous enlargements of their business, and excessive issues of their paper will be greatly diminished. Whilst a sound and stable currency guards the manufacturer against excessive importations from abroad, it protects him from disasters at home and from those ruinous revulsions in which so many thousands are reduced to bankruptcy.

The tariff, if followed, as in the absence of adequate checks it certainly soon will be, by an inflated currency, whilst it thus enhances the expenses of manufacturing at home, will speedily and certainly raise prices up to the whole amount of the duty, so as to repeal the operation of that duty in favor of the manufacturer, and enable the foreign importer again to flood the market at the enhanced prices arising from an inflated currency. But soon the revulsion comes, and all are overwhelmed in a common ruin. The currency is reduced below the wants of the country by a sudden and ruinous contraction; and the labor and industry of years are required to repair the mischief. Stability, both in the tariff and the currency, is what the manufacturer should most desire. Let the tariff be permanently adjusted by a return to reasonable and moderate revenue duties which, even when imposed truly and in good faith for that purpose, will yield sufficient advantage to afford reasonable profits; and let this permanent system (and none other can be permanent) be established and accompanied by a stable currency, and the manufacturer, in a series of years, will derive the greatest benefits from the system. The present system can not be permanent. It is too unequal and unjust, too exorbitant and oppressive, and too clearly in conflict with the fundamental principles of the Constitution. If the manufacturer thinks that this system can be permanent, let him look to the constant changes which have attended all attempts to establish and continue a protective tariff. The first tariff was based in part upon the principle of very moderate protection to domestic manufactures, and the result has been, as appears by the table hereto annexed, that the tariff has been changed and modified 30 times since that period, being more than once, on an average, for every Congress since the Government was founded; and one of these tariffs was in itself a system of successive biennial changes, operating through a period of 10 years. Of these changes, 14 have been general and 16 special. From 1816 onward these changes have been most frequent, and it is vain to expect permanency from anything but a revenue tariff. Stability is what the manufacturer should desire, and especially that the question should be taken out of the arena of politics by a just and permanent settlement. A great number of tables, illustrative of the effects of the tariff, compiled from official documents, accompany this report. Some of these tables exhibit the operation of each of our tariffs from the organization of the Government to the present period. In order to enable the Secretary to comply with the direction of the acts of Congress, requiring him in his annual report to suggest "plans for improving or increasing the revenues," and to give "information to Congress in adopting modes of raising" the revenue, two circulars were issued, published, and generally distributed propounding various questions connected with this subject, and requesting replies. Some answers have been received from friends as well as opponents of the tariff, but the Secretary regrets that the manufacturers, with very few exceptions, have declined answering these questions or communicating any information as regards their profits and surplus or in relation to the wages of labor. An abstract of all that is deemed useful in these replies, together with a copy of both the circulars, is appended to this report.

The coast survey is rapidly progressing, having been extended eastward to the eastern coast of Massachusetts, and southward nearly to the dividing line of Maryland and Virginia on the Chesapeake. Two new centers of operation have been opened, under the sanction of this department, in North Carolina and on the Gulf of Mexico, from which

the work may be spread until the parts unite. Important positions for forts, navy yards, harbors, and lighthouses present themselves along this interesting portion of the coast of Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama and the islands guarding the interior channel between Mobile and New Orleans. Great economy exists in the administration of the fund appropriated for the coast survey, and every effort is made by the superintendent to press the work onward to a completion; and his report in detail will be hereafter submitted to Congress. Three charts, resulting from the survey, have been published within the past year, and five more are nearly ready for publication. This great work is most honorable to the science of our country, most useful to our Navy and commercial marine, and, in connection with our lighthouses, must decrease the cost of freight and insurance as well as the risk of life and property. Great attention has been given by this department to the very important subject of our lighthouse system. The various improvements suggested by experience at home or abroad, the relative advantages of gas or oil, of reflectors, lenticular and revolving lights, the location and construction of the buildings as well as the mode of keeping the lights, are all being fully and carefully investigated, and report, it is believed, will be ready during the present session of Congress. From the Chesapeake to the capes of Florida, and thence westward, our coast is badly lighted, as well as the Great Lakes of the Northwest; and numerous wrecks, often accompanied with loss of life and property, seem to require the interposition of Congress.

Such portions of the charts of the exploring expedition as were placed under the charge of this department were distributed for the benefit of our whale ships. These valuable charts embrace the survey of many hitherto almost unexplored regions and islands of the Pacific as well as a part of the coast of Oregon, and must be eminently useful for many purposes, but especially to our seamen and merchants engaged in the whale fishery. In pursuance of a resolution of Congress a report is in progress of preparation as regards the banks and currency, and also in relation to statistics; and these, with all other reports required from this department, will be presented at the earliest practicable period of the present session.

In presenting his annual report, in obedience to the law, the Secretary of the Treasury submits his views with undissembled diffidence, consoled by the reflection that all his errors of judgment will be corrected by the superior wisdom of the two Houses of Congress, guided and directed by that overruling Providence which has blessed the unexampled progress of this great and happy Union.

R. J. WALKER,
Secretary of the Treasury.

HON. JOHN W. DAVIS,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I had hoped that we might dispose of the pending amendment, but I am informed that several Senators would prefer to have the matter go over until to-morrow morning, and therefore I move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. BAILEY. That is perfectly satisfactory.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Pennsylvania moves that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, July 12, 1911, at 11 o'clock a. m.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, July 12, 1911.

The Senate met at 11 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.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. Smith, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12109) to supply a deficiency in the appropriations for contingent expenses of the House of Representatives for the fiscal year 1911, and for other purposes; asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; and had appointed Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. CANNON managers at the conference on the part of the House.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. CULLOM presented a petition of the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor of the First Baptist Church of Glens Falls, N. Y., and a petition of the Christian Endeavor Society of the Presbyterian Church of Crows Landing, Cal., praying for the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WORKS presented memorials of sundry citizens of West New Brighton, Staten Island, and New York City, all in the State of New York, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Johnston Sunday-rest bill, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey presented a memorial of Moravian Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Hope, N. J., and a memorial of Local Grange No. 132, Patrons of Husbandry, of Cold Spring, N. J., remonstrating against the so-called reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of Plainfield, N. J., praying for the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the New England Society of Orange, N. J., praying for the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented memorials of Local Division No. 10, Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Hudson County; of Bismarck Lodge, No. 1, of Sayreville; of the Arion Club, of Sayreville; of the Schuetzen und Germania Society, of Sayreville; and of Martin Stanton, James Hamill, and P. D. Leary, of Jersey City, all in the State of New Jersey, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. MYERS presented memorials of sundry citizens of Fort Harrison, Helena, and Rimini, all in the State of Montana, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Johnston Sunday-rest bill, which were ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. BACON, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 2877) amending section 67 of the act approved March 3, 1911, to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary, reported it without amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 2925) providing for a Confederate naval monument in Vicksburg National Military Park, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 101) thereon.

EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY AND WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION COMMISSION.

Mr. SMOOT. From the Committee on Printing I report back with an amendment in the nature of a substitute Senate concurrent resolution No. 6, submitted by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND] June 29, and I ask for its present consideration.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

The amendment was to strike out all after the resolving clause and to insert:

That the hearings held before the Employers' Liability and Workmen's Compensation Commission be printed as a public document and that 3,500 additional copies be printed for the use of the Employers' Liability and Workmen's Compensation Commission.

The amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution as amended 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. BURNHAM:

A bill (S. 3017) granting an increase of pension to Fayette W. Barlow; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

A bill (S. 3018) granting an increase of pension to George H. Welshman (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GORE:

A bill (S. 3019) for the relief of Elizabeth McLaughlin; and A bill (S. 3020) for the relief of E. M. Hundley (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 3021) granting an increase of pension to Stalnaker Marteney (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3022) granting a pension to Rosa Ohm (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

NEW MEXICO AND ARIZONA.

Mr. NELSON submitted an amendment, in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 14) to admit the Territories of New Mexico and Arizona as States into the Union upon an equal footing with the original States, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

FLORIDA EAST COAST RAILWAY CELEBRATION.

Mr. FLETCHER. I submit a concurrent resolution, which I ask may be read and referred to the Committee on Industrial Expositions.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 7) was read and referred to the Committee on Industrial Expositions, as follows:

Whereas the citizens of the city of Key West, in the State of Florida, propose, by appropriate ceremonies, beginning on the 2d day of January, A. D. 1912, to celebrate the completion of the building of the extension of the main line of road of the Florida East Coast Railway Co. from the mainland of the State of Florida to the island city of Key West; and

Whereas the completion of this line of railway, covering more than 100 miles, along the chain of keys, connected by concrete viaducts, will mark the completion of the greatest enterprise in railroad engineering of this country and unequaled as an individual undertaking perhaps in the world; and

Whereas this great work is the result of the constructive ability of American genius, and has been made possible by the patriotic and progressive enterprise of its American promoters and builders; and

Whereas this marvelous accomplishment places the railways of the United States in close proximity to the Panama Canal and gives our country a commanding position with relation to the trade of all our neighboring Republics to the southward, thus making the enterprise one of both national and international importance, and its successful completion cause for congratulation: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, earnestly requested to extend to all foreign nations an invitation to visit the city of Key West, Fla., and participate in the celebration of the completion of said over-sea railroad so connecting the mainland of the United States with the island city of Key West, both by their official representatives and citizens generally, and particularly to invite such foreign countries to send such of their respective naval vessels as may be practicable and convenient to participate in such celebration so to be held beginning on the 2d day of January, A. D. 1912.

Resolved further, That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, requested to direct such portion of the Army of the United States as may be convenient and practicable to be present at Key West at the time of such proposed celebration and participate therein.

Resolved further, That under no circumstances is the United States to assume, be subjected to, or charged with, any expense of any character whatsoever in or about or connected with such proposed celebration.

ABOLITION OF SENATE OFFICES.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the following resolution, coming over from a former day.

The SECRETARY. Senate resolution No. 74, submitted by Mr. LODGE June 19, 1911, as follows:

Resolved, That the offices designated as "superintendent of the folding room," "assistant postmaster and mail carrier," "clerk, compiling a history of revenue and general appropriation bills," one unemployed messenger, and one unemployed laborer, be, and are hereby, abolished.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. In connection with the resolution just adopted, I ask if it has any relation to the colored man who was employed in the stationery room.

Mr. LODGE. It covers his case and one other.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I ask that the vote be reconsidered by which the resolution was adopted. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] desires to be present when it is considered.

Mr. LODGE. I put it over several times. It is a small matter, and I think it ought not to be put over again. It has been pending for three or four weeks.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It will not do any harm to let it go over until to-morrow. I am sure the Senator from Mississippi is interested in the matter. I do not know to what extent he is interested, but I know he wishes to be present when the resolution is considered, and I think that action ought to be postponed. It is of no great importance that it should be disposed of this morning.

Mr. LODGE. If it can be agreed that the resolution can be taken up and disposed of to-morrow morning, I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will hand it down again to-morrow morning.

Mr. LODGE. If it is agreed that it shall be disposed of to-morrow morning, very well.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. That course is entirely agreeable to me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the action by which the resolution was passed is reconsidered, and the resolution will be handed down to-morrow morning.

Mr. LODGE. The motion to reconsider goes over until to-morrow morning.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will lie on the table.

Mr. LODGE. I understood that the Senator from Virginia made a motion to reconsider.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I think the motion to reconsider leaves it with the status it had before. It is immaterial, so that there may be no final disposition before to-morrow morning.

Mr. LODGE. I only desire to have it disposed of; that is all.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion to reconsider will be entered, and the resolution will lie on the table.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12100) to supply a deficiency in the appropriations for contingent expenses of the

House of Representatives for the fiscal year 1911, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. WARREN. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the conference asked for by the House, the conferees on the part of the Senate to be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. WARREN, Mr. GAMBLE, and Mr. CULBERSON conferees on the part of the Senate.

RECIPROCITY WITH CANADA.

Mr. PENROSE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4412, the reciprocity bill.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4412) to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, and for other purposes.

ELECTION OF SENATORS BY DIRECT VOTE.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I desire to call attention to another matter for a moment. I should like to ask, if proper to do so, and I presume it is, whether the conference committee on House joint resolution 39 can advise me if there is likely to be a report from that committee soon?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The chairman of the conference committee is not in the Senate Chamber at the present time.

Mr. BORAH. Two members of the committee are here. I presume they know something about it.

Mr. NELSON. There has been no meeting of the conferees yet. I inquired of the chairman of the Senate conference committee yesterday whether the House conferees had been here and desired to have a meeting, and he said he had not heard anything from them on the subject. That is all the information I have.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I was of the opinion that there had not been any meeting of the conference committee, and I thought it proper to call attention to the fact that there ought to be an effort on the part of the conferees to get together. The Senate is entitled to know if the conferees can not agree, and it is entitled to have the result if the conferees can agree. We are approaching the time now when we are all hopeful of a final adjournment, and I feel quite sure that it will expedite the hour of adjournment if we can have a report from the conference committee.

Mr. NELSON. I desire to add a word further. My experience as a member of conference committees since I have been a Member of the Senate, and I think it is the experience of all Senate conferees, is that in all cases the House conferees come to the Senate conferees when they are ready to act; that it is not customary for the Senate conferees to go to the House, but the custom has been for the House conferees to indicate when they are ready to meet with the Senate conferees. I think I can safely say for the Senate conferees that we are ready at any time to meet whenever they are willing and indicate a disposition to meet. There has been no purpose, so far as I know, and I see the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON], a member of the conference committee, who, I think, will bear witness to the fact that there has been no disposition on the part of the Senate conferees to delay the matter in any shape or manner.

Mr. BORAH. I did not intend to intimate that there had been any intention to do so. I thought perhaps that owing to other pressing matters it had been overlooked, and I simply desired to call attention to it so that it might not be put aside too long.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I simply desire to say that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] has stated the facts as I understand them. I will add that I have had several conversations with the chairman of the House conferees and I judge from what he said to me that the disposition of the conferees on the part of the House is for an early meeting, and I have no doubt there will be one.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, I just came into the Chamber and became cognizant of the matter under discussion. The only thing I can say as a member of the committee of conference is that in the regular order of business the papers are in the hands of the Senate conferees. The Senate committee is waiting the appearance or the action or the request of the House conferees to act thereon.

RECIPROCITY WITH CANADA.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4412) to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President—

Mr. BACON rose.

Mr. HEYBURN. If the Senator from Georgia desires to speak, I yield to him.

Mr. BACON. I was going to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. HEYBURN. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia 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:

Bacon	Fletcher	Martin, Va.	Smith, Mich.
Borah	Foster	Martine, N. J.	Smoot
Brandeggee	Gallinger	Myers	Sutherland
Bristow	Gamble	Nelson	Swanson
Brown	Gronna	Nixon	Thornton
Bryan	Guggenheim	Oliver	Townsend
Burnham	Heyburn	Overman	Warren
Chamberlain	Johnston, Ala.	Page	Watson
Clapp	Jones	Penrose	Wetmore
Clark, Wyo.	Kenyon	Perkins	Williams
Crane	Kern	Pointdexter	Works
Cullom	Lodge	Pomerene	
Cummins	McCumber	Reed	
Curtis	McLean	Root	

Mr. GAMBLE. My colleague [Mr. CRAWFORD] is necessarily absent on important business out of the city.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-three Senators have answered to the roll call. A quorum of the Senate is present. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I would ask if the pending amendment has been read?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment has been read. Without objection, it can be read again, if the Senator desires it.

Mr. McCUMBER. I simply wanted to know whether it had been read. I have the amendment here. I should like to ask if the author of the amendment, the Senator from Texas, is present to explain the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understood that that Senator made a few desultory remarks in explanation of the amendment yesterday.

Mr. McCUMBER. I was trying to ascertain if he had made any remarks concerning the amendment. I listened very attentively to a most interesting argument between the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Mississippi upon general Democratic history and their elucidation of what constitutes a good Democrat.

I learned considerable about a gentleman by the name of Robert J. Walker, who seemed to have been the greatest philosopher as well as the greatest Democrat in the country, and who both Senators agreed was the greatest prevaricator we ever had in the country. But I got no information from either of the Senators concerning these amendments; there are several of them; and I wish the Senator from Texas was present—

Mr. BAILEY. I am.

Mr. McCUMBER. And that he would be able to explain, since we are now coming to a vote, some of their provisions.

Mr. President, if I understand the purpose of the pending amendment, it assumes that by the reciprocity agreement the farmers of this country have suffered great injury, and following upon the heels of this bill, which strikes them a most vicious blow, the Senator from Texas proposes this balm for their wounds. I want to find out from the Senator from Texas himself what benefit the farmer is to get out of what the Senator calls the farmers' free-list bill.

Mr. President, I can with mathematical accuracy determine just what injury this bill will be to the people of the entire Northwest. I can establish that so certainly that no Senator in this Chamber can gainsay the truth of the statement of the annual loss that will be suffered by the farmers of the State that I represent, of the State of South Dakota, and of the State of Minnesota. If we are to have some balm, some compensation for this injury, I want to know what it is.

Mr. President, but a few days ago we had a message from the President of the United States calling attention to the serious offense of fraudulently advertising nostrums as cures for certain ailments; and following the representation of the President of the United States I introduced a bill, hoping that it might be enacted into law, which would prevent any druggist or any so-called physician from advertising a nostrum which had no physiological effect on earth as a cure for some particular disease. I desire to make that act a criminal offense, and yet, while we would punish the fake doctor for prescribing something as a remedy which he knows will not be a remedy, we seem to gloss over an attempt to impose a fake remedy upon the farmers for the injury which is inflicted upon them by this bill.

I have diagnosed the case so far as this bill affects the people of the great Northwest. I know that we have a shortage of the kind of grain we need in our section of the country of a sufficient amount to make our tariffs on our present grain worth from 10 to 15 cents a bushel to us. I know that they raise in Canada, across the line, enough grain to make up that shortage, and in addition to have an enormous amount for export.

I know and have demonstrated that the result of this bill will be that both sections will then be placed on an export basis; that to-day our section, which is the great Northwest wheat-raising section, is not on an export basis and has not been on such a basis for a number of years; that the moment that it is placed on an export basis the market must necessarily go down from 10 to 15 cents a bushel on wheat; and that the moment we allow the Canadian crop to enter our land freely the market price of American wheat must go down to the level of the Canadian price.

Minnesota and the two Dakotas raise under normal conditions 250,000,000 bushels of wheat. Estimating the difference at only 10 cents a bushel, though the difference in price has averaged from 12 to 13 cents a bushel for the last few years, there is a loss of \$25,000,000 to the farmers of those three States for a single year on wheat alone.

The Northwestern States also raise about 100,000,000 bushels of barley. The difference between the Canadian price and the American price last year averaged the full amount of the tariff duty, or about 30 cents per bushel. Figuring that, however, at only 25 cents a bushel, to be conservative, and we have another loss of \$25,000,000 annually upon our barley crop.

Now, I want to make these matters clear; I want to make my diagnosis of the case certain; and then I should like to see whether or not the remedy which is proposed by the Senator from Texas will in fact be a remedy.

I then come to the flax crop, practically all of which is raised in the three States of North and South Dakota and Minnesota. My State raises about half of that crop, and the other half is divided between the other two States. We will place that conservatively at 15,000,000 bushels. I will ask my colleague if that is about right?

Mr. GRONNA. It is.

Mr. McCUMBER. About 15,000,000 bushels for those three States. The difference between the American and Canadian price during the last year and for about two years has been a difference of about 25 cents a bushel—nearly the exact amount of the tariff duty. That would make a loss of, we will say, \$4,000,000 more. Thus I have shown a loss in those three States annually by reason of taking away the protection on our farmers' products of \$56,000,000. I want to know, Mr. President, how we are to be compensated for this loss. I want the Senator who proposes this amendment to be as accurate in determining the extent of his remedy as I am accurate in determining the extent of our loss, so that we may estimate the amount of remedy or remedial salve that we are to get out of this farmers' free-list bill. If you rob one farmer of \$100 in a single year, I want to know what he is to get back out of any one of those articles. It will not do to say to him that it is a little matter of principle; that he at least is given opportunity to buy in a free-trade market, unless you can point out to him what that free-trade market is.

I want my Democratic friends, including the Senator from Texas, and my Republican friends on this side, to comprehend the fact, which they do not seem to comprehend very well, that the farmer of the Northwest who has intelligence enough to know that he is hurt has also intelligence enough to understand that he gets no remedy whatever from this free-list bill. You give him, you say, free farm implements. Well, where is he to get those free farm implements from? Does not every farmer understand to-day, if he understands anything about the question, that he already has free trade in farm implements, except from those countries that levy a tariff upon American farm implements?

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly.

Mr. NELSON. Is the Senator from North Dakota oblivious to the fact that this amendment would put leather goods, boots, shoes, and lumber on the free list? Is that of no value to the farmer?

Mr. McCUMBER. I am going to figure out the value of that right now. Let me show my friend from Minnesota just what that value is. There is a reduction of \$1.25 a thousand feet upon lumber. A farmer builds a house once in 45 years out of frame material. If he builds an ordinary, good-sized house he

would probably purchase 20,000 feet of lumber. Twenty thousand feet of lumber at \$1.25 a thousand would be \$25. The farmer will have saved because of the free-list bill \$25 in 45 years, or 55 cents a year, enough to buy five stogies. He is getting a great deal of benefit out of that, is he not?

Let us measure that against what he loses. I will take as a basis the farmer from the State of Minnesota who raises 100 acres of barley. He will raise on 100 acres, at a very low estimate, 2,000 bushels of barley, will he not? Two thousand bushels at a reduction in price of 30 cents a bushel would be about \$600. He will lose at that rate \$600 every year, and he will gain 55 cents—\$600 on one side of the ledger and 55 cents on the other side of the ledger. Will any Senator tell me that that is compensation?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. McCUMBER. With pleasure.

Mr. BORAH. If he gets 55 cents, the equity does not seem to be very strong in his favor; but the farmer will not get the 55 cents. It has been demonstrated since we passed the Payne-Aldrich bill that the Canadian lumber dealer takes up the amount of the reduction of the tariff immediately upon its going into effect. While we were passing the Payne-Aldrich bill two years ago the Canadian lumber dealer incorporated into his contracts the proposition that he was to have the benefit of the amount of the duty added to his price. While it was disputed during the debate that that would be general, since that time it has been demonstrated that it has been universal. The consumer of lumber has not received the color of a cent's benefit from the reduction of the duty on lumber two years ago. By the removal of the duty on lumber, on the other hand, we have been deprived of the revenue which we would have obtained, and which has gone directly into the hands of the Canadian lumber dealer. To put lumber upon the free list at this time is not, in my judgment, to reduce the price to the advantage of the builder at all.

Mr. McCUMBER. I have always contended, even though I am for free lumber and would vote for free lumber, that the granting of free lumber would make no difference in the price to the American consumer; that the only possibility of its affecting the price would be in the case where there possibly might be a combination here that would not take in the Canadian manufacturer. I support the proposition that that which the Lord Almighty put under the ground billions of years ago, and which can not be renewed by any process, but which when once used becomes forever exhausted, ought to be outside the pale of protection. That is the only reason why I have ever opposed a duty upon lumber. If I believed, as I know many Senators believe who claim that my fears are groundless, that the timber supply was not soon to be exhausted, I would be strongly in favor of a duty upon lumber.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I know of one lumber firm which shipped 8,000 carloads of lumber from the United States into Canada during the last year, and I am afraid that Canada is again getting the better of the diplomatic deal upon the question of conservation as well as upon the question of duty. If the Senator will permit me, I will read here a single paragraph from a letter from the governor of Vermont, written about the time the Payne-Aldrich bill was being considered, in which this process of taking up the duty was first brought to the attention of the public. The extract is as follows:

You will understand this better when I tell you that only a week ago I traded a cut of 10,000,000 feet to be shipped during next year, but before I could close a trade I was obliged to put in the contract that if the duty was changed the seller should have one-half the reduction. Where would the consumer come in on this kind of a deal?

That was referred to at the time as an isolated transaction, but those who are interested in knowing what the effect was will find that that practice became universal in such transactions, and that the reason why the reduction was not of benefit to the consumer was because it was taken up by the Canadian lumber dealer.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I did not intend to go into the question of the general policy of a duty on lumber; and I want to assure the Senator from Minnesota that, while he may consider that because I claim there is no financial benefit to be obtained from this measure, I would necessarily be opposed to it, on the contrary, there is something of a principle involved in it which will induce me, if I have an opportunity, to vote for it. But I am not going to vote for it and deceive the farming public into the idea that they will get a financial benefit out of this free-list bill.

I am sorry the Senator from Texas did not remain to answer a few of the questions I have propounded, for I understand this

is a Democratic measure, and that the Democrats, as a rule, will vote for the free list in a separate bill to compensate the farmer for the loss that he will suffer. Some of them think he will not suffer any loss; but, assuming that he will suffer some loss, they believe the so-called free-list bill will partially compensate him for that loss.

I now take up the first provision, namely, agricultural machinery. That machinery consists of wagons, of plows, of harrows, of seeders, of drills, of hay rakes, of thrashing machines, and so forth. I should like to ask anyone on either side of the Chamber to inform me what country outside of the United States is to furnish the farmer with a single one of those articles after you have taken off the duty, as you say you will take it off? It is practically off now, so far as I know, between nearly all of the countries, unless it be Canada. But will the Senator from Texas be kind enough to tell me where the farmer will get his wagon after we have passed this free-list bill, and he can include, if he desires, in the same statement what country will furnish him with the other articles I have mentioned. I want to take them one after another, and I know that I can rely pretty accurately upon any statement that will be given by the Senator from Texas.

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator from North Dakota must not have been in his seat, or if in his seat his attention must have been diverted when I was addressing the Senate yesterday afternoon, because I very frankly admitted that this provision of the free list will result in no substantial benefit to the farmer.

But while I am on my feet I will say to the Senator from North Dakota, who now underrates the value of this free-lumber provision, that I remember in 1909 what a persistent and earnest advocate of free lumber he was.

Mr. McCUMBER. I must say to the Senator, if he will allow me, that the Senator was absent when I just now discussed that point and that position—

Mr. BAILEY. Oh, no; I was not. I heard the Senator's point about conservation. But the Senator has changed his mind about that, I think, since the debate of 1909.

Mr. McCUMBER. Hardly.

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator is aware, of course, that the highest authority on conservation in this country takes a different view from the one he expresses, and the Senator from North Dakota, who knows very much about all these things—

Mr. McCUMBER. He does not—

Mr. BAILEY. Is also aware that a Canadian commission has in its report concurred in the view expressed by Mr. Pinchot as relating to their own forests and their conservation.

But whether that was right or wrong, and whether the Senator from North Dakota was right or wrong, he was earnest for free lumber then. The Canadian treaty gives him free lumber, which he is not willing to take with free wheat, free barley, free flax, and other things, and all I am trying to do or all the House of Representatives tried to do in this free list was to put planed lumber or manufactured lumber, we will call it, upon exactly the same basis as rough lumber.

I think myself that is right. I think if the man who does the roughest work, for which he receives the smallest wage, is to have no duty on the product of his labor, then I think the more highly skilled labor and the more improved machinery, commanding, as it always does, a higher wage and a higher price for its product, might consent to take the same treatment as its less fortunate brother engaged in a similar enterprise.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator agrees with me entirely upon the proposition that there ought not to be any distinction; that if we are to have free lumber, everything in the lumber line should be free. That is, if we are going to have free lumber at all.

Mr. BAILEY. I probably go further than the Senator. I would not only emancipate manufactured lumber in all of its forms from a duty, if I emancipated it in its crude form, but I would also emancipate everything necessary in the lumber business, from the ax which the woodman lays to the tree to the electric-light bulb which the saw mill man uses for night operations, including the bands and saws and the machinery of every kind.

In other words, if the Senator will permit me, if people are compelled to sell their products on a free-trade basis, I think they ought to be permitted to produce them on a free-trade basis. Does the Senator from North Dakota agree with me in that?

Mr. McCUMBER. Absolutely; but let us not abandon the purpose of the original query, which was to ascertain whether we would get what we might call a substantial benefit to compensate in any way for our losses, or whether it is a mere bagatelle, so small, so very minute that we can scarcely take it into consideration as compensatory relief.

Mr. BAILEY. I need only repeat what I said to the Senator a moment ago and what I said to the Senate yesterday afternoon. I do not regard this as anything like a compensation. I do not even regard it as important. But whatever it is worth I want to give it to the American farmer.

I will say further to the Senator from North Dakota that in my view it would not and will not be possible to compensate the farmer for having put everything he produces on the free list, even if you give him 50 per cent of what he buys on the free list. The only equivalent that you can give him for compelling him to sell all he produces in a free-trade market is to give him the right to purchase all he consumes in a free-trade market. In that way—

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator would not call it an equivalent.

Mr. BAILEY. Yes; I think that is an equivalent. The Senator from North Dakota knows that my view is that if everybody in this country could buy on a free-trade basis, everybody in this country could produce and sell on a free-trade basis. If it were not for the necessity of raising revenue to support the Government I would be willing to convert the customhouses into schoolhouses. I have no doubt that with the superior intelligence, the superior skill of our people, supplemented by the superior natural advantages of our country, we could maintain an equal contest in our own markets and, I believe, in all the markets of the world.

Mr. McCUMBER. If we would put on the free list everything that is imported into the United States we could not compensate the farmer in the Northwest for the loss he suffers under this bill. Now, let me give the Senator a little illustration.

Mr. BAILEY. If the Senator will not think I am impolite, I must leave the Chamber to meet some young constituents who are waiting for me. As soon as I dispose of them I will return and renew the debate with the Senator.

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly.

The proposition is this: The farmer sells a dollar's worth of his produce which without a protection of 25 per cent duty would bring only a dollar. He sells that produce, because of the duty, for \$1.25. He takes that \$1.25 and goes into the market and purchases one dollar and a quarter's worth of goods at retail. Now, here is the difference, and Senators will comprehend it the moment that they look at it.

He buys upon a retail basis. He sells upon a wholesale basis. The tariff that is levied upon the things he purchases is not levied upon the retail price, but upon the manufacturers' price. If it was levied upon the retailers' price, then a 25 per cent ad valorem duty taken off of that retail price would balance an ad valorem duty of 25 cents taken off of his selling price. But it so happens that under our method of doing business the article advances so rapidly in value from the time it leaves the manufacturers' hands until it is turned over to the consumer, that every time it is touched by the golden hand of American labor you have added to its value sometimes two and three fold, that there is no relation whatever between the original price and the selling price to the consumer.

Then we take this same article that he buys at retail for a dollar and a quarter, and on the average you would find that the manufacturer's price was perhaps not over 20 cents. Then if you take away 25 per cent duty from the manufacturer's price you will have reduced it 5 cents. Therefore, the farmer would save in his purchases, provided he always pays the full amount of the tariff, 5 cents. He would lose 25 cents on a dollar on his sales. The result would be that he would lose five times as much as he gained. That is true in almost every line of purchases.

So, Mr. President, I say you can not fully compensate him. But the complaint I make against this amendment is that it seems to have originated with a studied care that the farmer, under the guise of receiving a benefit, will absolutely receive nothing; that almost with studied determination they have eliminated—those who are responsible for this farmers' free-list bill—everything that would operate as a substantial benefit to him.

Now, following this matter a little further. Take a suit of clothes. If the farmer, in paying \$45 for a tailor-made suit of clothes—which he does not very often do; ordinarily he will buy one at from \$20 to \$25—could have a tariff of 25 or 40 or 50 per cent ad valorem taken off of the retail price, of course he would benefit very greatly by it. But that suit of clothes is made up of goods which probably did not cost \$4 in the market, and probably were imported into this country for \$2, and if you, therefore, were to take away a 25 per cent duty you have saved him only 50 cents in the value of the cloth that goes into that suit of clothes.

In a purchase price of \$45, how many dollars' worth of his own products must he expend to save that 50 cents? In buying that suit of clothes for \$45 he expends \$45 in actual goods—worth that much to him—and if he loses his benefit of 25 per cent protection, then you will see that he has lost \$11 and has gained 50 cents. So I might follow along all lines of purchases.

I want Senators to understand, and I wish it was in my power to make the farmers of the country understand thoroughly, what the tariff really means to them, how much of a burden it is upon the people, and what part it plays in raising the retail price of any article.

Let me give Senators another little illustration which I believe will be interesting to them. I had my attention called the other day to a new brand of crackers, retailed at 40 cents a pound, made of wheat flour. A bushel of wheat to the farmer in my State who raised it, we will say, is worth 80 cents. That bushel of grain made 44 pounds of flour and 16 pounds of shorts and middlings. That 44 pounds of flour was made into these crackers. The 16 pounds of shorts and middlings would certainly buy the cottolene or the lard that was used to shorten those crackers.

Now, let us do a little computation. Forty-four pounds, at 40 cents a pound, makes \$17.60. The farmer got 80 cents for that bushel of wheat. The consumer paid \$17.60 for that bushel of wheat. Take off the tariff on wheat and your farmer has lost 10 cents on his bushel. How much difference will that 10 cents a bushel make in the matter of the 44 pounds of crackers in reference to their value? Will it make any difference whatever in their enormously enhanced selling price?

Again, bringing it more directly home to the farmer he sells 4 bushels of wheat for 80 cents a bushel, and he buys his flour under the present rates, and we will say that he pays 50 cents duty. It will cost him that much more on a barrel. The farmer, therefore, in raising 2,000 bushels of wheat will lose \$200 on that crop in a year, and, as the American public consume on an average a barrel of flour a year, the farmer will save 50 cents. Balancing your accounts you have a loss of \$200 on his wheat crop and you have a saving of 50 cents, and you call that compensation.

Now, I am trying to show, Mr. President, what a mere bagatelle is all of the benefit that the farmer will derive out of this free-list bill. I ask the Senator from Texas—and I ask it for information, because I believe he is not only acquainted with the conditions in the South, which I am not, but that he has also investigated—what the savings will be to the farmers of the Southern States in the matter of bagging. I will say to him I only know it in the Northern States and it amounts to so little, it is so infinitesimal, that I can not consider it of any value to him.

That may be due to the fact that we handle most of our wheat without the use of sacks at all; but I assume that bagging will be used for some purposes in the Southern States; that this bagging will be used to cover the bales of cotton and that the bands will be used for that purpose. I should like to have the Senator, if he will, kindly inform me what the saving would be to the farmers of the Southern States under that provision of the farmers' free list.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I stated yesterday afternoon that I thought the saving to the farmers of the South on free bagging and free ties provided in the bill would probably not exceed 10 cents a bale on their cotton.

Mr. McCUMBER. Will the Senator give me an estimate? There are 500 pounds in a bale.

Mr. BAILEY. Thirteen million bales is a large crop. Ten million bales is a small crop. Taking the average crop at 11,500,000 bales, it would mean \$1,150,000 to the farmers of the South. When you set it at 10 cents a bale to your small farmer who makes but 8 bales of cotton, netting a saving of only 80 cents, it seems small; but when you take the aggregate of \$1,150,000 it is of some consequence.

The Senator from North Dakota will permit me to say further that the provision for free grain bags was not made in the interest of the southern farmer.

Mr. McCUMBER. I understand that.

Mr. BAILEY. It was made in the interest or the supposed interest of the western farmer. The Senator will remember that I myself proposed an amendment in that respect in the Finance Committee. Free burlaps means a loss of \$7,000,000 of revenue, and I can not bring myself to believe that it is wise legislation which remits that large amount of revenue upon that single article, which is not one of universal use. However, it is but justice to say to the Democrats, and especially the southern Democrats, to say that they would not propose free dressing for the cotton crop of the South without proposing free dressing for the grain crop of the North and Northwest.

Mr. McCUMBER. I wanted to get it down in percentages if I could. I do not know the value of cotton now, but I presume it is worth about 15 cents a pound. Is it not?

Mr. BAILEY. Hardly that. I think, perhaps, cotton selling in the local markets as far as any is sold—the crop has long since been marketed and only a few of the most prosperous farmers have held and been able to hold their crop—

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is \$65 or \$70 a bale.

Mr. BAILEY. I expect cotton is selling in the local markets of the South to-day at between 13 and 14 cents per pound, and averaging the bale at 500 pounds, that would make from \$65 to \$70 per bale. Of course, a saving of 10 cents on a \$70 bale of cotton is not a very substantial gain.

Mr. McCUMBER. What I was trying to get at is, that the saving would be about one-tenth of 1 per cent.

Mr. BAILEY. But even that is worth saving.

Mr. McCUMBER. Oh, yes; I am not doubting it. All the way through I am simply trying to demonstrate what the Senator from Texas has so well said, that there is some little benefit, but it is really not a substantial benefit. I want the farmers of the country to understand that they are getting no substantial benefit out of this bill; that was all.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President—

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I think the Senator from Texas has been misinformed as to the probable saving to the farmer on his bale of cotton. There are 6 yards of bagging, the average weight is about 2½ pounds to the yard; there are 6 ties, 6 bands, 6 steel hoops to the bale. It is called in local parlance a "pattern." The cost is anywhere from 90 cents to \$1.10 and \$1.15 per bale for the amount that it takes to cover a bale and put it upon the market.

Under the present ruling of our customhouse officials bagging, on account of certain foreign matter that we have discovered in it, has advanced beyond the ordinary revenue duty, and just now a remittal of that duty, in place of the saving of 10 cents, as indicated by the Senator from Texas—I had the figures here two years ago and gave them to the Senate—would come nearer a saving of from 50 to 60 cents a bale on the bagging and ties if your duties were removed and we were allowed to buy the steel bands free and get our importations of bagging directly from Calcutta in place of having to pay a duty to the Massachusetts manufacturers.

Mr. BAILEY. Will the Senator from South Carolina permit me? I think I am not mistaken. The duty on cotton bagging is about six-tenths of a cent a yard.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. BAILEY. And it takes about 6 yards to the bale.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Yes; I understand.

Mr. BAILEY. Thirty-six tenths would be 3.6 cents on the bagging, and I think probably the duty on the ties will not be more than 7 cents.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Texas, with the permission of the Senator from North Dakota to the fact—

Mr. BAILEY. It certainly would not be anything like 40 or 50 cents.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. The ruling of the customhouse officials has been that on account of the foreign matter in the ties the duty in place of being six-tenths of 1 per cent has been raised to 35 and 40 per cent.

Mr. BAILEY. They did not do it on that ground, and I think they ought not to have done it at all, but they have done it on the ground that the imported bagging did not contain 51 per cent of jute.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. That is what I said, that it contained foreign matter.

Mr. BAILEY. I think that is a bad ruling, but—

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. It served its purpose, however, in raising the price of the article.

Mr. BAILEY. The remarkable circumstance was that the man who imported jute bagging had the test made to force him to pay a higher price on it.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. If the terms of the bill under which the ruling was made is examined closely it will be found that if there is one thread of foreign matter in that bagging it will put it under the 45 per cent duty.

But the point that I wish to make in order to set the Senator from North Dakota right, because he is generally very fair, is that in view of the fact that no jute is produced in this country, and in view of the further fact that this bagging is made out of the refuse of the jute vegetable, we could get it at the least from one-quarter to 2 cents a pound cheaper than it is now, and

in view of the fact that your burlaps and your higher finished articles come under a higher rate of duty, and they have practically a monopoly of that, and practically, therefore, a monopoly of the refuse that comes from the butts out of which the bagging is made, the six-tenths of 1 per cent, which was the average previous to this new ruling of our customs officials, is not a measure of the relief that would come to the farmer were the bagging from the foreign countries, from India, where the principal part of the jute is raised, allowed to come into this country free, because they get their greater profit out of the finer article, and the duty on that is practically prohibitive. The refuse is made into bagging, and even there the farmers of the country lose something like seven or eight million dollars.

Mr. McCUMBER. But I ask the Senator from South Carolina this question: Does the Senator from South Carolina believe that with the duty removed the farmers who raise cotton would get the full benefit or a benefit equivalent to the amount of duty?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. In 1906—I am not very sure, but I will risk that, anyhow; I think that was the year—in 1906, just upon the eve of the marketing of the crop, the American Steel Co. issued an order that there should be a raise of 30 cents a bundle on ties, which extracted over a million and a quarter dollars from the farmers of the country without a moment's previous notice, and the bagging company—there are practically only two in this country—

Mr. McCUMBER. Is the Senator sure that you could avoid that difficulty if you had free bagging?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Surely; because previous to the monopoly of the bagging business in this country we got our bagging cheaper. I am sorry that I have not the figures here that I prepared two years ago.

Mr. McCUMBER. I will say to the Senator that I appreciate the difficulty of creating a market overnight and changing the course of trade; and while it might be possible that it could be imported for a less amount, so that the farmer could have the full benefit of the tariff removed, I can see great difficulty if there was a combination made in this country or elsewhere in immediately getting that bagging at a cheaper rate, even though a combination were made, and the cotton will not wait for a new competitive plant to be established.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I should like to state, with the permission of the Senator from North Dakota, that it is now alleged, and those who use bagging believe, that in order to increase the weight and therefore increase the profit the bagging that we have to-day is salted. It is certainly a fact that if you will take a load of bagging and unload it and expose it to the sun and to the air during any kind of a dry period it will lose from one-eighth to a quarter of a pound a yard. Besides that, there is incorporated into it all manner of cheaper articles, so that the six-tenths of 1 per cent measures the duty on jute imported from India, but there is nothing to measure the salt that is in it, nor is there anything to measure the foreign substance that is in it. It is positively so unfit for the purposes for which it is created that it will not hold the hook. Anyone who has been abroad and has seen the condition in which American cotton gets to the market under the foreign bagging manufacture as compared with the previous state when we had pure jute, with its resistant fiber, will understand that the six-tenths of 1 per cent on bagging is like the duty on wool. Woolen goods consist largely of cheap cotton which they buy at 15 cents and sell at \$1.25 per pound in the shape of wool. You buy your jute, bring it over here for a monopoly, incorporate the salt and waste, and sell it to the American farmer, and it will not hold the hooks to weigh it.

I for one, not only for the sake of the farmers of the country, but for the preservation of the cotton after it is baled, would rather see the cheap labor of Calcutta or India produce the bagging, for that would give us value received, than to be at the mercy of the Bagging Trust in America, which sells us salt and scrap in place of selling us jute.

Mr. McCUMBER. I am thankful to the Senator for his information. I want to say to him that I asked the question not for the purpose of bringing out any conflict of ideas, but I want to get the matter clearly before the country as to what saving the farmers in different sections will derive by reason of this farmers' free list. For instance, in my own State I know on some articles we get the full benefit of the tariff. We do not get one-half the benefit of the tariff on our wheat, because the difference in price is only about 12 or 13 cents a bushel, while the actual tariff is 25 cents a bushel. While I am acquainted thoroughly with conditions as they are affected by the tariff in my own section of the country, I must plead almost total ignorance of the effect of these tariffs upon the products that are raised by the farmer of the South.

Mr. BAILEY rose.

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. BAILEY. Without desiring to controvert the statement of the Senator from South Carolina, but purely that the Record may not mislead anybody, I want to put in the Record the actual duty on bagging and ties.

The duty on bagging I have already stated. It amounts to about three and a fraction cents on a bale of cotton. The duty on ties is three-tenths of 1 cent, or half of what the duty on bagging is. I know the Senator from South Carolina does not want to mislead his own people, but if he leads them to believe that they are going to save 50 cents a bale on their cotton in consequence of free bagging and free ties, he will disappoint them. While we failed to procure free bagging in the tariff law, we succeeded in making the duty a low one. If we give it out that we can save 50 cents a bale in the cost of wrapping our cotton, and we do succeed in passing this bill and our cotton farmers only buy their cotton and ties and cotton bagging 10 cents less per bale, they will think we either have not been accurate or sincere. I think the Senator from South Carolina has only to take the quantity of hoop iron in the ties for a bale of cotton and to take the quantity of bagging in the bagging for a bale of cotton, and he will find that my estimate of 10 cents' saving per bale is not very far from what it will actually turn out to be.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I should like to state, with the permission of the Senator from North Dakota, that I have several letters from dealers in bagging asking what is the probable outcome of this agitation of putting bagging and ties upon the free list, in view of the fact that it has advanced on account of the ruling of the customhouse that the bagging now put upon the market should bear a duty of 45 per cent; I believe that was the ruling.

My estimate that we would save 50 cents or more was not predicated upon the actual duty that is collected now, but upon the fact that within the last four or five years in place of paying 80 cents for the covering for a bale of cotton I myself on my own farm have been forced to pay a dollar and a quarter for exactly the same goods. I have heard of no depreciation or of no less crop of jute in India; I have heard of no less product of the Steel Trust; but there is not a farmer on this floor who wraps his cotton with bagging and ties who will not testify that in the last 10 years we have increased the price of the bagging and the ties on a bale of cotton from 80 cents on a bale to \$1.10, \$1.15, and \$1.20.

Mr. BAILEY. It ought also to be stated that the cotton-bagging manufacturers have done that injustice against the cotton farmers of the South at a time when they had free raw material with which to make cotton bagging.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield to the Senator from Utah if the Senator from South Carolina is through. I do not wish to take him off his feet.

Mr. SMOOT. I take it for granted that the Senator will not claim that it is the tariff that has advanced the cost of bagging and ties per bale of cotton from 80 cents to a dollar and a quarter.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, by virtue of the tariff on ties and on bagging and a combination of the bagging manufacturers of this country, they have a practical monopoly of the manufacture thereof and, like the Steel Trust, can overnight raise the price to where they please, whereas if there were no duty at all on those articles—because six-tenths of 1 per cent on bagging—

Mr. BAILEY. Six-tenths of 1 cent.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Six-tenths of 1 cent, I mean. Practically a cent a yard on bagging is almost prohibitive, in view of the cheapness of the raw material. It only costs about 3 to 4 cents a yard, so the duty is practically 1 cent. You have, therefore, got from 25 to 33½ per cent duty on it; and on account of the cheapness of it, that is practically prohibitive. I claim if that duty were removed and competition were allowed to be free in this country and abroad that in place of bagging costing 4 cents a yard, or from 25 cents to 30 cents a bale, we could get it for 2 cents a yard, which was the original price when we had it imported here, thus reducing it by 50 per cent. If it were not for the tariff, if the Senator from North Dakota will allow me, we would use the so-called pauper labor of India; and yet the claim is made on this floor that we are attempting to preserve the laborers of America as against the cheap labor of Europe; and here are the laborers of America producing not a pound of jute or a pound of bagging, but producing the raw materials in America—they are

laborers par excellence; they are the men who produce the raw material—and yet you will not allow the laborers of America to enjoy the benefits of the pauper labor of Europe; you put them at their mercy; and you will not allow them to get the product of the pauper laborer of Europe when they can utilize it and increase their own wage.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] made a statement to the Senate that if we had free cotton bagging and free ties it would save the cotton planter of the South 10 cents a bale or thereabout. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] interrupted the Senator from Texas and stated that that was a mistake, that instead of being 10 cents a bale it was nearer 50 cents a bale.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. The saving that it would be.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the only saving there could possibly be would arise from the protective tariff, and the protective tariff of six-tenths of a cent a yard on 6 yards of bagging required to cover a bale of cotton is 3.6 cents on a bale.

Mr. McCUMBER. If I may address myself to both Senators, so as to keep this argument in a logical form as I am going over each of the propositions, we have now arrived at about what the savings would be in the matter of bagging, which I think could be fairly estimated at about one-tenth of 1 per cent upon the value of the cotton; that is, of course, assuming that the farmer will get the full benefit of the reduction of the tariff. Of course there is a very big "if" in that proposition, but in my argument here I will give the farmer the full benefit of it.

I come now to the next proposition, as to which the Senators have preceded me a little in their joint discussion, and that is the proposition of hoops or bands.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, before the Senator goes to that—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Perhaps I can correct the conclusion at which he is about to arrive. Will the Senator permit me to do so?

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I hold in my hand a communication from the New Orleans Cotton Exchange, signed by its president, Mr. W. B. Thompson, which I should like to read for the purpose of correcting the statements thus far made.

Mr. SMOOT. I have a copy of the same letter, I will say to the Senator, and I believe every Senator in the Chamber has one.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I did not pretend to be a monopolist in the possession of the letter.

Mr. McCUMBER. The whole object of this discussion, Mr. President, is to get light on this subject, and I am yielding to the Senator for that purpose.

Mr. WILLIAMS. This is a very high authority, and this is to give you light. I by no means pretend to be the monopolistic possessor of this information. I am giving it because it seems to be correct. The letter reads as follows:

NEW ORLEANS COTTON EXCHANGE,
New Orleans, April 12, 1911.

HON. JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS,
United States Senator from Mississippi, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I beg to hand you copy of preamble and resolutions adopted by the board of directors of the New Orleans Cotton Exchange at a special meeting held on the 10th instant.

I trust that I may be permitted to add a few words by way of explanation and of argument touching this important matter.

The cotton crop of the South yields annually an average of about 12,000,000 bales. Of this total approximately five-eighths, or 7,500,000 bales, representing an average money value of over \$500,000,000, are exported and exchanged for foreign gold. The mere statement of these facts attests the importance of the cotton-producing industry, emphasizes the obligation which the country at large owes the producer of this crop, and establishes his right to at least just treatment at the hands of the general law-making power.

Under the present tariff law the duty on steel cotton ties amounts to 0.027 cent per bale, or to \$324,000 on a crop of 12,000,000 bales. This tariff is prohibitive, as is shown by the fact that no steel ties are imported. Therefore the Government has no share in this impost, which constitutes simply and solely a tribute levied upon the cotton farmer for the benefit of the Cotton Tie Trust.

The duty on jute bagging imposed by the present tariff law amounts to 0.051 cent per bale, or to \$630,000 on a crop of 12,000,000 bales. This tariff is to a large extent prohibitive, inasmuch as it yields only about \$100,000 in revenues to the Government. The balance of about \$530,000 constitutes a tribute paid by the cotton farmer to the Bagging Trust.

Now, this is the point to which I would especially call the attention of the Senator—

But the Bagging Trust is not satisfied with its share of this impost. It desires to raise the duty to a figure which will not only prevent the Government from receiving any revenue therefrom, but will enable the trust to take from the farmer four times as much as it has been able to take heretofore. This trust has recently made a technical test case, based upon a question of chemical analysis, and has secured a ruling thereon from the Board of General Appraisers in New York which will

change the duty on imported bagging from the present rate, which amounts to about .051 cents per bale, to an ad valorem duty which will amount to about 21 cents per bale.

To that I call the attention of the Senator from Texas—

This means an increase from \$630,000 on the crop to practically \$2,500,000, all of which the trust will collect from the farmer without any division with the Government.

Thus, under the Payne-Aldrich law as heretofore interpreted, the cotton producer has borne the burden of a \$950,000 yearly tax on bagging and ties—

That is not far from the figures of the Senator from Texas, who put it at a million dollars—

and if the "chemical interpretation" holds he will hereafter be mulcted in the yearly sum of \$2,800,000 for his baling materials, all of which will go into the treasuries of the bagging and tie trusts.

And right there the Senator from Texas was right, as I understood him, in saying that the suit by the decision of which this conclusion was arrived at was brought about by these very people, so that it might be decided against them to their own benefit in future transactions.

The remainder of the letter from Mr. Thompson is as follows:

From the reasons stated it will incontestably appear that not only the proposed outrage but the present tax on bagging and ties is inequitable and wrong; and because the western farmer has now and has had for more than 15 years his binder twine on the free list, the tax upon the southern farmer stands condemned of the additional vice of discrimination.

It is respectfully submitted that the lawmaking power rests under the compulsion of a two-fold duty in the premises. Bagging and ties should be allowed to come in free, not only as an act of justice to the cotton producer but as a penalizing rebuke to the cupidity of the manufacturing combinations which have preyed upon him.

Respectfully,

W. B. THOMPSON, President.

With the permission of the Senator from North Dakota, I will also insert in the RECORD at this point the resolutions of the New Orleans Cotton Exchange, which are as follows:

Extract from minutes of board of directors of New Orleans Cotton Exchange, April 10, 1911.

Whereas under the provisions of the Payne-Aldrich law the producer of cotton is and has been paying as tribute to a few manufacturers of bagging and ties a yearly sum amounting to approximately \$950,000; and

Whereas the Bagging Trust has recently secured from the Board of General Appraisers in New York a technical ruling which will increase the amount of tribute paid by the cotton producer to the said combination of manufacturers to approximately the sum of \$2,800,000 annually; and

Whereas the imposition of this burden, or of any burden, upon the large class of citizens who produce one of the greatest trade assets of the Nation, for the purpose and with the effect of enriching a few individuals who prey upon the industry is not only unjust and indefensible but un-American: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the New Orleans Cotton Exchange earnestly declares that all bagging and ties used in the baling of cotton should be placed upon the free list: And be it further

Resolved, That Senators and Representatives from the State of Louisiana and those from all the cotton-producing States and from all the United States be earnestly urged to use their efforts to bring about this just conclusion by enactment of the necessary legislation at the present extra session of Congress.

A true copy.

H. G. HESTER, Secretary.

Here is a letter from Mr. C. Lee McMillan, a very distinguished cotton factor in the city of New Orleans, an expert in point of information upon matters of this sort, directed to me, in which he says:

C. LEE McMILLAN & Co. (LTD.),
New Orleans, April 13, 1911.

HON. JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I must again beg your kind indulgence and ask that you will please read the inclosed copy of a letter I am sending by this mail to Judge BARTLETT.

While I realize the Senate last time agreed to place bagging upon the free list, and although now there are more Democrats in the upper House than there were at that time, still I feel the cause of the cotton farmer, which you are advocating, is going to require much of your attention, and I hope that you can be patient with me and with my suggestions upon the subject of free cotton bagging.

If Judge BARTLETT can get through the House the bill I have suggested (as per inclosed copy) and you can later get same through the Senate, I assure you there will be no way the Bagging Trust can prevent importations, except by keeping prices so low imports would not pay.

Before closing this, permit me to state that I have thought of but one item of information you have not already been furnished with upon this subject, and same is as follows:

If you are ever in position to ask the Bagging Trust people any questions ask them to explain why it is the trust takes some of the bagging it buys in Calcutta to its Brooklyn mill?

For your information, let me state, the trust puts Calcutta-made bagging through a bath of strongest salt water, thereby adding considerable weight, and as each additional one-fourth of a pound added to each yard enhances its selling value three-fourths cent you can realize that it pays better to take the Calcutta bagging the trust buys up in India to the Brooklyn mill, there load it up with salt, and pay freight on same to the South, than it would to ship all of its foreign-bought bagging direct from Calcutta or Liverpool to the Gulf ports of New Orleans or Galveston.

With my highest regards, I beg to remain,

Yours, faithfully,

C. LEE McMILLAN.

I have other information of like character, but I do not wish to intrude too much foreign material into the body of the remarks being made by the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from North Dakota will permit me, the Senator from Mississippi read the letter correctly, but from the reading it sounded like the duty was 27 per cent. Of course it is not.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; 21 cents is what he said.

Mr. BAILEY. The estimate I made on a crop of 11,000,000 bales—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Twenty-one cents if the decision holds and six-tenths of 1 cent if it does not.

Mr. BAILEY. The estimate I made was a saving of \$1,150,000 by the passage of this bill on a crop of eleven and a half million bales. Mr. Thompson, the cotton expert, estimates the saving at only \$950,000 on a crop of 12,000,000 bales.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But the Senator and he are substantially in accord.

Mr. BAILEY. We substantially agree.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is upon the basis that the duty on the face of the statute prevails, and not the duty as fixed by the decision of the Board of Appraisers.

Mr. BAILEY. I think, Mr. President, the effect of the decision will be this: It will cheat the men who have made contracts for bagging under the belief that they could import that kind of bagging under the duty; and the result of that will be that hereafter we will only import bagging that contains 51 per cent of jute. I think the effect of the high duty as established by this collusive suit would be to force that change.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. I call the attention of the Senator from Mississippi to the fact that 10 cents a bale protection is too high, according to the estimate of this letter, because of the fact that if they—

Mr. WILLIAMS. His estimate is \$950,000; and 10 cents a bale would amount to \$1,200,000 upon the basis of a crop of 12,000,000 bales, which is his basis of calculation.

Mr. SMOOT. That is not 50 cents a bale as I contended.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Nobody said that would make 50 cents a bale. It is not quite 10.

Mr. SMOOT. That is what I contended in answering the Senator from South Carolina. It is not quite 10 cents per bale.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What the Senator from Utah is forgetting is that the duty which is in operation by the decision of that board of appraisers is a duty of 45 per cent ad valorem, which amounts to 21 cents per bale of cotton.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, that is for bagging alone.

Mr. SMOOT. There is no question that the cotton planters of the South are not going to import cotton bagging containing less than 51 per cent of jute under the recent ruling; in fact, they could not afford to do so, because the cheap jute bagging would cost them more than 51 per cent jute bagging. So the figures that have been quoted here will have no effect whatever in future transactions, because they can buy cotton bagging containing 51 per cent of jute for not to exceed 3½ cents a yard, and why should they pay 21 cents duty on 6 yards of cheaper bagging?

Mr. WILLIAMS. They thought they were buying jute bagging.

Mr. SMOOT. Well, Mr. President, if it is decided now that bagging containing under 51 per cent of jute could not come into this country at less than 45 per cent, no planter or importer would import cotton bagging in the future unless it contained 51 per cent of jute. So the argument, so far as actual experience and actual business transactions are concerned, will cut no figure whatever in the future.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, with the permission of the Senator from North Dakota, I should like to say a word further. In view of the testimony of the expert from New Orleans in reference to ties, and in view of the operation of the bagging trust, just as soon as you get the duty prohibitive, so that there is practically no importation of their articles, as I explained before—I may have been rather unfortunate in my phraseology—the saving would be nearer 50 cents a bale than 10. The actual amount being calculated ad valorem, there would be a saving of 10 cents a bale. If the duty were removed and the price were allowed to go back to where it was under the free importation of bagging and the free importation of ties, the saving would be the difference between \$1.20 and 80 cents. That is what I claimed would be the saving if we would remove the duty.

The Senator from Mississippi has read a letter from a firm in New Orleans affirming what I claimed in the first instance,

that not only do we pay almost a prohibitive duty on the bagging, but that it is also loaded down with foreign material. The dealers do not ship directly to the small consumers the bagging as they receive it, but salt it down in order to increase their profits, because the minute it is spread out and put upon the bale of cotton every particle of the added weight by virtue of the salt solution is evaporated. If this weight were removed and we could buy real bagging and get our ties without the duty, I still maintain the saving would be nearer 50 cents a bale than 10 cents, as is now specifically and technically calculated upon the actual duties collected.

I am a practical farmer; I make cotton; and I think I know whereof I speak. Let me reiterate—and then I am through—there may be a possible technical saving upon the showing made by the Senator from Utah and the Senator from Texas, but the real effect will be that you will get bagging that does not evaporate; you will get it from 1½ to 2 cents a yard cheaper; you will get your ties cheaper; and we have every reason to believe that in place of paying \$1.20 a bale for enough bagging to cover a bale of cotton, the individual farmer who buys it—and the negroes and tenants of the South make 72 per cent of the entire American crop—in place of paying \$1.20 a bale, will get this covering for 80 cents a bale.

Mr. McCUMBER. I have always heard of the great generosity, of the natural hospitality of our good southern friends. I have had very many occasions to demonstrate the truth of their good reputation. I fear their reputation for generosity is a little shaken by their explanations of the provisions of these amendments. Here is a bill introduced which takes from the northern farmers of three States an annual income of \$56,000,000, that absolutely inflicts a loss of that much upon farmers of the two Dakotas and Minnesota, and in the same session that you strike that blow at the farmers of those three States, in the same session that you inflict that enormous loss upon the fellow toilers of the fields, the representatives of the cotton industry—the most important industry in the United States—ask Congress to create a benefit for them of \$2,800,000.

Now, I submit to my friends on the other side that you certainly are not upholding your excellent reputation for generosity in that kind of legislation. It may be that the farmers of the South will save \$2,800,000. I have such a deep sympathy for every one who toils in the field under the southern sun or in the long northern days that I am predisposed to assist them in every way possible, and I in doing that feel that I ought to have something of a reciprocal sentiment from them. If I am asked to vote for a proposition which will save the cotton growers of the South \$2,800,000, am I not entitled to ask of them that they vote with me to defeat a proposition that will entail a loss upon my people of \$56,000,000?

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. REED. I understand the Senator from North Dakota to say that if the reciprocity bill is passed there will be a reduction to the farmers of the Northwest alone—

Mr. McCUMBER. Of three States alone.

Mr. REED. Of three States alone of \$56,000,000.

Mr. McCUMBER. That is what the Senator from North Dakota stated.

Mr. REED. In other words, the people are now paying \$56,000,000 a year more for their wheat from these three States than that wheat will bring after the bill is passed.

Now, will the Senator from North Dakota please answer this one question directly and categorically? Who pays that \$56,000,000?

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I can not answer an erroneous question categorically or in any other way. The loss upon the 250,000,000 bushels of wheat per year of the three States, at 10 cents a bushel, is \$25,000,000.

Mr. REED. Well, I—

Mr. McCUMBER. Oh, I am going to answer the question. But I am first going to make the question right.

Mr. REED. I will include the other grains that the Senator included in his statement, so that we will not cavil over that.

Mr. McCUMBER. That means 10 cents a bushel. That 10 cents a bushel measures the farmer's profit in a year under the present conditions. This 10 cents a bushel he is entitled to for the same reason that he is entitled to a profit upon his labor.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. McCUMBER. Oh, let me answer it. Therefore the public are not injured if they pay a reasonable profit to that farmer any more than the farmer is injured if he pays an honest profit to the manufacturer and the laborer.

Therefore, Mr. President, admitting that the consumer, if you see fit, pays the amount, then the consumer pays no more than he should.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. McCUMBER. But I have to answer the question thoroughly.

Assuming, now, that the consumer pays the 10 cents a bushel a year, and each consumer utilizes one barrel of flour a year, by removing the duty the consumer, then, has saved 50 cents a year, or at 10 cents a bushel for $4\frac{1}{2}$ bushels, 45 cents. In other words, he saves 45 cents a year by reducing the farmers' business to no profit. In other words, he pays 45 cents a year in order that the farmer may have a most meager profit, and that means 4 cents a month; that means but one-thirtieth of 4 cents for a single day.

Now, I say that the consumer can well afford to pay that little profit and that little addition, if it is charged to him, in order that the farmer may have a reasonable profit upon his produce.

Mr. REED. I knew I could not get a direct yes or no answer from the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator is in error.

Mr. REED. I am going to ask him the question again.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator can always get a direct answer from me to a direct question. The question asked was not one that could be answered directly yes or no; and even if it could be, the Senator could not dictate what my answer should be, provided it was explanatory.

Mr. REED. I did not desire to dictate, but I say now that my question was direct, was susceptible of an answer direct, and it was this: The Senator states that the farmers of the three States he has named receive \$56,000,000 annually more for their wheat—and was it barley and rye?

Mr. McCUMBER. Barley and flax.

Mr. REED. Barley and flax—than they would receive if this bill was passed. I asked the Senator the simple and direct question: Is it not the consumer who has to pay that additional \$56,000,000? Now, will not the Senator just answer that yes or no and then make his explanation?

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator was certainly not listening to me if he did not hear my answer to that—that the public did pay it; that the consumer did pay it.

Mr. REED. Very well. One question further—

Mr. McCUMBER. Now wait. The consumer did pay that. Now, if the consumer by paying that has paid the farmer more than the farmer was entitled to, then there is an injustice upon the consumer. But if taking into consideration what the farmer has to pay for the things he purchases, the amount he receives for his product is only a very meager, fair compensation, the public have no right to complain. That is the complete answer.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator yield for just a moment further?

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly.

Mr. REED. Of course, the latter part of the Senator's argument—not his answer, but his argument—is a general argument from the protectionist standpoint. I do not intend to argue that with him now. He has given great study to this question, and I simply wanted to get that admission, which I now have obtained, that whatever increase of price there is upon grains comes ultimately out of the pockets of the consumers.

Now, I wanted to call attention to one thing. The Senator figures \$56,000,000 as the increase of the price of farm products—that is, farm grains, flax, and barley, and wheat—for three States each year. Has the Senator figured the amount for all of the States?

Mr. McCUMBER. No; but these are the principal grain States which are directly affected. The Chicago market is not benefited 10 cents a bushel, probably. The Kansas City market receives a benefit, but not to the same extent. It is probable that the San Francisco market in wheat receives no benefit whatever. It is probable that the New Orleans section receives only that little benefit, that indirect benefit, which comes from a higher price on similar articles, which is rather light. But the benefit is very important to the three States I have mentioned.

Mr. REED. I understand, then, that the Senator concedes there is no substantial benefit to any of the States except the three States he has mentioned?

Mr. McCUMBER. Oh, no, no—

Mr. REED. That it does not benefit in Kansas City, and I can say to the Senator, for I live there—

Mr. McCUMBER. Do not make that statement, Mr. Senator. I did not say they did not get the benefit. I said they did not get the same benefit.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator, then, give us an estimate of what proportion of the benefit these other States would get?

You get 10 cents a bushel. How much do you think the rest of the country gets?

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator asks a question which is impossible to answer in dollars and cents. I can only explain to the Senator how all of these estimates will be made. The Senator knows that if oats, for instance, which is used for feed, is considerably higher in any year than it has been in previous years, that of itself will create a greater demand for a substitute, which we will say is barley, and the increased demand will raise the price of barley. When oats and barley are both very low, corn under ordinary conditions goes down with them, and when one of these articles which is used for food goes up, the other tends to rise by reason of the demand created for the other articles, and it raises the value of that. No man has statistics on it. No man can compute it. We only know of its general influence in raising values. Wheat is an article of ordinary consumption, and the general world's supply and the world's demand fix a sort of a level, not an actual level, but what we may call nearly the world's level.

Local conditions make values higher here and lower there. Many conditions affect it, but they all have an effect upon the value of that product. And if the prices of wheat are higher in one section of the country the very fact that they are higher there, that there is a shortage, for instance, of No. 1 northern in the country, as I have explained to you, sends the millers of Minneapolis and Duluth down into the Chicago market, and they begin to buy up and create a demand for No. 1 red, which can be mixed with the No. 1 northern, that demand raises the value of the No. 1 red. I can not tell you in dollars and cents because there are no statistics by which we can measure the influence of the price of one product upon another, but every man who knows anything about trade knows of that influence. I think I have answered the question as far as it is susceptible of being answered.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator yield?

The Senator's answer to my question as to the amount or per cent of benefit the rest of the States would receive from this tariff or have received from it reminds me of the line of the old song—

The longest way around is the shortest way home.

The Senator challenged—

Mr. McCUMBER. Sometimes it is the surest way home.

Mr. REED. And sometimes it is the only way to avoid walking directly into a cul-de-sac.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator wants to be fair, I know, and I think if he will stop one moment he will give me credit for being most fair in my explanation as to what extent the value of one product modifies the value of similar products.

Mr. REED. I give the Senator credit for the utmost sincerity of purpose; I give the Senator credit for having given this subject special study; and I asked these questions with a sincere desire to get some light. The Senator this morning challenged the Senators from the South to a mathematical statement of how much their States would be benefited by this bill.

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes, Mr. President; let me answer the Senator right here. I did that because the question I propounded was capable of mathematical demonstration, and I will say that the Senators were kind enough to give me the answer in a mathematical demonstration, just the same as I have given you the accurate statement of the losses upon certain products.

Mr. REED. I do not desire to press this matter importunately, but, if possible, to get at a conclusion. The Senator for some reason is able to give us what he calls a mathematical demonstration regarding the losses upon wheat in Minnesota and the two Dakotas. He asserts it will be 10 cents a bushel. That influence of 10 cents a bushel certainly does not run sharply to the red line of the map that divides those States from other States.

Mr. McCUMBER. That is what I am trying to explain to the Senator.

Mr. REED. Ten cents a bushel up to that line, and capable of mathematical demonstration and certainty, and then suddenly to enter the realm of uncertainty where there is no possible estimate that can be made. I wanted to ask the Senator if he could not give this body and the country the benefit of his opinion and judgment and estimate as to the amount in the aggregate the prices of wheat and flax and barley have increased in the entire country, if he has any estimate of it.

Mr. McCUMBER. If the Senator is through, I will answer the question.

Mr. REED. Yes, if you can make an estimate; because, Mr. President, to be frank with the Senator, if there is going to be a tax of 10 cents a bushel levied for the benefit of the farmers of North Dakota and Montana I want the farmers of Missouri to get their 10 cents a bushel. I do not want any tax levied

the burdens of which fall on all the people of the United States and the benefits of which are limited to three States.

Mr. McCUMBER. Let me ask the Senator, does Missouri produce any barley?

Mr. REED. A little.

Mr. McCUMBER. How much?

Mr. REED. I can not tell you. I have not been a student of this question from that standpoint. I have not been trying to tax the rest of the world for the benefit of my State. I can say to the Senator from North Dakota that the farmers of Missouri do not ask for any protection. They simply want a fair field and no favor, and they will meet the competition of this round world and beat it.

Mr. McCUMBER. I suppose, Mr. President, that we have all kinds of farmers in all sections of the country. I have a good many letters from farmers in Missouri and they are just as intense upon this question as the farmers of North Dakota. They may be mistaken, it may be only a few, it may be only the ones who wrote to me, because the farmer does not generally write at all unless he is worked up to a pretty high pitch of excitement over a proposition.

But, now, I want to get right back and answer the Senator. He wants to know the line of demarcation between the 10 cents a bushel and that which would be less than 10 cents a bushel.

Mr. REED. That was not my question. I want to know your best estimate of the total amount of addition to the price of these three grains upon all the grain raised in the country.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, the great trouble with nearly all the Senators who have tried to argue the wheat question seems to have been a sort of a total lack of knowledge as to where the different kinds of grain were raised, what it was used for, into what markets it generally went, and where was the usual course of trade, and the hundred and one things that bear upon it.

As I stated in a previous discussion of this question, they seem to think that the surplus of this country was as though it was in a single bin, and that if you draw from a part of that bin it would lower the surplus throughout the entire bin. They seem to forget entirely the breadth of our own country, the different sections into which it is divided, and the course of trade. They seem to fail to understand that there might be a shortage of grain in the Northwest to meet the millers' demand, of the kind of grain that would be required, and could not be supplied from the San Francisco district or from the New Orleans district on account of the great distance and the freight. They seem to take cognizance of but one fact, that there are 650,000,000 bushels of wheat raised and there are 100,000,000 bushels to export in wheat and flour, and as long as we export any of it its price must be generally about the same and fixed by the world's demand.

I have tried to make that clear, Mr. President, in previous arguments upon this occasion, but I can be definite as to some localities. I know the kind of grain that is raised up in the Northwest. I know where its market is. I know what its value is. I know what it is used for. I know the comparative price between that grain and the price on the other side. I know that the grain on one side is sold upon a market whose price is established by the home demand. I know that the mighty surplus upon the other side is sold upon a market whose price is established by the world's demand and not the home demand. I know that the amount of the surplus on the other side is so enormous that it would supply our entire demand upon this side and would still leave an enormous balance for export. I know that the logical, the conclusive, the only result would be that we would both be placed upon the export basis. Knowing what the difference between the export basis and the home-demand basis is, I take a period of 10 long years, and I can make an actual estimate and apply it to the crop during those 10 years and get a sufficiently accurate result upon which I can base my judgment.

I used the 10 cents a bushel, first, because it was ultraconservative, and, second, because it made it more easy of computation. I was using it only as a matter of illustration. As a matter of fact, the difference averages about 13 cents a bushel for the last two or three years. But, lest there might be some question about that being the average, I have taken the lower amount of 10 cents a bushel. If we raise and sell, under the ordinary conditions of a full crop, 250,000,000 bushels of wheat in those three States, and the difference is 10 cents a bushel, then I know that if we would be placed upon an export basis we would be losing 10 cents a bushel, and that 10 cents a bushel on 250,000,000 means, in round numbers, \$25,000,000.

Now, I take the barley, that which is raised down in the Senator's own State. I do not know just how much is raised

there, but, assuming that the farmers raise a fair amount, the difference between Canadian barley and Minnesota barley over the line has been for the last year a difference equal to the tariff of about 30 cents a bushel. I can then multiply the difference of the price by the number of bushels, and it will very accurately measure the loss. In some years—in 1910, for instance—there was a very little crop raised up in the Dakotas, but I am estimating that the three States will raise about 250,000,000 bushels if the three States are raising a normal crop with their present cultivation.

The Senator must see that if barley was worth a dollar a bushel, the highest I have ever known it to be in Milwaukee during the last year, and it was worth only from 50 to 70 cents a bushel over on the Canadian side, and they had a surplus in Canada which they would either have to consume at home or export, then we are getting a benefit, and the farmer of Missouri shipping his barley up into Milwaukee for \$1 a bushel is making money on his barley. He is getting a direct benefit, and with that much difference he certainly can afford to ship it to Milwaukee, although that may not be the nearest market, and possibly not the most profitable market; but he is securing a benefit from that duty on barley.

It is impossible, as I said before, to estimate how much Iowa gets out of this. Iowa's market for the most part is Chicago, but the wheat and the barley of Iowa will be influenced by the value of the wheat and the barley of the Dakotas and Minnesota, how much no man can tell. We only know that an increased demand always increases the price, and when there is a higher price of any one article it creates a demand for other similar articles that can be used as a substitute.

Mr. REED. Would the Senator think if he gets—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUSBURN in the chair). The Senator from Missouri will please address the Chair.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. McCUMBER. Always, with pleasure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. I apologize to the Chair. I thought by consent of the Senator from North Dakota I had the floor to interrogate him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Whenever a Senator—

Mr. REED. I will observe any rule, however technical, with great pleasure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state the rule. When a Senator desires to interrupt another Senator who is speaking, he must first address the Chair and receive recognition, and then must be recognized as entitled to speak.

Mr. REED. I fully understand the rule, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the duty of the Chair to state the rule to the Senator, whether he understands it or not, if he disregards it.

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield, Mr. President.

Mr. REED. I am not disregarding it. Would the Senator say that the rest of the country get half as much benefit as the three States that he is especially interested in?

Mr. McCUMBER. After having stated the general proposition, the intelligence of the Senator from Missouri, his general information upon trade matters is such that he can probably answer as accurately as I can. When I have stated that it could not be reduced to dollars and cents or even percentages, I have stated a fact which is self-evident to the Senator, which is as conclusive as it can be made. So if I would answer the Senator my opinion would be no more convincing to him than it is at the present time.

Mr. REED. I simply desired to get the Senator's opinion, and I understand now he can give none; that—

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, the Senator does himself an injustice when he says that I can give none, because if the Senator—who certainly represents a State with great agricultural interests and who, true to those interests, investigates the commercial relations of the products of his State—is unable to answer the question, I am unable to answer it for him. But the Senator does know, for instance, that if the price of what we call northern wheat goes up, the price of red, the wheat of the Central States, always rises some. He will know that if the prices of barley and oats go up there is some similar relation with corn that is used for the same purpose. When he says that I admitted that I can not answer the question as to whether it benefits or not, the Senator is inaccurate in his statement.

Mr. REED. I do not want to be misunderstood, Mr. President.

Mr. McCUMBER. I know the Senator does not.

Mr. REED. I do not want to misquote the Senator. I have been very sincere in my desire to get an estimate of the Senator, based on his own judgment and his own investigation.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator must remember that the estimate I make on this year will not be wholly applicable to conditions, which may be different, another year.

Mr. REED. I understand.

Mr. McCUMBER. I would have to take each year separately, and then I would have to take one kind of grain and compare the rise and the fall of that particular grain in that year with another grain of a similar character, which can be used for the same purpose, and see what effect the rise and the fall on the one would be. That, the Senator should see, would be so changeable that I could not reduce it to an estimate that would be satisfactory to either of us. Yet the fact would never be denied by either of us.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Senator hardly allowed me to conclude, but since his response let me pass this observation. The same difficulty which he speaks of as existing with reference to an estimate of the amount of money that is paid to the farmers outside of the Dakotas and Montana exists, of course, in making his estimate with regard to Montana and the Dakotas.

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly.

Mr. REED. I thought that certainly the Senator would take one of two positions, either that this 10 per cent raise operated in general throughout the country and gave the country a general benefit substantially the same throughout, or else he would admit that its benefits were limited to those local markets immediately contiguous to the Canadian line, or that he would take a third position, that the benefits throughout the country could be approximated, so that you could say if it raised it 10 per cent in these three States it certainly raised the price 5 per cent on a similar amount in the other States.

What I was trying to get at, what the American people are trying to get at, in my judgment, is how much, if anything, does this tax on wheat cost the man, the woman, and the child, the farmer and the laborer, the minister and the lawyer, the 90,000,000 people who eat bread? We know, according to the Senator's statement, that we are to pay \$56,000,000 to three States. I want to know how much we are to pay to all the States for the bread that sustains life.

Mr. McCUMBER. Suppose, Mr. President, it operated even 10 cents a bushel on every bushel of wheat that is raised in the United States. I want the Senator to get that now, because he seems to want a question to be answered many times before he fully comprehends it. I have stated that suppose the entire charge was made to the people of the United States of 10 cents a bushel, which would amount to 44 cents upon a barrel of flour, and that each individual consumed a barrel. That is approximately correct. Each individual would then pay to the farmer an additional price, if the farmer got it all. Of course he is not getting it all, nor would the consumer get the full benefit if it was taken away. But I am giving the Senator the benefit of every possible doubt. Then the consumer would pay an addition of 44 cents a year, or about 4 cents a month. That would be a loss to the consumer of one-thirtieth of 4 cents a day. If the Senator will multiply that by 92,000,000, as a lightning calculator, he will then get the entire amount that the consuming public would pay in addition for their flour, assuming, of course, that they did pay all of this sum.

But, Mr. President, they do not pay it all. I am doubtful if the difference of 10 cents a bushel would make one penny's difference in the price of a barrel of flour. Its proportion to the price of the barrel is so small that the great manufacturers seem to scarcely take it into consideration. I am, therefore, very doubtful if the public would get any benefit by reason of taking it off, and it may be doubtful if they pay one-quarter as much as my estimate would be by reason of its being on.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator from Missouri must understand that the difference of 10 cents a bushel in the value of the wheat has never made any material difference in the selling price of flour. If he will look over the statistics and the Statistical Abstract he will find that that little difference is not considered at all by the miller in fixing his established prices. That the miller would make something, that he would save 10 cents a bushel, there is no question, but I doubt very much if you take it off if the consumer would get any benefit whatever.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I think I have answered each query of the Senator very thoroughly. I want to go a

little further and I will answer another proposition, because I noticed in the debate a short time ago that the Senator from Missouri questioned the fact whether or not the laborers of the city were paying less expended energy in the purchase of a barrel of flour than was expended by the farmer in producing that barrel of flour.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President—

Mr. McCUMBER. That becomes a most important factor in determining whether or not the farmer should be benefited—

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

Mr. McCUMBER. In just a moment. Because, Mr. President, if the amount of expended energy in the city produces a result three or four or five times as great as the expenditure of the same amount of labor upon the farm, then there is something to be righted in our trade relations, and it becomes our duty as representatives of all the people to do what we can to right those conditions. I want to give attention for a moment to that condition. I will now yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator that in selecting a small unit to determine the weight or burden of a tax that burden and weight may be reduced to what seems to be a trifle. He lacked one step of going far enough in his hypothesis with reference to the wheat crop of the United States. As I understand, the wheat crop last year approximated 700,000,000 bushels.

Mr. McCUMBER. No; about—

Mr. GORE. Six hundred and ninety-five million, to be exact.

Mr. McCUMBER. It is less than 675,000,000, but that is close enough for your estimate.

Mr. GORE. Six hundred and ninety-five million.

Mr. McCUMBER. Six hundred and seventy-five million.

Mr. GORE. No.

Mr. McCUMBER. All right; give it at that.

Mr. GORE. I will take it at 700,000,000, in order to make the calculation easy. If the hypothesis be true that each bushel is advanced 10 cents by the tax, then the total increase in the crop was \$70,000,000. According to the Senator's contention, the farmers of the United States on his hypothesis would have received \$70,000,000 more for the wheat crop last year, on account of the tariff, than they would have received without the tariff. Does the Senator think that on that hypothesis the farmers would have received last year \$70,000,000 on account of the tariff for nothing?

Mr. McCUMBER. Had we free trade with Canada last year the farmers of our section of the country would have suffered about one-third of that in actual loss in the three States.

I have stated to the Senator over and over again that I do not think every bushel of wheat in the United States is benefited 10 cents a bushel by reason of the tariff, and the debate has been so long upon that subject that I think the Senator will not presume to press that part of it any further.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield further to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield, Mr. President.

Mr. GORE. I should like to place the exact figures in the Record. The crop was 695,443,000 bushels. I realize that the Senator did not state that there would be a net advance of 10 cents on the entire crop in the United States, but I will bring it to the three States which he designates—Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota. As I understand the Senator, he contends that the farmers of those three States realized last year \$56,000,000 on account of the tariff more than they would have realized without the tariff. Is that correct?

Mr. McCUMBER. Will the Senator repeat his last statement, because my attention was called away?

Mr. GORE. I say the proposition is that it advanced the entire crop throughout the United States 10 cents. I do not understand that to be your contention, but that is your hypothesis. But I do understand the Senator's contention to be that the farmers of the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, and Minnesota realized last year on account of the tariff on grain \$56,000,000 more than they would have realized without the tariff.

Mr. McCUMBER. No; to be accurate, I did not state that. I stated that under normal conditions with our present land under cultivation we have never raised in the three States 250,000,000, I think, but with the present amount of land under cultivation and the usual proportion sowed for wheat and with ordinary weather conditions the three States would now produce about 250,000,000. I desire to correct the Senator so that my statement may stand irrespective of what the estimates may be for the past years.

Mr. GORE. As I understand, the Senator embraces in that \$56,000,000—

Mr. McCUMBER. Three States. I will state to the Senator there are hardly 100,000 of barley, I think, raised in the three States. When I spoke of barley I spoke of the northwestern barley States, which might include Wisconsin and other States.

Mr. GORE. Then, on the conditions which the Senator suggests, I ask him if the farmers of those three States realized \$56,000,000 on account of the tariff for nothing?

Mr. McCUMBER. No; Mr. President, they did not realize it for nothing. Now, let the Senator finish his question and I will give him a full answer.

Mr. GORE. I wish to know if they received \$56,000,000 more on account of the tariff than they would have gotten without the tariff?

Mr. McCUMBER. That has been answered over and over again.

Mr. GORE. I wish to know what value they returned for that \$56,000,000, what value they parted with for the \$56,000,000 that they got on account of the tariff, and if it was due to the tariff?

Mr. McCUMBER. Is the Senator through with his question?

Mr. GORE. Yes; I am.

Mr. McCUMBER. They parted with a 60 per cent duty on their clothes; they parted with a duty upon everything that they purchased; they parted with extra taxes; they shared in paying a great national indebtedness; they incurred sacrifices in building up their own State; they parted with large sums of money to educate the people of the State; they parted with large sums of money for the benefit of other sections of the United States; and having parted with those, they do not feel that it is just to them that there should be turned over now a great market, built up by their sacrifices, built up by their labors in past years, built up by their enthusiastic support of a policy that would increase the population and the home demand for their products, that they should now surrender that home demand for the benefit of those who have sacrificed nothing, who have endured nothing in the past, and who will pay nothing in taxes or anything else in the future for the benefit of the country.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President—

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, we are leaving the real question at issue and we are going back into academic questions, which it was not my purpose to discuss. I have tried to be fair with Senators in interruptions, and doubly so am I glad always to get the good views of the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. GORE. That is very kind.

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

Mr. McCUMBER. I do.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I appreciate the very eloquent and very comprehensive answer which the Senator from North Dakota has returned and his catalogue of what the farmers receive for the \$56,000,000, yet I do not quite understand what value they parted with in order to get the \$56,000,000; and I will suggest that if they received the \$56,000,000 on account of the tariff, then somebody parted with \$56,000,000 to those farmers on account of the tariff.

Mr. McCUMBER. The millers parted with a considerable portion of it, I will say to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. GORE. What did the people who parted with the \$56,000,000 get for the \$56,000,000?

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I think I have answered the Senator's question very thoroughly. If he wants detailed answers, I will say that the millers parted with considerable of it; that the millers paid a better price for the grain than they would have paid if they had had Canadian grain, and therefore the millers paid some of this. I will say that the brewers paid some of it. The brewers paid a higher price for their barley. It may be that the brewers ought to be protected in a better way than they are and ought to be allowed cheaper barley; but when I look at the mammoth homes of the brewers, when I look at their palaces scattered all over the country, and then when I look at the little farm hovels over the entire United States, with their inhabitants having scarce enough to wear of good clothes, when I think of the number of people who serve and wait upon the pleasure of the brewer, I am not inclined, Mr. President, to want to enhance his profits at the expense of the farmer.

What I can say generally of the brewers I can also say of the great millers of the country, and I am certain that the taking off of this tariff will inure to their benefit. Very little benefit, if any, will go to the general consumer. I have several times over covered the subject of what the consumer would pay.

Now, Mr. President, I will agree partly with the Senator from Oklahoma that if we are all to go upon a free-trade basis, of course that presents an entirely different proposition, but assuming that we are still to continue upon a tariff-protection basis, I want to consider now the farmer's condition compared with the condition of other laborers of equal intelligence.

I was told the other day by a contractor the prices that he paid for his help in building. He pointed out in one instance a sleepy sort of individual, who sat for eight hours in an elevator, and upon the ringing of a bell lazily pulled a lever on one side and sent the elevator up, and, waiting a few minutes until there were two rings, pulled the lever the other way and he went down. For eight long hours he continued in that very active work, and received for five and a half days the sum of \$36, or over \$6 per day. I find that the bricklayer, I find that the plasterer, I find that the carpenter, I find that the stone-cutter, and also the paper hanger are receiving about the same rates. I go to the bricklayer, and I find he is paid by the hour, instead of by the day, and he receives 62½ cents per hour.

If the Senator will follow that out and take the number of hours in a year at some 3,000 and multiply it by 62½ cents per hour he will get the wages of the ordinary laborer; certainly a laborer who is not more intelligent than is the farm laborer—at least, he need not be—because in order to raise crops we have to receive a technical education and we have to invest a large sum of money as capital. After estimating the amount that this laborer receives per day, I go back to the farmer who works on an average of 12 hours a day, and I find by as careful an estimate as can possibly be made, that he receives for that labor the beneficent sum of about 6½ cents per hour. Then you have your city laborer at 62½ cents an hour and your farm laborer at 6½ cents per hour, the city laborer receiving 10 times as much for his energy expended per hour as the farmer receives.

What has been the result? The result has been that you have built up a high cost of living in the city which is out of all proportion to what it ought to be, so that we are seeking some means to alleviate the condition of the man who is working for a definite salary. With that high price of labor your building costs you 10 times as much as it would if constructed with farm labor. Your land then takes on an enormous value.

The result is that everything that is handled in such buildings, erected upon a foundation of gold created by the higher price of the American laborer, takes on a higher value, and you must tax the purchaser to pay it. Then, because your prices are high, you go back to the farmer, who is not responsible in any way or in any degree for the higher cost of living, and you immediately shave down his profits to a mere existence, in order that the balance of the world may live upon his labors and live as well as they have been living. And you call that justice to the farmers of the country. Then, in the face of the injury that you have created, you offer him this sop, which you call the farmers' free-list bill, and from which the best of you can not establish to any certainty that he will get any benefit whatever.

Mr. President, I have, in all the years that I have been here, tried to impress upon the Senate the real condition of the farming public of the United States; I have tried to have them understand that the farmer is not receiving his just deserts for the labor that he and his family are daily performing; but the average Senator, the average Member of the House of Representatives, looks upon him in the same light as does the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] and the Senator from New York [Mr. ROOR], when they consider him a mere necessity in the economy of living, as an individual intended by God Almighty to furnish food that the rest of the people may live in ease and comfort. Anything that tends to raise the value of his product so that he shall receive a compensation for his labor, one that will more nearly equalize his compensation with the labor compensation of other individuals, is looked upon as something dangerous to the American people, and he is answered with the cold proposition that the other two-thirds of the American people will not submit to having the price of the loaf of bread increased to them and to their families.

The Senator from Ohio speaks in kindly terms of the farmer; he seems to have an affectionate regard for him; but when it comes to putting that affectionate regard into the form of a benefit, both the Senator from New York and the Senator from Ohio balk and say, "We can not do that." We can not afford to allow the farmer any more than he is now receiving, and lest his products might raise in value, we must have this Canadian reservoir ready.

The Senator from Ohio dilates upon the great men who have come from the farms of the United States. Mr. President, if great men come from the farm, it is because of the trip-

hammer of poverty that makes human character, that, with its heavy stroke upon stroke, hardens the individual and makes him capable of resistance, that gives him a power of endurance and enables him to walk out into the world and to meet the world with a courage and a confidence that you can not find in the hothouse flower of the city. But, Mr. President, would the Senator from Ohio keep the farmer in poverty that he might be the breeding ground of strong American characters? It is against that proposition that we who represent farming constituencies rebel.

Every Senator knows if he has carefully estimated the earning capacity of people on the farm that their earnings really are not one-fourth of what labor of equal intelligence receives in the city. I say here that the farmers are entitled to the same amount, and I say that the country would be in better condition if we could equalize the earning power of the whole rural districts until they would be an inviting field for the men and the women of the cities.

But I am told "Ah, this is an idle dream"; that there should be as much wealth displayed in the country as in the city.

Mr. President, if by any character of law I can make the farmer's product worth more than it now is, then it is my moral duty to make it so, but instead of assisting the great class of citizens who need your help more than any other class in the United States, a benefit to whom would benefit the whole country and take your excess population out of the cities, your first blow is at the farming population—those who earn the least—and you take from them every vestige of protection, while continuing to protect those whose earnings are the greatest.

I wanted to ask my Democratic friends to mention some benefits that will inure to the farmers of this country by reason of the farmers' free-list bill. I take agricultural machinery, and I ask the author of the amendment if he can tell me where the farmer will get his machinery any cheaper if we take off the tariff, and he says, if I recall rightly, the farmer will get no benefit. This is one of the principal items, and the author of the amendment admits it is a sop to the farmer and gives him no real benefit whatever.

Then I take bags and bagging. This reciprocity treaty will not injure the cotton raiser of the South. It will injure the wheat raiser of the North. Then, under the pretext that you are to give a benefit to the farmer, you give a benefit to the farmer who is not hurt, and you refuse to insert in your free-list bill anything for the benefit of the farmer who is hurt.

Then I take the articles of hoops and bands. I want to get that matter definite. I understand that the tariff upon hoops which are used to bind cotton would amount to 2.7 cents. That is my information from the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SMOOT. That is correct.

Mr. McCUMBER. That is a saving, if you get the entire saving, of 2.7 cents on a value of \$65 for a bale. It is a bagatelle, though taken in the aggregate, of course, it amounts to considerable; but there is nothing for the farmer you hurt, no salve for the wounds that you inflict upon him.

Then I take the next item, boots and shoes, which it is proposed to put on the free list. When boots and shoes are on the free list, are you to get boots and shoes any cheaper? We reduced the duty on them down to 10 per cent. Did we get them any cheaper? The difference in cost on account of the tariff on the leather, which you took off, amounted to only about 3 or 4 cents on the very best pair of shoes, and will the shoe manufacturer make a difference upon a shoe, the price of which he never divides into smaller division than 50 cents? On a \$2, a \$2.50, a \$3, or \$3.50 shoe is he going to make a reduction of 3 or 4 cents? So, here again you have given the farmer absolutely nothing.

Then I come to barbed wire. You say you will give the farmer some benefit on barbed wire. Mr. President, where is he to get it? Is anybody importing barbed wire into the United States? We are exporting barbed wire, and we are jumping over tariff walls to do so. If that is the case, if we can manufacture barbed wire so cheaply that we can get into other countries with it, is there much danger of other countries coming into ours with their barbed wire? Who manufactures it abroad? The same condition applies to barbed wire as applies in the case of farm machinery. No foreigner would attempt to construct a plant to manufacture farm machinery to sell to the people of the United States unless he could get a guaranty that for 15 or 20 years at least he would not have any tariff to pay, and neither you, nor I, nor anyone else can give him that guaranty. Therefore he will not enter into the business of competing with the American manufacturer. So we get nothing out of that.

I turn to your next proposition—that is, beef and veal and mutton. It is a new proposition that you are going to benefit the farmer by lowering the duty on the thing which he produces—his protection. I do not care whether the protection is direct or indirect. I believe that the tariff is 1½ cents a pound on those articles. Well, we are exporting meat to Canada; we are exporting canned meats elsewhere. We are consuming about all of the meats that we produce in the United States, but the Chicago packers, the Omaha packers, and the St. Louis packers are able, I believe, to compete with the world, and therefore the farmer will get no benefit because no man is going to import meat into the United States.

Then take the item of flour. I have heretofore gone over that, and I have shown you that the difference is so little that it is not worth being taken into consideration at all.

Then we have lumber, and I have shown you that, taking the average amount which the farmer would use to build a house, he would have an actual saving of about 55 cents a year in the difference in the value of lumber, but against this he would have a loss of from \$200 to \$250 a year, dependent upon the character and the amount of grain that he raises.

I come now to the item of sewing machines. Those who are manufacturing sewing machines do not need any protection at all, and I do not see why the duty has ever been kept on, for the reason that American manufacturers are selling sewing machines abroad and are manufacturing them abroad. If they manufacture them abroad, they probably would not bring them into this country and sell them in competition with their own goods manufactured here. A Singer sewing machine, I presume, costs about from \$25 to \$30 at retail, and it is good for 30 years. Suppose the farmer did save 10 cents a year on a sewing machine, what is that compared with the enormous loss that you are inflicting yearly upon him by reason of this reciprocity agreement?

Mr. President, I am going to vote for this amendment, but I am going to do so upon a principle, and that principle is this: When you take all the protection from the product of one man you ought not in morals and in justice to retain it upon the product whenever it has been manufactured by some one else. The people of my State not only complain, as they have a right to complain, against the damage, against the general injustice of this reciprocity agreement, but they complain, as they have a right to complain, against the injustice contained in the proposition that they are not treated as the manufacturer is treated. They rebel against that; and it is in conformity with their almost universal demand that I stand as much as I can between them and this outrageous policy that they are not to be treated as having the same rights that are accorded other American citizens, that I shall vote for a proposition that would otherwise be obnoxious to me as a protectionist.

Mr. President, I had hoped that some Senator who favors this amendment would have the kindness to explain to the Senate the benefit the farmer is to get from the free-list bill; but no one has done so, for no one can show a benefit to the farmer that is worth the breath he expends in proclaiming it.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OLIVER in the chair). The absence of a quorum being suggested, the Secretary will call the roll.

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

Borah	du Pont	Lippitt	Simmons
Bourne	Fletcher	Lodge	Smith, S. C.
Brandeggee	Foster	McCumber	Smoot
Briggs	Gallinger	McLean	Stone
Bristow	Gamble	Martin, Va.	Swanson
Bryan	Gronna	Nixon	Taylor
Burnham	Guggenheim	Oliver	Thornton
Clapp	Heyburn	Page	Townsend
Clark, Wyo.	Hitchcock	Penrose	Watson
Cullom	Johnston, Ala.	Perkins	Wetmore
Curtis	Kenyon	Pomerene	Williams
Dixon	Kern	Shively	Works

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum of the Senate is present.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I have been in some doubt in my own mind as to whether I would say anything before the vote is taken upon this amendment. It is not in accordance with the policy that I have laid out for myself to attempt to discuss these amendments except where there is a probability, or even a possibility of the amendments being adopted. In that case I would feel that I was not performing my duty should I allow them to come to a vote without placing in the RECORD such views as I might desire to have accompany my vote.

It is being asserted around me to-day that certain Senators are going to vote for this amendment on the wool schedule, and the reasons have been given. If that policy is prevalent it may be that we will find ourselves with Schedule K amended, and we will have to wait for some years for relief from a condition which would be very embarrassing to the country and those whom we represent, and those whose interests are at stake might say, "In that hour, when this was imminent, you were silent. Why?" I could not say that I was silent because I acquiesced in it from any standpoint or for any purpose. Therefore, I feel impelled briefly to say what I have to say against the enactment of such legislation.

The single question to be voted upon is whether the duty on wool shall be reduced from 11 cents to 3 cents. That is what it amounts to. We have had some experience, and we are not without a guide in this matter. Only once during the lifetime of any one in this Chamber have we had free wool. Schedule K has stood as the law of the land under the McKinley bill in 1890, under the Dingley bill in 1897, and under the existing tariff law. During the period of the Wilson bill or the Wilson-Gorman bill, or whatever you choose to call it, we had free wool—absolutely free wool—with a duty on manufactured articles.

I have sat here and listened with some amazement to a discussion as to the principles of the Democratic Party in regard to these matters, and I have been unable to see how they would reconcile their position under the Wilson-Gorman bill with the position they are assuming at this time. They are now demanding that the manufacturers of wool shall be relieved of their duties and proposing to place a small duty upon the raw wool.

Their action then and their policy now are so utterly inconsistent that it is difficult to explain. But I never was able to give a reason why a man should be a Democrat, and I was never able to explain to myself or anyone else why the Democratic doctrine should be the rule or law of the land; and I will not attempt it now. I will let it stand for itself.

The wool interest, of course, carries with it the sheep interest, because unless the wool is an inducement the sheep will not be raised. This, taken together with the proposed Canadian pact, which allows the sheep to come in free, of course presents the problem of wool and sheep together. You let the sheep in under the Canadian act and the wool in under this act. Of course, under the Canadian act, the sheep might bring in his own wool. He could come over onto this side of the line for shearing, and he could come by the millions. It is safe to say that more than a million Canadian sheep are sufficiently accessible to the boundary line to enable them to come in free, and to make money by coming, and it is safe to say that the Canadian Pacific road and the other roads could well afford to give rates to the sheep coming into this country for the sole purpose of being sheared and taken back.

I have given some attention to that matter, and I do not hesitate a moment to say that the cost would be so insignificant that the sheepmen on the Canadian side of the line, within 50 miles of the American line, could afford to bring their sheep over here on the railroads and shear them—bring them here for a few cents—and derive the benefit that they would derive by getting their wool into our markets free.

I have taken the matter up with some transportation men in order to see whether or not I was mistaken, and I am justified in saying that there is no question but that a very large quantity of wool would come into this country on the backs of the sheep and the sheep would go back to raise more wool.

But that was bad enough, and I raised my voice against that on a former occasion at greater length, but now it is proposed to allow the wool to come in in the fleece because, of course, 20 per cent ad valorem on the prevailing price of wool—3 cents a pound—would not be a deterrent at all and would not keep any wool out of the country.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

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

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes.

Mr. BORAH. I agree with my colleague, as he knows, upon the subject of the general necessity of maintaining protection for the wool industry. But my colleague stated that we now have a protection of 11 cents.

Mr. HEYBURN. Eleven cents.

Mr. BORAH. Yes.

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes.

Mr. BORAH. Well, that is ostensibly so, but does not my colleague agree with me that, as a matter of fact, the wool-grower only has about 7 or 8 cents now?

Mr. HEYBURN. If I were not afraid of overrefinement in reasoning, I would go into that question. I understand exactly what the Senator suggests, and it is in a measure true that there

are certain things to be charged against the 11 cents protection that reduce the benefit derived under it. But then, in discussing a principle of legislation, I think it is sufficient to accept the face of the law and base the reasoning or conclusion upon it.

Mr. BORAH. I only wanted to call attention to the fact that it is another instance based upon the same principle as the reciprocity agreement—

Mr. HEYBURN. Very much like it.

Mr. BORAH. Where the eastern manufacturer gets very much the best of it.

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes; there is room for improvement in regard to that matter.

There are certain regulations that ought not to exist in regard to the manner of estimates. But I might go into that at the sacrifice of the general principle which should control. This is a place where principles of law and principles of government should be discussed rather than the details as to their application, and one often enters into a detailed consideration of a political question here at the expense of the question itself.

The large question in regard to the manufactured products of wool that is affected in this bill is in the wages item. This measure would carry with it about \$75,000,000 in wages. That is, in connection with the manufactured products alone. It is a question as to which side of the line you are going to drop those wages on. I have taken my figures from the statistics within the last hour, and consequently I have confidence in stating them.

Now, are you going to leave those wages on the other side of the line and bring in the product that has been benefited by the wages paid there and never to come here, or are you going to keep the wages on this side of the line employed in converting our own raw material? Are we going to convert the raw material of other countries through their labor or are we going to convert the raw material of our own country to useful purposes through our wages paid to our own wage earners?

In my judgment, as I have said before, the two questions involved in discussing the question of the tariff are: First, the question, which involves all of the minor questions, of the displacement in our market of our own products displaced by the introduction of the products of other countries. There is a loss that can not be made up in any other or any future or any subsequent stage of the transaction. If a product that is the result of a million dollars paid in labor in some other country comes into our country, whether subject to duty or otherwise, it displaces the products of our own country to that extent, and we have paid the million dollars to the foreigner, and it never comes back to us, and our labor that would have manufactured the articles has not been given the advantages that would result from its work, the wages it would have received.

That is the basis upon which I consider the tariff question. I understand these details are very interesting as to the cost of this item and that item, but they are all involved in the general proposition of wages and displacements in our market.

Those who have been discussing this question have suggested that our remedy would be to find a foreign market for our products. That is such a cruel argument, that is such an unreasonable proposition, that I can not think anyone capable of thinking will agree with it. The idea of opening our market to the foreign product, knowing that we could produce it ourselves, and then when the foreign product has come in, say to our producing capacity, "All right; go ahead and produce it, and you can find a market in some foreign country." There is no patriotism in that, and there is no common sense in it.

The market of this country belongs to the people. It is their property. They created it by the civilization that they builded. In every part of the country they have created this market, and it is theirs. It is no one man's property or right, but it belongs to all of the people.

The primary object of our Government is to afford opportunity to the citizens. It is not to assist them in taking advantage of the opportunity, one as against another. It is to enable them all to stand upon an even footing and enjoy the same opportunity, and having the same opportunity, the Government, in the exercise of quasi-police power, sees to it that the strong do not run over the weak.

In regard to this wool question the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] left an argument in the air yesterday. For fear it may light and create a wrong impression, I will see if we can not pull it down now and investigate it. He read from the statistics the number of sheep in the United States during certain years, and he did not draw any comparison between the sheep and the sheep's products, and I will state it.

He called attention to the fact that the number of sheep did not decrease so much during the Democratic administration,

which, while some years ago, is quite fresh in our minds. He called attention to the fact that there were 47,000,000 sheep in the country in 1893, 45,000,000 in 1894, 42,000,000 in 1895, 38,000,000 in 1896, and 57,000,000 in 1910. And he seemed to think that the increase was hardly in proportion to the increase of the population.

Between 1896 and 1910, 14 years, the area—that is, the open area of the country upon which sheep might be raised; that is, the range—had been diminished by about 25 per cent. But it was suggested to him that he had better look to the value of the sheep because if the sheep are worth nothing the more you have then the greater disadvantage are you under. In 1895, which was after the Democratic Party was in power and its policy announced and its tariff law enacted, when the Democratic Party was in the saddle, we had 42,294,064 sheep, worth \$66,685,767. That is \$1.57 a head.

I saw sheepmen offering sheep at 10 cents a head if the buyer would drive them away and do it quickly, because they were eating up the grass, and there was no market for either the sheep or the sheep's fleece. That was in 1896. That was the year for which I have given these statistics.

Just compare that condition with this year. The increase in the number of sheep is only about 12,000,000, but the increase in the value of the sheep is the difference between \$1.57 a head and \$4.08 a head. That is where the Senator stopped short. He did not incorporate that statement into his remarks. In other words, the value of the sheep in 1896 was \$1.57 a head because of the scant market for them, and it became worse immediately afterwards, and in 1910 it was \$4.08 a head, because prosperity had returned to the country and there was a market for the sheep and for the fleece.

Now, attention was called to the effect of a free-trade policy upon the wool market and the volume of production and of import; that is, during the three years when the Democratic tariff was the law of the land, because that is about the length of time it was operative. It was not enacted until 1894, notwithstanding the party came into power in 1893, on the 4th of March. During the Democratic free-trade policy, with wool on the free list, we imported 786,797,405 pounds. That we bought from other countries at the expense of the dissemination of our own herds. During the equivalent period after the enactment of the Dingley bill we imported only 365,459,866 pounds. That was because there was a duty of 11 cents a pound upon the wool, which kept foreign wools out while our flocks were growing again. The difference there is 421,337,539 pounds, as showing the different conditions resulting from the different tariff policy of the country, and no other.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the interest in this measure is lagging, and I move that the Senate adjourn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho moves that the Senate adjourn. [Putting the question.] The "noes" appear to have it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. CULLOM. I hope we will have a call of the Senate.

Mr. HEYBURN. Has there been a call for the yeas and nays?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A call was made for the yeas and nays, and the Chair asked for a second. The Chair will again ask for a second.

Mr. HEYBURN. The Senator from Nebraska asked for the yeas and nays. If he does not second it, I do not know that it is worth while for anybody else to do it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I will withdraw the call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska withdraws the request for the yeas and nays. The Senator from Illinois suggests the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CULLOM. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois suggests the absence of a quorum, and the Secretary will call the roll.

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

Borah	Dillingham	Kern	Simmons
Bourne	Dixon	Lippitt	Smith, S. C.
Brandeggee	du Pont	Lodge	Smoot
Briggs	Fletcher	McCumber	Swanson
Bristow	Foster	Martin, Va.	Taylor
Brown	Gamble	Oliver	Thornton
Bryan	Gore	Page	Townsend
Burnham	Gronna	Penrose	Watson
Chamberlain	Guggenheim	Perkins	Williams
Clapp	Heyburn	Pomerene	Works
Clark, Wyo.	Hitchcock	Reed	
Cullom	Johnston, Ala.	Root	
Curtis	Kenyon	Shively	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum of the Senate is present.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, we see some queer things here. The only thing that I have not yet seen that I think would be a novelty would be to see some Senator go out while he was speaking. Every other phase of neglect and dilatory tactics has been presented in connection with this legislation. A majority of the body will sit here supinely and neither hear advice nor place themselves in a position to receive it. They seem to have been content to align themselves under different banners, and inscribe on the banner some epithet or title of glory according to the relation that they bore to it.

The Republicans of the Senate are opposed to this Canadian pact. All of the Republicans of the Senate are opposed to it. When I use that term I refer to men who stand for the principles of protection, a protective tariff policy, not protection on some one particular item or class of items, but as a policy of government. Those are Republicans.

There has been some talk with reference to the administration, and it has been thought by some to identify it or classify it as representing republicanism. It does not represent republicanism or any principle for which the Republican Party ever stood. I am not going to indulge in any attack on the personal character or personnel of the administration; I am talking now of political principles.

When this vote is taken there will be a majority of Republicans against it, and those who are not against it will be classed as Democrats and semi-Democrats, real fee-simple Democrats and borrowed Democrats. Fee-simple Democrats and—I will not use the word that came to my mind because it might be taken in an offensive sense, but I will suggest what it was—hired Democrats. I do not intend to use that in a sense which would be offensive. Then there may be one or two deceived Republicans, but I have a rather high opinion of the intelligence of Republicans, and I do not know whether to admit that they are deceived or not. They are misled. And here we stand to discuss this question.

Great interests are at stake. Men's fortunes and happiness are at stake. The interests—and I do not use that term in the sense in which it is used in the newspapers either; I mean the real interests of the people of the country—are divided upon this question, very largely from a selfish basis. That is to say, the people in the cities have been misled into the belief that they will benefit under this measure at the expense of the country, and they are willing to do it. They talk about cheap living. What difference how cheap the living if the man has nothing with which to pay for it? I have heard 20 men speak here from the assumption that every laboring man has always at hand the money to buy things with, and they have discussed only how cheaply he could buy them. Senator after Senator, even to-day, has risen and spoken of the choice that the laboring man might exercise in the market into which he would go for the purpose of buying the things he needed. There is a great big question behind that. If he goes, it matters not where he goes with an empty pocket; he can buy at no price. He does not have an accumulated fund out of which to purchase the necessities of life. He must earn as he spends. That is true as a general statement. Of course there are some exceptions to that, but it is true as to the great mass of the people. They know that they must have employment to-day in order that they may live to-morrow.

What are you proposing to do with them? You are proposing to substitute for the man who must depend upon the labor market a foreigner. I do not care whether he is a Canadian or a Swede or whether he is an Italian or where he comes from, he is not an American. He does not pay taxes for the purpose of the support of our Government or any part of it. He does not live here; he does not vote here, but he lives under the laws of another country and owes fealty to another Government. Yet you are going to give him a preference at the expense of the American citizen, who is as necessary to you, or more necessary to you, than you are to him.

Suppose the country were to conclude that it would live at home. It produces everything it needs, and can produce it even to the clothing that people wear. It can produce everything it needs in the way of food. When I was a boy the neighborhood mills made the cloth and the blankets, and the sheep owner, the farmer, sheared the wool with his own hands. He drove with it to the mill, and he was told, "You may come back here at a certain time." He would go back and he would get those bolts of clothing of different kinds and grades and take them home and put them upon the shelves in the storehouses of the farm. That was not an exceptional condition; I have seen it.

I think some remnants of that still exists in the old, solid, substantial sections of the country.

So the country can live, and live happily, and clothe itself and feed itself and get rich, because it does not have this continual outflow. That is where our ancestors and forefathers accumulated the wealth and the competence and the comfortable living that some of us have enjoyed. There was a small stream only flowing out from that home. The farmer would take the skin from the animal that he slaughtered for food to the tanner to be tanned. He would go back in seven months afterwards and get the leather, heavy or light, as it might be, and bring it home and put it on the shelves. Twice a year the competent tailor and the competent shoemaker would go to the home of those people, or if a smaller family they would go to his place; the tailor would make up the suits of clothes out of the cloth that was made from the sheep that were raised on the farm and the shoemaker would make the shoes for the family, all that they could possibly need between that and the next period. That is living. It was a healthier, better kind of life than the glitter of to-day.

That is the condition out of which the men who stamped their genius and greatness upon this country came. I can go back where those conditions are in a large measure existing to-day. I heard a man well known to the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot], who is sitting on my left, say to me, in talking tariff, "I am a protectionist." He said, "I knew the sheep upon which the fleece grew out of which that coat was made. I knew the calf that wore the skin that covers my foot. This hat was made from the silk of my own silkworms, and this gold that carries my watch was mined from my own mines." He said, "Are you a protectionist that good?" That is getting back to the old school, and the best school and the best age this world will ever know.

Mr. President, it is not to throw away or destroy existing conditions, but it is to temper them with that sort of patriarchalism applied to the government of the people, where the people live patriarchal lives, where they produce as though there were no world beyond the boundary lines of the United States, where they barter and buy and sell among themselves. The existence of crime is no constitutional argument to me—that men are violating the law, either natural law or the law of the country, through the forms of trusts—why we should support a measure of this kind that deals with economics of honest men. This country can take care of the rogues, I guess. If it can not, it had better go out of business. If we are to be governed by police law, and if our legislation is to be shaped upon the lines of police government, then the Government is not worth sustaining. Let us act upon the assumption that we are capable of exercising a clean government, regardless of the crimes that are committed or charged.

I will not stop in this hour to determine that crimes are aided, perhaps made possible, by this legislation. But crimes are made possible by the manufacture of the dirk or the pistol or of powder. Is that any reason why those things that are being so used should be destroyed or abandoned?

Mr. President, we are going to have an accounting one of these days. There were 7,000,000 Republican votes cast at the last election, and there are 7,000,000 Republicans in this country. They are as a political principle 7,000,000 times bigger than any man, I care not whether he lives in the White House or whether he stokes the fires in the furnaces of this building. Those men are the Republican Party. It is the Republican Party that I care for, and not the men who happen to be in office for the few brief hours. The principles that the Republican Party stands for constitute Republicanism, and no man, no coterie of men, I care not whether they are high in office or otherwise, can change that fact.

I have seen men purse their mouths and look wise and say the administration has concluded so and so and the policy from this time will be so and so. I have seen the fortunes of government hurl them under, and they were lost under the wheel and never came up again. You will see it. They will be strewn upon the banks after the Republicans of the country realize their betrayal. They will be strewn upon the banks as the wreck of a miserable mistake; that is all.

Mr. President, I do not desire to enter the field of prophecy, but I will predict. That is a mild kind of prophecy. I will predict that after the coming election, which will be a political potpourri, the Republicans who are in the majority of this country, as I say there are over 7,000,000 of them registered, will simply say to the self-constituted leaders who sought to lead them astray, "Step aside now, we will organize ourselves; we will be organized by no man or set of men who have led us up to the trough of free trade and demand that we drink at it." And they will not be heard of. They will select from

out the loyal ranks of the Republicans men whom they can trust, or think they can. I merely utter these words of prediction in order to lessen the disappointment which some will experience.

Do you think that those Republicans are going to adopt Democratic principles, or do you think that they are going to indorse those who try to persuade them or compel them to adopt Democratic principles? I do not object to Democratic principles on that side of the aisle; I like them, because I have been accustomed all my life to meet them in the open field of controversy, and generally to prevail against them. They are candid men; they believe in those principles of government, and I believe them when they say they believe in them. But I do not believe men whose record in the Republican Party is as old as the party itself when they tell me to-day that they believe in free trade. Call it what they please, that is what it is. The free list, on the face of the bill called the free list, is free trade. Reciprocity is simply a honeyed phrase with which to tempt those who allow some one else to think for themselves.

The most desperate and the most dangerous man on earth is the man you have persuaded to think wrong, and who has acted upon it. You had better beware of him either singly or in the aggregate—the man you have persuaded to think wrong when he had confidence that you would lead him only aright. When they rise they rend.

Mr. President, there are two bodies of insurgents in the Senate, insurgent Democrats and insurgent Republicans. I regret to see, and I say it in all candor, that a certain number of loyal, true Republicans are persuaded into the belief that they can afford to train with the insurgents for temporary purposes. When I see Senators in whose heart I know it would be impossible to fasten a belief in the doctrines of the other side of this body willing to adopt them for the purpose of vengeance, to use them as a hatchet to hack something with, it appalls me. I do not want to see it. It has been the boast of men that brave men will stand up on the deck of the sinking ship and go down with it rather than flee at the expense of others for whom they are responsible. It is a boast, and it is a proud boast, and it is a just boast.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HITCHCOCK in the chair). Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. HEYBURN. Certainly.

Mr. McCUMBER. May I ask the Senator a very pertinent question? According to the Senator's rule of morals and human duty, does he believe the man who is assaulted, who feels the grasp of the enemy's fingers upon his throat, while he may have an abhorrence of the general choking business, having no other weapon at hand, finds no justification in shutting off the other fellow's wind long enough for him to release himself?

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I would not reach out and grasp the body of my brother man and interpose it between myself and any danger that might arise.

Mr. McCUMBER. Suppose my brother man is the one who has fastened his fingers on my throat?

Mr. HEYBURN. Then I would fight him.

Mr. McCUMBER. That is what I would do.

Mr. HEYBURN. And go with the issue.

Mr. McCUMBER. But, Mr. President, I think I would fight him with a weapon that was closest, in an emergency.

Mr. HEYBURN. There are some things that ought never to be used as weapons by a man.

Mr. McCUMBER. He can use the same weapon as the one by which he is assailed?

Mr. HEYBURN. I did not intend, nor do I intend, to reflect upon the earnestness, upon the integrity of thought, or anything concerning those who are going to vote to pull down all the temple because a part of it has been pulled down. I am not going to do that, but I must claim and exercise the power and the right here to speak true to my own sentiments, wherever that may follow.

Mr. McCUMBER. I hope, if the Senator will allow me, he will not for a single moment believe that, earnest Republican as he is, protectionist as he is, he would for a single moment make an onslaught upon a general policy, but I think the Senator will agree that there are times when a person must strike back. It is not vengeance, because I have heard that term used so often. It is not through a spirit of vengeance, but in a spirit of fair play, of justice, of equal right to defend yourself, and defend yourself in the only possible and appropriate way.

Mr. HEYBURN. No; there is no time on earth when a man should not strike back when he is assaulted wrongfully. There is no substitute for the duty of defense against your honor or your person.

Mr. McCUMBER. Let me ask the Senator, then, if this tariff proposal or this reciprocity agreement does not strike, and strike hard, at the agricultural sections of the Northwest, and if they are struck are they not justified in relieving themselves in any possible legitimate way?

Mr. HEYBURN. Now the Senator asks whether they are justified. The question of justification is a very uncertain term. The thing that justifies with one man does not always justify with another. I think that is a personal question to be left to each individual.

Mr. McCUMBER. But the Senator says the man's duty who was assaulted is to strike back.

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes.

Mr. McCUMBER. He admits, now, the man has been struck. Then my claim is, it is his duty to strike back and strike quickly.

Mr. HEYBURN. Strike back, but do not take some other person as a weapon with which to strike. Let him strike on his own responsibility and abide the issue. All men are of the same size and the same prowess when the question of honor is involved. The man who stops to think whether his opponent is larger than he is or stronger is lacking in the sense of honor with which men should defend themselves.

I do not take kindly to the term "leader in the Senate." The Senator who is led is lacking in appreciation of his duty as well as his right. This is a body of peers. I will go with any man in the investigation of intellectual thought and the determination of right and wrong. I will go with him and work with him intellectually beside him, but I do not want him to think that he is leading me. It might divert my mind.

Mr. President, I have here a very concise statement of the sheep and wool industry locally applied but of general application. It had been my intention to read it as a part of my remarks. With the permission of the Senate I will insert it as a part of my remarks.

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

The matter referred to is as follows:

BEAR LAKE COUNTY WOOLGROWERS' ASSOCIATION,
Montpelier, Idaho, June 16, 1911.

HON. W. B. HEYBURN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The above association presents the following facts and respectfully implores you not to consent to any legislation inimical to our industry:

In the first place it costs a great deal of money to enter the sheep business. Most of us have paid, or promised to pay, from \$5 to \$6 apiece for our grade ewes. Some, who have bought pure-bred ewes, have paid from \$15 to \$25 each for them, besides which, all of us have been compelled to purchase pure-bred rams for from \$15 to \$50 each, to improve our flocks, as well as a first-class team of work horses, harness, sheep wagon, sleigh, several saddle horses, pack saddles, tents, guns, saddles, and camp equipments, etc., for both summer and winter use. Valuable property of this description, in the hands of the kind of men we are forced to hire, deteriorates very rapidly, for they seldom, if ever, take any interest in their work, or in the care of the herds, animals, or outfit intrusted to their charge.

You must be aware of the fact, that through the gradual settlement of the country, and especially since the arid-homestead law became operative, open range is becoming scarce, and bids fair to become scarcer every year, until the luckless sheepman in his almost desperation hardly knows where to find range for his flocks. All this forces him either to purchase outright or to hire from the State or private parties spring and fall grazing grounds. In the summer he tries to secure a permit to graze on some forest reserve, and sometimes is successful, or partially so. The forest-reserve policy of gradually cutting down every year the number of sheep that the sheepman may graze on a reserve is productive of much injury to the business. The applicant aims to keep from each fall to spring as many sheep as he has had on the reserve the previous summer. When spring comes he often gets a cut of from 10 to 25 per cent off his previous permit, and what to do with the animals included in such cut he does not know. He can not sell them at that time, for they are too thin and there are in most cases too few of them to make a herd alone. Experienced sheepmen have proved that the only profitable and practical way to run sheep is to run two ewe bands in the summer, cared for by two herders and one camp mover, merge the two herds in the fall, and either feed them hay or send the strong sheep to the Utah, Wyoming, or Nevada deserts during the winter, feeding the old ewes and thin lambs at home. The winter desert grazing method is a very risky and dangerous one, many sheepmen having lost the savings of a decade in one severe winter on the desert.

Our industry is now conducted in such a way that each sheepman must now own his own corrals for handling, separating, dipping, and shearing his sheep. In many cases a separate corral or inclosure must be built for each of these operations. Besides this, he is compelled either to hire from the settlers or from the State government land on which to lamb his flocks in the spring. During the last 10 years scores of sheepmen have been forced to purchase irrigated land on which to raise oats and hay for their sheep and horses, as the thin, old ewes and thin rams, wethers, and lambs can not go on the desert, but must stay at home and be fed hay and sometimes grain during the whole of the winter, as if they were thin when they went down on the desert, the chances are that they would either die on the way down or perish from exposure, which none but fat, hardy sheep can possibly endure or survive.

The high, almost extortionate rate—from 8 to 12 per cent per annum—of interest charged by every bank in the West is another very heavy incubus on this industry. Very often, and especially so during

the last two years, sheepmen have been forced to mortgage all their real estate and chattel mortgage every sheep in their flocks to obtain money to conduct their business. During the last few years some banks, having chattel mortgages on the herds, have refused to allow sheepmen to risk their flocks on the winter range, and have also declined to lend them more money to buy hay. This has forced many a sheepman to either accept almost any offer for his sheep at home, or to put his whole herd—ewes, lambs, rams, everything—on the cars, ship them East, and dump them on a falling market for any obtainable price.

High wages, ranging from \$50 to \$75 per month and board and bedding, are paid to sheep herders. Camp movers (embryotic sheep herders) receive from \$40 to \$55 per month, including board and bedding. Boarding expenses would not be such a heavy tax if these men would be economical with their supplies, etc., for it costs many a sheepman much more to board two herders and one camp mover at the sheep camp than to feed his whole family at home. If it cost the sheepman as much per capita to feed his family at home as it does to feed his employees at their camps he would immediately call in a referee or receiver in bankruptcy. The vast majority of the sheepman's employees will not eat the class of food that their employer will and must. The old adage, "Put a beggar on horseback and he'll ride to the devil," receives one of its most truthful and forceful illustrations in their case. The herder who can not and will not purchase with his own means delicacies for his table at his own home refuses to work unless his employer procure them for him at the sheep camp. Two herders who boasted of having lived on \$9 per month per man last winter refused to accept \$15 (in lieu of board) per month per man this summer, even if free flour, mutton, and potatoes were also furnished them. In practically all cases the extravagance of the sheepmen's employees forces him and his family to endure a domestic economy that is almost parsimony. Almost all men employed by sheepmen must have the most expensive kind of food, no matter what it costs, no matter whether their employers can afford to furnish it or not, or they will not stay with him. Waste and carelessness and extravagance seem to characterize all their operations. If the sheepmen could obtain as good, reliable, and obedient help as the banks, stores, railroads, etc., they would be a happy class of men. It is a standing joke among the sheepmen in the West that when they want something good to eat they tell their wives, "Guess I'll go to the sheep camp to get a square meal." The high prices for camp supplies, in the shape of groceries, canned goods, etc., add very greatly to the cost of conducting this industry. This would not be so bad if their employees would be as careful as any prudent man should be with his employer's supplies and property, but as before said, waste, carelessness, and extravagance seem to be these men's rules, to which there is little if any exception. Concerning the irresponsible nature of the labor employed perforce by sheepmen it might be well to state an obvious fact, that many a sheepman is forced to employ a herder and trust him with tens of thousands of dollars' worth of property to whom he might and probably would refuse to lend a dollar were he not in his employ. This paradox is a fact. Perhaps the less said of this feature of the case the better for the sheepman's peace of mind, for this is the sheepman's greatest trouble. He does not complain of paying good wages to good men, but of the unfortunate and unprofitable fact that good wages, good board, good bedding, and good treatment will seldom obtain and retain good men. They will often leave him at a moment's notice with a herd or herds of sheep on his hands, when it is absolute cowardice and inhumanity for them to think of doing so. Of course there are occasionally some notable exceptions, but these only go to prove the truth of the rule.

During the last two or three years sheepmen have been compelled to pay the same prices for herding, lambing, camp moving, dipping, and shearing that prevailed when the industry was flourishing. Last spring a committee appointed by the National and State Woolgrowers' Association waited on a committee appointed by the sheepshearers' union and on account of the losses endured tried to induce the union to reduce the price of shearing at least 1 per cent per head. All the satisfaction the sheepmen's committee secured was a demand for the sheepmen to "come through" with the same old prices.

The high railroad freight rates, ranging from \$2 to \$3 per hundred-weight, prevailing on wool from the intermountain region to the Atlantic coast adds very greatly to the cost of conducting this industry, and these prices prevail whether the wool nets the sheepmen 10 cents or 25 cents per pound. It may be well to state here that the transcontinental freight rate on wool from the Pacific to the Atlantic seaboard is considerable less than half the rate from the intermountain region—one-third of the way across the continent—to the Atlantic coast. Of course the fact that there is no competition, and the further fact that the sheepman must ship his wool to the eastern market on the railroad nearest to his shearing corral, causes this extortionate charge on the part of the railroads.

Cost of the forest-reserve fees and the regulations made by the Forest Bureau, while they may have been, and perhaps have been, of some assistance to some sheepmen, have likewise been a further tax to be added to the sheepman's expenses.

In this State—Idaho—the sheepmen have a 2-mile-limit law to contend with. This forces them to keep their sheep away at least 2 miles from any farm, ranch, town, fence, or sign of habitation, and the only way that the unfortunate sheepman can obtain any feed on the public land near a farm or ranch is by wearing out checkbooks in paying ranchers for the privilege. Besides this, some counties—Bear Lake, in particular—have made regulations through their commissioners creating "herd districts" on the public land of the United States, thus forcing the sheepmen, under fine and imprisonment penalties, to keep off such districts. In this county if the 2-mile-limit law were enforced strictly—which it would be if the sheepmen did not pay the ranchers for the privilege of herding sheep near their ranches—and if the herd-district laws were always strictly enforced, every sheepman would have to leave the county.

The sheepman is also forced to pay taxes in every county and State through which his herd passes. In some counties he occasionally obtains a rebate, but in most of such cases he is often forced to threaten to sue the county before he can obtain it. Not only is this the case, but by the way of piling Pellon upon Ossa, the poor, unfortunate sheepman is always compelled to pay full annual taxes for the whole year in every State through which his herd passes. Some winter on the deserts in Nevada, Utah, or Wyoming, lamb and shear on the trail north, and summer in Idaho or north Wyoming. The ubiquity of the tax collector and his deputies, so far as sheep is concerned, is proverbial. They seem to be omnipresence personified. Like the trusts, banks, and rail-

roads, "they catch the sheepman coming, going, in between, and then some." Some members of the association, one in particular, have paid full yearly taxes during the last two years in the three different States—Idaho, Utah, and Nevada—and some have done the same in five different counties. The Idaho tax collector takes no official cognizance of a tax receipt from Utah. The Utah tax collector follows suit, and the Nevada tax collector, not wishing to be singular, thinks it is his duty to do as the others do and make the motion unanimous. The victim is only a sheepman, has few, if any, friends, and has money to throw away. The sheepman, unlike the professional tax dodger—the coupon cutter—can not evade his taxes. He can not, if he would, dodge or evade his taxes. His woolly friends are only too evident.

Another great outrage to him is the fact that railroads, railroad and private stock yards, commission houses, etc., charge about \$200 to ship from the intermountain region, and market a car of sheep on the Missouri River. This must be paid whether the sheep net the price or not, and they must be sold on the day of their arrival, no matter how much they have shrunk in flesh, as they always do, on the way.

The slow speed of the stock cars, which have been known to take 10 days or more from Pocatello or Ogden to the Missouri River, makes the animals shrink considerably in flesh, and as sheep are always sold by weight at all the sheep markets, this takes away a very great deal more of the profit. Lots of sheepmen do not know their own stuff when they see it on the market, especially if they foolishly trust it to the herders or other help to accompany it to the market. It is a common thing for fruit trains to have the right of way East over sheep cars. One sheepman who owns a small orchard, as well as a few sheep, says that his pocketbook knows no difference between a loss from the shrink of his sheep or from the decomposition of his fruit. Everything seems to have the right of way over a sheep car. Many a sheepman has often seen his sheep car sidetracked that such perishable freight as coal, lumber, and gravel may not be hindered on the way. In fact, if the sheepman is wise and wants a good run to the eastern market he slips a little change to the yardmaster and gets his sheep cars put on a fruit train. He would like to get them attached to a faster than fruit train.

It is also a notorious fact that wool, one of the most important and valuable products of the sheep industry, has during the last two years declined about one-third in value. There was a time, a few years ago, when the wool and wether lambs from a herd would pay its annual expenses, but this is no longer true.

The prevailing and prospective uncertainty in the wool and mutton markets is very much worse for this industry than perhaps the actual withdrawal of the tariff on such things may be. Capital is proverbially very timid and will not invest where uncertain conditions prevail; and the uncertain conditions that prevailed last year are prevailing this season and threaten to continue during next year, have done the wool business almost irreparable and incalculable injury.

Many sheepmen in the West, commendably desiring to improve their flocks, have never purchased or bred anything but pure-bred rams. During the last few years the price of these animals, instead of decreasing as wool and mutton have done, seems to be and is increasing. The breeders of such stock plead when asked for cheaper prices, that very same excuse to the sheepman that he is pleading, viz, increased expenses, etc. It is impossible for the self-respecting sheepman to succeed in this business unless he improves his flocks by purchasing purebred sires. Not only is the first cost of these animals high, but they must be taken out of the ewe herd in the middle of the year and herded separately from that time till late in the fall or early winter, when their services are needed in the ewe band. This necessitates another herder, camp mover, camp outfit, and the heavy expenses incident thereto. The necessity for the high feeding of the rams during November and December every year adds very greatly to the fixed expense account.

To still further assist the sheepman in the road to bankruptcy court all the principal railroads in the West have recently raised the rates on rams in carload lots from the sheepman's ranch to the ewe band in the desert, where they are annually unloaded in December and put into the herd, and the same increased rates prevail when they are returned home in the middle of the winter. When the Oregon Short Line and the Southern Pacific Railroad officials were recently asked for the cause of the before-mentioned increased freight rates on rams in carload lots to and from the desert they replied that they had raised the rates because the Western Pacific had done so. Inquiry at the office of the Western Pacific elicited the response that the Western Pacific had raised rates because the Southern Pacific and O. S. L. R. R. had done the same. What a delightful instance of telepathy and induced unanimity of sentiment and action on the part of the railroad officials in their frantic efforts to assist the wealthy sheepman to become a multimillionaire! Such unselfish efforts ought to receive the attention and commendation of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The worst thing with which the sheepman has to contend is the class of help he is forced to employ, and the unfortunate fact that when he pays for good help he is seldom able to obtain it, but next to this great loss is the one sustained by predatory animals, viz, coyotes, wolves, mountain lions, bears, etc., and especially the ravages of the coyotes, which seem to be increasing annually. Most sheepmen think themselves lucky if they lose only 10 per cent of the ewes and lambs on the summer range. During the last two years poisonous weeds have grown up and multiplied on the range, and this spring scores and scores of sheep in every herd have been killed by them. The only feasible remedy for the loss by predatory animals seems to be that the Federal Government and the States afflicted by them shall all pay the same amount of bounty for such of their wild animals.

It is a notorious fact that the sheepman has had heavy losses on the deserts during the last few winters, especially during the winter before last. One of the members of the association declares that during the last two years he has only met one sheepman who confessed that he had made any money, and he knows that he lied because he wintered near him on the desert, and the two herds lambed, sheared, and shipped mutton East together.

Last summer was acknowledged to be the driest season in the history of the intermountain region. Sheep came off the range thin. Lambs were small and thin in the fall, and, consequently, fetched low prices in the markets. Lots of sheepmen for the first time in their lives were forced to sell their ewe as well as their wether lambs. The true sheepman always tries to retain his ewe lambs because they are always better in quality than their dams, so that his herd may increase in value if not in numbers.

During the autumn of 1909 there was a species of venereal disease among the rams which cost sheepmen scores of thousands of dollars. It was impossible to put them in the ewe bands till late in the middle

of the winter. This made the 1910 lambs smaller in the fall, thus depreciating their value. The disease was eradicated only by heroic and strenuous efforts, and the expenditure and loss of a great amount of money.

The cost of complying with Federal and State regulations made expressly for sheepmen is not inconsiderable, and while no true sheepman objects to these regulations, which he knows are made for his benefit, and which he is not only willing but anxious to comply with, not only for his own sake but for the sake of other herds and the community at large, still a further depleted bank balance is the result of such compliance.

During the last few years hay and grain for winter feeding have not only been high in price but scarce, and, consequently, difficult to obtain. Some sheepmen have paid as high as \$20 per ton for hay. The average price has been from \$5 to \$8 per ton. The high prices prevailing for grain (from \$2.50 to \$3.50 per hundredweight) used by the sheepman's horses and the extortionate prices charged for supplies during the winter by the little stores in and around the edges of the desert, have added greatly to swell the expense account. To add to their trouble some sheepmen have been charged from \$500 to \$1,000 per herd for the privilege of obtaining winter grazing leases on land claimed by railroads and other companies. In many instances, these high prices charged by these companies, who have secured the alternate sections of land, have prevented sheepmen from using vacant Government lands, because the parties claiming these lands have refused to allow sheep herds to cross their lands in order to reach Government lands to which these people had no title.

One of the members of our executive committee has a cousin, Henry E. Horne, living at Old Castle, Leadville, New South Wales, who informed us that he can make good money by selling his wool for 6d. a pound and his lambs for 10s. each. He can borrow money from the Australian banks for only 5 per cent per annum, and rent at a nominal price tens of thousands of acres of good grazing grounds from the Australian Government. His lands being all fenced, he has few herders to employ. His principal labor expense is to keep up half of the fences around his inclosure. His neighbors keep up the other half. He obtains help for less money and at less expense than we can possibly do. He has no winter feeding to do, no expensive camp outfits to maintain, no hard winters to contend with, and his greatest expense is at shearing time. If, and when, the sheepmen of the United States have to meet such competition as this they may just as well order cars enough to take their whole herds to market, dump them on the same, accepting any obtainable price, use the money in part liquidation of their obligations, and trust to Providence to permit them to liquidate the rest at some future time. There are more sheep herds, farms, ranches, and homes owned by sheepmen under mortgage to-day than at any other time in the history of this industry. Many banks in Boise, Salt Lake City, Pocatello, and Ogden have from \$5 to \$6 invested in each sheepman's ewe belonging to their customers and debtors. What the end will be Omnipotence alone can tell. One fact is certain, that if there is much more tinkering with the wool tariff most sheepmen will and must gravitate back to sheep herding for their more fortunate sheepmen—the few who have purses long and well-filled enough to stand the financial strain. They will leave sheep owning and go back once more to sheep herding, but their loss will be their employer's gain, for there will then be a very much better class of labor in this industry than the United States has ever seen. The average man that we employ to-day is our *bête noire*. "If we praise him, he strikes us for a raise; and if we roast him, he jumps his job." He often dictates terms of both peace and war to his employer.

We do not like to bother you too much with this affair, but we deem it our duty to this industry, to our wives and children, and even to the whole country, to state these facts. We respectfully submit them for your consideration, and we implore you once more to do all that you possibly can to prevent any legislation inimical to this useful and indispensable industry.

The ridiculous and utterly indefensible idea that selling wool in the grease for 5 or even 10 cents less to the wool buyer will make woolen clothing any cheaper is the most laughable and ridiculous idea ever emanating from that most ridiculous of all sources—a Democratic brain. The value of the wool in a suit of clothes has and will cut very little ice in its value after the tailor, retailer, etc., get a whack at their customer. The retailer can always be depended on to care for himself. He always has a lot of specious excuses to offer in defense of his high prices. The duty was taken off hides, but who buys shoes any cheaper? And echo answers: "Who? Who?"

The Democratic policy spells dismay, disaster, and bankruptcy to the whole sheep industry of the United States. The American people are needing and will soon use all the mutton and wool that can possibly be raised in this country. The American sheepman ought to raise it. The American sheepman is unwilling and unable, however willing he might be, to meet competition from the South American or even from the Australian sheepman. In the Democratic policy the American sheepman sees his finish, but he will have the supreme satisfaction and consolation of dragging the Democratic Party down to defeat with him in November, 1912.

The poor, unfortunate American sheepman, bound, blinded, and tortured by his life-long enemies, the Democratic Philistines, may be, and evidently is, doomed to financial defeat, disaster, and death; but instead of being the sport of his enemies, he will, if and when he fails, pull down the already tottering pillars of the Democratic tariff temple and cause his enemies to perish politically with him not later than the next general election.

We are ready to answer any questions, and, if necessary, to send a sheepman thoroughly acquainted with the business and with these facts to meet you or any Senate committee at any time or place you may please to designate for the purpose of furnishing any and all further information in our power.

Believing and knowing that you will do all you can for us, and thanking you cordially for all your past efforts in our behalf, we have the honor to remain, sir,

Your most obedient servants,

L. B. LEVERICH, President.
J. G. CRANE, Clerk.

Mr. HEYBURN. I will say that this table gives a very clear and succinct idea and statement as to the cost of every feature and phase of the sheep industry, and it is formulated by a man who is capable of doing it honestly and in a useful manner.

I desire, with reference to the cost and relation of the wool and the sheep, to read the following from the discussion of Mr.

Hagenbarth before the Committee on Finance. He was asked to give the relative value of the wool and the sheep. On page 34 he says:

The average value of mutton product per head, five years, is \$2.0172.
The average value of the wool product per head for five years is \$1.1494.
Giving for sheep a value of \$3.1616.

I present that for the purpose of showing the relation between the value of the sheep and the wool.

Now, when you make wool unprofitable the sheep goes; the thing of greater value goes. As I said to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] yesterday, it can disappear almost entirely in a year or two, because men will not allow a profitless animal to occupy and graze upon their lands; they will try to do something else with it.

When you destroy the flocks of this country, as it will appear from an examination of the Statistical Abstract, it takes from five to seven years to reinstate them, because sheep are not grown overnight, and men must reaccumulate the land for pasture, and then the breeding stock, and then time must elapse until they multiply according to the rules of nature.

During all of that time you are at the mercy of the foreign market. You have destroyed your own source of production, and the foreigner has stepped in and supplanted you in the home market, and when conditions are revived under which you can engage in the business profitably you can not start out and say, "To-morrow morning I will start in the sheep business and begin to reap profits and benefits." You can say, "I will begin to get some land; I will begin to get some breeding sheep; and then I will wait until in the process of a few years we will be able to dispense with this foreigner who has come into our home market."

There is a little joker in this bill that is rather funny. There are 7,000,000 animals now grazing on the forest reserves. The General Government itself will be out of a customer for the grass that grows on the reserves, because those animals will just as surely disappear from the forest reserves as from any other part of the country when it is not profitable to raise them. Then I suppose the Government will have to look for some wild animals with which to stock the forest reserves. I do not know what they will substitute for those sheep.

Mr. President, the question is worthy of a fuller discussion or consideration, but, as the Bible says, "Ephraim is joined to idols: let him alone." That seems to be the condition here, and the Ephraims are those who are going to support this measure.

Just take our own State. I now have a report which is reliable. The total of the sheep now on the range in Idaho is valued at \$10,000,000—I give the round figures, but the sum is much more—and the average value of a sheep is \$6.30. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] seemed to express some surprise that the number of sheep had not continued to grow. He had not taken into consideration the fact that there was a standard beyond which it is not necessary to grow. The ranges are full; the industry is at flood tide; yet the other day when this free-wool bill came in from the House of Representatives wool dropped 4 cents a pound. How can Congress, a great dignified body, play the child and stick its finger into the machinery of a delicate clock or watch and giggle while it does it and wreck the beauty of the mechanism? That is what they are doing when they introduce this bill to revise or reduce the duties on wool. They are as ignorant of the effect of their act as is the child who projects its finger into the machinery, because it does not happen to grow under their feet or around their doors. They know about the thing that represents their bread and butter to them or their luxury or comfort, but they are impatient with the man who lives, perchance, a few miles away and seeks the exercise of his right and his duty here to present the interests of those people, and they say, "Oh, we are not interested in those people; they live out in the woods; they live on the frontier."

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President—

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

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes.

Mr. CLAPP. In criticizing the lack of knowledge on the part of those who have taken up the wool matter, I fear the Senator from Idaho has lost sight of the wonderful evidence of their thorough familiarity with the subject, which was indicated by the dictionary which they attached to their report. Does the Senator remember that?

Mr. HEYBURN. Who did that?

Mr. CLAPP. Presumably the committee; but I do not know.

Mr. HEYBURN. What committee? Let us have it so definite that the man who reads this record in the future will never be in doubt.

Mr. CLAPP. Has the Senator a copy of it?

Mr. SMOOT. It was the Ways and Means Committee?

Mr. CLAPP. Yes, sir.

Mr. HEYBURN. The Ways and Means Committee of what?

Mr. SMOOT. Of the House of Representatives.

Mr. HEYBURN. And they attached the dictionary to the report? I have read that. I do not object to being funny sometimes, but I do not want to be that funny.

Mr. CLAPP. In the light of that dictionary, can the Senator from Idaho question the familiarity of those gentlemen with the subject?

Mr. HEYBURN. I could, but the Senator from Minnesota having anticipated me, having explained it, I shall not engage in that.

The impatience, however, that is shown by those who do not happen to know the difference between a sheep and a goat, when men presume to stand here and do their duty, is shown by the fact that they go away. They come back occasionally when they are sent for. They think, however, we ought to vote. There is a class of men who think that when they have spoken all has been said, and that after that any conversation is superfluous. We have had some instances of it, where a man would stand up and declaim long and loud and eloquently and beautifully and sit down and draw a long breath and say, "Now vote; that is all there is to be said."

Mr. President, I hope that during this leisurely hour some Senator may be induced to inquire whether or not he is entirely sure that he is pursuing the right path. I am not going to argue with the Democrats; I never converted a Democrat in my life; I talk to them; they attend meetings where I speak, and they greet me gracefully and pleasantly, but I never suspected that I converted one of them. Let them be Democrats; let them so vote. If they should vote the Republican ticket I should lose confidence in them. [Laughter.] But when I talk to Republicans I have a right to demand, I have a right to plead with them, I have a right to urge upon them their duty. It is a right which exists and belongs to every one of us. We have no right to go into a controversy of this kind with our minds closed against change. Otherwise we might as well vote immediately upon the reading of the bill or the report on it.

Mr. President, I am looking not so much to to-day because to-day is mortgaged; this political hour is mortgaged to the verge of bankruptcy, but I am looking to the future. Some Senators will stand on this floor some day in sackcloth and ashes, because they will stand discredited as loyal members of a great party that represents a great principle. They may not confess it. I have been through several of these political cyclones, but I never went to the cyclone cellar. I stood out, and I felt the winds and saw the waves and buffeted them. I saw in the State where I live a condition that may have existed elsewhere, but I doubt it, where it was charged that we would not be given the right or the opportunity to vote for the Republican candidate for President because there should be no election. I sat in a convention under the threat that it would be captured; but we had policemen at the doors, and those who went in had a card with the chairman's name on it as evidence of their right of admission. That convention nominated an electoral ticket, and they nominated a ticket which represented Republican principles untainted by any hyphen. They only cast about 7,600 votes for that ticket out of a great many thousand, but those 7,600 votes were the leaven of the loaf, and that loaf rose from that day until we gave a Republican candidate for President 30,000 majority out of less than 80,000 votes. I am looking forward to those conditions, but they will not arise in my State if I can help it. I do not intend to temporize or compromise. I intend to support the nominee of the Republican Party, and I intend to promise on his behalf that the Republicans of the United States—the more than 7,000,000 of them—will send to the Congress of the United States a Republican majority that will enact laws along Republican lines and in conformity with Republican principles.

I am going to promise that from the rostrum wherever I speak for the nominee of the Republican convention, let him be who he may, I am not going outside of the house and throw stones at the windows because, forsooth, the fire has gone out. I am going to stay in that house, and I am going to live there in comfort, if I can, but I am going to submit myself to whatever discomforts may come and keep on repairing the house. That is my idea of being a Republican.

Now, to my friend from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER]—and I say it in all consideration—does it not seem a little like throwing stones at our own mansion to be throwing this free-wool bill and free-list bill at the Democrats? They like it; they just seize it with the avidity that a fish would seize the bait, because it is in their direction. They believe in those principles, and you are not hurting them any. It reminds me of the man who tried

to freeze a dog to death by holding him at the northeast corner of the house in the nighttime. You can not choke the Democrats by throwing free trade at them, but you may choke yourselves. That is what I mean by saying to the Senator, I am not going to throw stones at the windows of our house in order that they may get in.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

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

Mr. HEYBURN. Certainly.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator from Idaho directed his remarks to me.

Mr. HEYBURN. In kindness.

Mr. McCUMBER. In kindness always, I know. I might suggest to the Senator that the Republican mansion is built in harmony, in symmetry, and in justice, and the moment that you displace the relationship of one part of that structure to another, that moment you are producing an inharmony, and the only thing that is left us to do is to harmonize other parts as much as we can. The Republican party stands for protection, and it stands for protection so applied that the benefits, so far as the protective idea is concerned, will be made as nearly equal and in as near a line of exact justice to all industries concerned as possible. That has been disarranged. I will stay with the Senator in the house. I purpose to support the Republican nominee; I purpose at all times to be a Republican. The Senator has known that I have stood as such in the storm, and in very bitter storm, and I am able to do it again.

I may disagree with the Senator as to just exactly what shall be my attitude as to changing one schedule to conform to another schedule that has already been changed, and still with him maintain the same high regard for the Republican Party. I simply maintain that, when you have put everything on the free list which the farmer produces, there is no injustice in attempting to harmonize some of the things which the farmer buys upon the idea of a closer conformity with the prices at which he sells.

I agree with the Senator absolutely in that I will stand for the same proposition that he does to get a plank in the Republican platform that the next Republican nominee must stand on, demanding equal protection to all of the industries of the country; and I will take my chances upon that being the policy of the next administration. But in the little matter of how to remedy conditions in our house at the present time we may differ as to how far we may go.

I want to say to the Senator that I have not indicated my views upon the particular matter of which he has been speaking, and that is the wool schedule, and possibly he misapprehends my position upon that subject.

Mr. HEYBURN. No; I intended to be entirely impersonal; but I am free to admit that I did look at and direct my remarks to the Senator from North Dakota, in a measure, yet in a very impersonal measure. It was rather to point a principle than in the way of attack.

The Senator speaks about a little thing. This little weapon that is to be hurled into the ranks of Democracy will be a boomerang. It has the curve in it, and it will come sailing back and strike Republican protection on the head, and it will not skin a single Democrat. [Laughter.] You want to be very careful what weapon you take up. You must first know how to use the weapon and be quite sure that the other man is not more skillful in its use than you are.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, will the Senator pardon an interruption?

Mr. HEYBURN. Certainly.

Mr. CLAPP. I heard several Senators approve of the Senator's suggestion that this will be a boomerang that will come back and strike the head of the Republican Party. I want to suggest to some of the Senators that when they have violated the fundamental principle of Republicanism in striking down one of the great industries of this country there will be something perhaps other than the head only of the Republican Party left for the boomerang to react on.

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes, Mr. President. Imagine carrying such a policy forward in the Alamo, with a lot of men fighting an enemy on the outside and needing every life and every arm that was inside the wall, getting into a quarrel among themselves and killing half of their number—that strikes me as being about the proposition—and then undertaking to continue their defense with the remaining number. No; that will not do. You can not win any contest in life in that way. You may feel like it; we all have those impulses sometimes to strike close at home, but the wise man does not do so.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

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

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes.

Mr. McCUMBER. When there is a mutiny in the ranks of the Army what is the first duty of the commander?

Mr. BAILEY. To surrender.

Mr. McCUMBER. To surrender or to take care of the mutiny, and then, after he has disposed of that, to go ahead upon his original lines of battle?

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I intended that my remarks should be directed against the formation of a mutiny. I do not believe that the discontent in the Republican Party has gone so far as to be incapable or impossible of adjustment and correction—not by yielding Republican principles, but by pointing out to those who think they have a grievance the fact that they also have an enemy. They have a grievance, and they have a common enemy at the same time.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield further to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes.

Mr. McCUMBER. Does the Senator not agree with me that a certain portion of Republican Senators are to-day, by their votes upon the reciprocity agreement, attacking the citadel of Republican policy?

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes; but they are a minority.

Mr. McCUMBER. Very well; I want to deal with that minority.

Mr. HEYBURN. If we do not succeed in teaching the minority of Republicans in the Senate that they are making a mistake, the Republicans of the country will do so, and they will never forget that they have been so taught.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

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

Mr. HEYBURN. Certainly.

Mr. NELSON. I should be glad to hear the Senator from Idaho inform us how we can educate the leader of our party, the head of our party, and bring him back into the true Republican lines of protection?

Mr. HEYBURN. Who is the leader and head of the party? [Laughter.]

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, if this does not indicate a mutiny in the Republican Party, I do not know how to describe one.

Mr. HEYBURN. Let us see—

Mr. BAILEY. There is a debate as to who is the real leader.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Following the debate on yesterday as to the real principles of the Democratic Party.

Mr. BAILEY. How can an army win a battle while it is disputing as to who its general is?

Mr. HEYBURN. Well, generals have gone down in battle, and armies have selected other generals who led them to victory.

Mr. BAILEY. But you do not know whom to select.

Mr. HEYBURN. There will be a coming together of the Republicans, and they will know whom to select. This is not the first time that internal dissension has caused us to enter into a house cleaning. We have succeeded heretofore.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. WORKS. The beauty of it seems to be that the meeting is between reactionaries.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, "reactionary" is a nice word; it is a very fine word to conjure with in the newspapers. They use it. The man they do not like is "a reactionary." There is no such thing as a reactionary in politics; there is none in this body at least, although there may be some outside. I am not going to be diverted by the calling of names—"reactionary." I have stood in the ranks and fought with the Republicans—that is, alongside of them, not against them—all my life. I was born before the Republican Party existed. My first teachings and my first impulses were in the direction of the principles of the Republican Party. I have never abandoned them for a moment. I have seen men abandon them to the regret of their lives. I remember in 1872 or 1873 one of the foremost men in the State in which I lived coming to my father, who was always a staunch Republican, and he said, "John, we have got to leave the old Republican Party and go with this new movement. It represents progression; it represents a lot of other things that are fashionable now." My father said, "John"—this was Forney, of the Philadelphia Press—"it is

easier to leave a party than it is to get back into it. I will stay in the Republican Party, and if you come back and knock at the door in a spirit of true repentance some day I will admit you." He never came back. The same was true of Andrew G. Curtin. I heard him argue with my father in regard to going out of the Republican Party, and he got the same answer. He went out; but, like Forney, he never came back. Gov. Curtin came to the House of Representatives as a Democrat, and the only way he knew he was a Democrat was that he saw a "D" after his name in the Congressional Directory. [Laughter.] Poor Forney died of a broken heart because he did not get to the United States Senate.

No; these are not new questions. There is a fundamental principle behind both great political parties. One is right and the other is wrong; but no Republican can find any excuse on earth for supporting this Canadian reciprocity bill or any amendment that is offered to it that would justify his action in my eyes or that will justify his action in his own eyes 10 years from now; and the man who does not see 10 years ahead in his political life is not a wise man or a safe man. You want to be very sure that you are going to be able to vote for yourself 10 years hence or stay away from the election.

You are going to strip this country of one of its great industries. There is no more doubt about that than there is that the sun will rise and set on the day in which you do this infamous thing. There is no personal element in what I say. It is an infamous thing because of the result that flows from it. You are going to strip the country of its clothing and take chances on some foreigner clothing you; you are going to be a beggar at the door of some other nation for clothes to wear; and they will charge you what they please and place the burdens that suit them upon the mercy that they grant you. That is what you are going to do. Would you rather be clothed by France or Spain or Mexico or Australia than by your neighbor, whose flocks graze under your vision and in the green fields that are your benefit as well as his? That is the question. Do you choose, rather, that some other Government shall make the laws under which your commodities are furnished you than that you make them yourselves? What will you say to the laborer when you take away his employment? When I say "laborer" I include all men in this country, for I do not legislate for the loafer; he simply creeps under the tent. The American people are a laboring people in the various vocations and walks of life, and the same right and consideration runs to all of them from Congress. Are you going to say to the people because, forsooth, some community with which you happen to be better acquainted will not be affected by this bill, that you have no further interest in it?

What are you going to substitute for these industries when you turn men away from their employment, in the lumber industry, for instance? One of the largest industries in the United States is that of lumber. The largest amount of wages paid is that in the lumber business, and yet you shut them out, and you say "We will not buy lumber of our own citizens; we will buy lumber of the foreigner, and we will be subject to the laws that the foreigners make in reference to its production and its sale," and you turn those millions of your workmen loose. Where are they to go? Will they go down into the fields of the South and say to you, "We are American citizens; we are hungry; we want an opportunity not to beg, but to work." What will you say to them? You will say, "Where have you been working?" They will answer, "We have been working in the great forests of this country to make the lumber to be used to protect the people and build up their civilization." You will ask them, "Why did you leave there?" And they will reply, "Because you voted me away. You said to me by your vote you shall not any longer labor in this field; we will allow the foreigner to do what you are doing, and you take your chances." Does that not appeal to men who are charged with the responsibility of creating equal opportunities, not for all the people of the earth, but equal opportunities for our own people. The legislator who would stand here in this body and legislate for equal opportunities for all the people of the earth with our own people should be subject to the recall. If there is any one case on earth where I would support the recall, it would be in that contingency.

Just think of it, a man, lacking an intelligent comprehension of the purpose and the principles of our Government, thinking that we must take into consideration the people of other countries when we legislate to control the industries of our own people! Such a man has no place here. We are a family Government. Our first duty is to the people of this country.

I have heard it said here that the line north of us, between this country and Canada, is a dim one, a geographical line, and various kinds of a line, always minimized. It should be

the best marked line of any boundary of the United States, because there is more reason for it. It is easier of crossing by the man who would encroach upon us, who would come into our country and take our markets and contribute not even the duty of citizenship, not even the duty of bearing arms in defense of our country, of paying taxes to support it. The man who would come across this line that is boasted to be an indefinite line is the most dangerous man that you could admit. We can see a ship land at our seaports. We keep an eye on our southern boundary line. But here to the north a man may walk across the line with a hundred thousand dollars' worth of dutiable goods in his pocket. Is there any other line upon which vigilance is so necessary and so justified as upon that line?

And yet, I repeat, they minimize it as an argument why we should disregard its existence. Yes; they call it an imaginary line. I have seen men and heard them in this country to whom patriotism was an imaginary principle. But they are not the men in whose hands we can place the tiller ropes. The only argument that has been advanced in favor of it is that somebody wants it.

I have said many times that if there was any argument that would compel me to vote against a man who wanted an office it was the argument that he wanted it. Of course, that is the foundation principle—I hesitate to diverge—of the direct primary, where the man runs after the office and no office runs after the man, and the only reason he ever puts forward is: "I want it and I am willing to pay the admission fee. How much is it?" That is all there is of it. He is required to pay an admission fee in that kind of politics.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. President—

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

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes.

Mr. DIXON. I am very much interested in hearing an orthodox Republican speech made here in these days, but the suggestion of the man paying the entrance fee in the primary recalls to my mind that there have been elections recently in this country where there was a pretty heavy fee paid not under the primary system.

Mr. HEYBURN. That is very likely. I do not know anything about it. But all the direct primary laws require what one might call an "ante," and your name can not go on the ticket without it; your name does not receive consideration until you have paid it up.

Mr. President, we are being confronted with that kind of an argument here. We are told that somebody demands it. Why, great heavens, the United States Senate stands appalled before the statement that "you will take that bill and you will not alter it. Do you see?" That is the spirit in which it comes in here. "You will not amend it." The Senate of the United States, invested with the power of legislation and the duty of conscientious and separate action, are told, "You will take that bill as we give it to you, and you will not amend it. If you do, we will wreak vengeance on you. We will keep you here during the hot weather. We will do anything else that we can to you." And the Senate cringes and bends its knee before that edict.

I would look closer into a measure that came with that challenge, because of the challenge. I would suspect the intelligence and the motive of the power that would assume to exercise that control over the Senate individually or collectively.

The Senate of the United States, whose proud boast it is that it is the highest legislative body in the world, submit to a dictation of that kind from anyone on earth! And to submit to it from some one who has no legislative power, some one who by the conscience of law and government is bidden to keep his hands off the coordinate branches of the Government!

Has the day come when men in this body fear to disregard the dictation of anyone? For fear of what? The Senator who has anything to fear should go into counsel with his conscience.

Mr. President, while this may seem apart from the wool schedule, it is the very heart and soul of it, because it comes here wrapped in the flag of the pirate. It comes here discredited by the threat against the right of the free exercise of the duties of the high office that rest upon us. It is not too late in this hour, Republicans, this hour, to repudiate any dictation as to how and when we shall legislate in the performance of our duty. Let us get out from under this spell. It is like a deadly cloud which seems to have fallen upon Republicans. They are affrighted. Stand up and proclaim not only the right of action, but the determination to act! Did ever such a measure come before Congress in the history of this country—and I have gone back since these debates commenced for the purpose of investigating the question—did such a measure ever come into Congress and pass without any amendment?

Why is it? Is the spirit of empire rising up over the people to dominate them? Have the days when the people dared speak for themselves in their own councils gone by? We are the people. There is no voice of the people but that of the Congress. The people must either speak through Congress or they are dumb. Laws originate here, under the Constitution. They are formulated and finally determined upon here, and there is no other tribunal on earth authorized to make laws for the people of the United States. It is the spirit of self-government, and when we forget it the people's rights are in danger. Whenever the time comes when any man or set of men or coterie of men can state a line of action to be followed by Congress without controversy, then Congress has fallen from her high position to one that courts—I was going to use a harsher word—discredit.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President—

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

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes.

Mr. CLAPP. The Senator says that Congress has fallen in that—

Mr. HEYBURN. No; I did not. I said "if."

Mr. CLAPP. I will say if. I am in complete sympathy with the Senator, but I want to ask him if he does not go farther than that, and in that equation alone from which there can come representation to the various sections of this country. If this condition is to continue, would he not go a step farther and say that the country had fallen?

Mr. HEYBURN. That day will never come.

Mr. CLAPP. It will come unless we enter and maintain a protest against it.

Mr. HEYBURN. No; 90,000,000 people with the right to govern themselves will govern themselves right.

Mr. CLAPP. Then there will have to be some sort of a change, for those 90,000,000 people are to-day interested in this very legislation and powerless to meet the dictation that comes from one single source.

I am in complete accord with the Senator from Idaho. I believe the time has come when Congress, not for the sake of Congress, not for the sake of the dignity of the Senate alone, but for the dignity of the American people, should enter not only an emphatic protest, but a protest that means something against this policy that is growing up in regard to these matters.

I am in thorough accord with the Senator.

Mr. HEYBURN. The time has come for Republicans—Republicans who believe in the principles, for the principles are greater than the party; the party is only a crystallization of them—the time has come for Republicans who believe in the principles of the party to lay aside factional differences and march under one flag, to vote down this measure, and every amendment to it except the amendment that throws it out of Congress. That time has arrived, and the question is, Has the man arrived? The hour is here, and I am calling out for the man. The man who does not do it is in front of the wheels of the Juggernaut.

Mr. CLAPP. For one, I am in favor of doing it. But the Senator had reached a point which I think is vital, and that was the fact that Congress is gradually surrendering its power of initiative in legislation, gradually yielding to a condition where legislation can come in here with the dictation that there shall be no change and no amendment. In sympathy with that suggestion of the Senator I rose to suggest that not only do we owe it to ourselves, but in a broader sense to the country, to protest in a manner, and the Senator suggests a manner very aptly. It would be for Republicans, as Republicans, under the banner of Republicanism, which is known to every member of the Republican Party, to stand here with reference to this legislation independent of any outside dictation.

Mr. HEYBURN. Stand here to vote this bill out of existence, because there are men enough here who call themselves Republicans to do it.

Mr. CLAPP. Yes.

Mr. HEYBURN. Stand here and vote down every amendment that is proposed to it, because every amendment here is a splinter off the Republican flagstaff. These are only splinters that you see flying about, chipping in here, chipping in there. Let us keep that—

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, instead of the flagstaff being splintered, the flagstaff has been broken down, the flag has been lowered, and there is no splintered flagstaff, to refrain from further splintering.

Mr. HEYBURN. I will bet 7,000,000 Republican votes what the Senator says is not true.

Mr. CLAPP. Then does the Senator believe that the passage of the Canadian tariff bill leaves flying the Republican standard,

the Republican flag, the Republican policy? The Senator does not understand my position in this respect.

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes; I do.

Mr. CLAPP. When this bill passes the flag has come down.

Mr. HEYBURN. No; the flag has not come down.

Mr. CLAPP. The mast has been broken.

Mr. HEYBURN. I have seen ships come in with their bulwarks shattered and splintered, and I have seen them come in with cracks in their sides, but the old flag was up at the mast.

Mr. CLAPP. But if the ship had gone down in mid-ocean—

Mr. HEYBURN. That is an "if."

Mr. CLAPP. Our ship has gone down.

Mr. HEYBURN. The only men who could think that the Republican ship has gone down are on that side of the aisle. No man on this side has a right to think it. The very concession that is embodied in that suggestion is one outside of the rights of the Senator.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President—

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

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes.

Mr. BAILEY. I merely wanted to observe that even Republicans who agree with each other become embroiled.

Mr. HEYBURN. Yesterday we spent a delightful day. It was equal to being up on the coast of Maine or somewhere else. We sat here and basked in the sunshine and watched the Democrats rend each other. The Republicans are not going to rend each other. They are going to come back to the old fold of protection that protects without any fine lines of discrimination as to just how much above high tide it is. We are going to come back to that. When I say that I mean the Republicans. I do not undertake to speak for what is called the organization. Organizations are momentary, but Republicanism is eternal, and the people will stand ready to correct the mistakes of those who have proven to be failures as their representatives.

Mr. BAILEY. That is very good so far as it goes. But who is authorized to define Republicanism?

Mr. HEYBURN. Every Republican; and I am one of them.

Mr. BAILEY. Each for himself.

Mr. HEYBURN. I am authorized to speak for the great body of the American people with which I have been associated for a lifetime. I know them. I can tell a Republican when I hear him speak. If I can not do it by sight, I know him when he speaks. He may look like a Republican and open his mouth and seem like a Democrat.

Mr. BAILEY. I have myself thought that it is easier to distinguish a Republican by his voice than it is by his vote in this time. I read the record for a definition of a man's party affiliation rather than listen to his voice. The Senator from Idaho, when the roll is called, will find his party voting according to a split almost into two equal parts. I would like to know which is the Republican Party.

Mr. HEYBURN. The majority in this body is the Republican part in this body; the majority of those who sit on this side, and those who do not belong to the majority are probably on the mourners' bench, or will be there.

Mr. BAILEY. Are they Republicans? That is what I want to know. I want to know how to treat them.

Mr. HEYBURN. The Republican Party in this body is represented by those who stand for Republican principles, and they are so old that they need no branding.

Mr. BAILEY. But that is so general that a dull man can not comprehend it. What I want to know is if the majority are the real Republicans, what are the minority?

Mr. HEYBURN. What are the minority?

Mr. BAILEY. Are they apostates?

Mr. HEYBURN. They are mavericks, and the Senator knows exactly what a maverick is. It awaits branding.

Mr. BAILEY. It is an unbranded yearling, and if the Senator wants to call his associates that, he has my full permission to do it.

Mr. HEYBURN. They will either brand themselves or be branded, and then the Senator will know exactly to whom they belong.

Mr. BAILEY. If they could be rounded up in the White House lot I know how they would be branded.

Mr. HEYBURN. They will not be branded by anyone.

Mr. BAILEY. That is the way they do with mavericks—

Mr. HEYBURN. They do not wind them up in anybody's lot particularly. They will find them up at the end of a rope.

Mr. BAILEY. I did not say "wind." I said "round." The Senator must employ the cattle vernacular when he starts that way.

Mr. HEYBURN. I understand the cattle vernacular pretty well. I learned it a long time ago.

Mr. President, I had intended to talk to the Members of this body who sit on this side of the Chamber. It has been said, "You can not do any good. You can not accomplish anything." I am not willing to believe that. I am not willing to believe that men are going to determinedly and deliberately attack the principles in which they believe in the hope that they will make some measure so unpopular that it will die. I do not believe it. I do not want to believe it. I want to see these men here with whom we have served so long under the banner of the Republican Party, which is always over this side of the Senate, come back to their senses and their reason.

Mr. NELSON. You mean those who are in favor of reciprocity?

Mr. HEYBURN. No; I mean I want to see them all come back and disregard these madnesses which seem to have come upon the people, and come back to us and say, "We will have nothing to do with this kind of legislation; it is not representative of the Republican Party's principles or the principles of Republicans." That is what they ought to do. Do it if you sacrifice the impulse of the hour; do it because of the sentiments that have directed you in your lives in the years gone by and made you Republicans.

It is so easy for a little difference to make a big disturbance. Waive the little difference. Wait until four years from now, when the body at the other end of the Capitol will be as overwhelmingly Republican as it is now overwhelmingly Democratic; and it will be. There is not the slightest question about it. With that force and sentiment behind you, you can bring the old Republicans together. Let them throw off these progressivisms, as they call it. They progress like a crab. You can not tell which way they are going.

If I should stand here as long as my strength would permit and the patience of the Senate would permit and feel that I had sown a seed in the mind of any man who ought to be a Republican, which seed would germinate and grow and bring him back again, I would be willing to stand here until I was ready to drop. It is a very serious proposition. When I see that men who have been termed "war horses" are willing to be led away, with the hand of the enemy of Republicanism on the bit, it appalls me, and it will appall the sturdy, strong Republicans in this country, and they will strike like lightning when they strike and they will destroy those who forgot how to be Republicans.

It seems to me that there have been so many fancies and foibles in politics recently that men in the Republican Party have forgotten the necessity of avoiding temptation, tempted off by this and that fancy. They may be meritorious and may be good, and were they presented with the deliberation and the patience and the determination by which men accomplish great things you might be able to secure recognition for them. But the trouble is, because the whole world will not fall down on its face in worship of the new idea, you immediately abandon the world. That is the trouble. You say, "I want quick action. I have got a new idea—a new thought here. No man ever entertained it before. It is grand. I want you to adopt it, and I do not want you to take time to think about it." That is the trouble in this political age; and we have in this body and we have in the organization of the party throughout the country these factions which represent just that principle. Come in with the ideas, but be patient with the party. Be patient with the majority. Do not quarrel with the majority immediately. Be patient with it, and if there is merit in your cause it will receive recognition at a proper time.

But if we were to undertake to change the faith, to change the policy of the Republican Party as often and as rapidly as is demanded by some, we would be continually afflicted with a political cold from sudden change. I wonder if the Republicans and those who call themselves Republicans are going to stand out stubbornly and wreck a part of the people of this country, in violation of the pledge that they and their ancestors made to preserve the people. Who ever heard of the Republican Party advocating free wool? Who ever heard of the Republican Party advocating a revision of the tariff by schedules? In 1894 they wrote an express declaration in their platform condemning it. "We condemn in unqualified terms the proposed policy of the Democratic Party to revise the tariff by schedules."

You might as well attempt to build a chimney from the top as to make an intelligent revision of the tariff by schedules. One door would be closed before you were permitted to look into the room adjoining it and know what was going to be there. Yet I find here that whatever your declarations may be, that is what you are doing. You are proposing to revise the last tariff in separate schedules. You are revising the farmers'

free list—God save the mark—by schedule. You are proposing to revise the cotton schedule separately, and demanding that each of them shall be a closed book before the other is opened. That is Republicanism, is it?

If I had an idea that I had slept with and lived with all my life and believed in as I believe in my God, I would not sacrifice the Republican Party for it. I would not take chances on that unharmony which results from insisting that no other man shall think but you.

Mr. President, I am loath to leave this question feeling, as I do, the helplessness of this hour. I feel like a man who in the waning hours of the night looks upon the face of his friend who will pass away before he sees him again. It is not the deathbed of the Republican Party, but it will be the deathbed of a lot of men who think they are Republicans. It will be their deathbed, because when the millions of loyal and true Republicans rise up it will be such a political cyclone as will sweep them like the dust into the Democratic Party, and the Democratic Party will treat them as the dust as it walks about among them.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I rise to occupy the attention of the Senate a very few minutes in presenting a matter that has a practical bearing upon the amendments that the Senator from Texas proposes to offer relating to the wool schedule of the Payne-Aldrich law.

It will be remembered that on yesterday during the most entertaining speech of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] the question arose as to the number and value of sheep in the United States, covering a period of years. A portion of the table was put in the RECORD, but I desire to place in the RECORD a table covering the last 25 years, which shows the number and value of sheep in the United States, during each one of those years, as taken from Statistical Abstract of 1910.

Mr. President, I will not stop to read the figures, but will ask that they be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection that will be done.

The table referred to is as follows:

January 1—	Sheep.	
	Number.	Value.
1886.....	48,322,331	\$92,443,867
1887.....	44,759,314	89,872,839
1888.....	44,544,755	89,279,926
1889.....	42,599,079	90,640,369
1890.....	44,336,072	100,659,761
1891.....	43,421,136	108,397,447
1892.....	44,938,365	116,121,290
1893.....	47,273,553	125,909,264
1894.....	45,048,017	89,186,110
1895.....	42,294,064	66,685,767
1896.....	38,298,783	65,167,735
1897.....	36,818,643	67,020,942
1898.....	37,656,960	92,721,133
1899.....	39,114,453	107,697,530
1900.....	41,883,065	122,665,913
1901.....	59,756,718	178,072,476
1902.....	62,039,091	164,446,091
1903.....	63,964,876	168,815,750
1904.....	51,630,144	133,530,099
1905.....	45,170,423	127,331,850
1906.....	50,631,619	179,056,144
1907.....	53,240,282	204,210,129
1908.....	54,631,000	211,736,000
1909.....	56,084,000	192,632,000
1910.....	57,216,000	233,664,000

Mr. GALLINGER. It will be observed that there are more sheep in the United States to-day than in any year of the period covered by the table, except the years 1902 and 1903; but the value of the sheep to-day is in excess of the values of either of those years to the amount of about \$65,000,000. The value of sheep to-day is \$25,853,871 in excess of the value of any other year since 1886, and more than three times the value of the year 1897. In 1900 the number of sheep in the country was 41,883,065, and their value was \$122,665,913. In 1910 the number of sheep was 57,216,000, an increase of 5,332,945 in 10 years, and the value in 1910 was \$233,664,000, an increase in 10 years of \$110,408,087.

Now, let us compare the year 1909 with the year 1910. The Senator from Mississippi suggested that we were making very slow progress in the sheep industry of this country. A comparison of the year 1909 with the year 1910 shows that in 1909 we had 56,084,000 sheep, and in 1910 we had 57,216,000, an increase of 1,132,000, or over 20 per cent.

The value of sheep in 1909 was \$192,622,000, and in 1910 the value was \$233,664,000, an increase of \$40,442,000 in a single year, or a trifle over 20 per cent.

In 1900 the number of sheep in the country was 41,883,055, and their value was \$122,655,913.

In 1910 the number of sheep was 57,216,000, an increase of 5,332,945 in 10 years. The value in 1910 is \$232,064,000, an increase in 10 years of over \$110,000,000, an increase of over 90 per cent. This showing is certainly a very gratifying one.

Mr. President, the table I have submitted is worthy of careful study by the Senate at the present time. The fact is that the sheep industry has progressed as rapidly as could have been expected. There was a period from 1893 to 1898 when there was a great depression in the industry, and there have been other years when the number of sheep has somewhat decreased, but in no instance from 1886 to the present time has there been a year when the value has not increased over the value of the preceding year.

It is a remarkable circumstance that the value of our flocks has increased enormously, it being now three times that of the year 1897, and the increase for 1910 over 1900 was, as I have suggested, over \$40,000,000, and the number of sheep has been correspondingly increased.

Mr. President, it may be that the wool schedule needs revision to some extent, but I appeal to my Republican associates to be extremely careful in this matter and not legislate in a way which will seriously cripple this great industry, which is giving employment to so many persons and supplying high wages to the men on our sheep ranches and also to the operatives in our woolen mills.

It is an indisputable fact that during the period of the Wilson tariff law—and I will not say that the depression was entirely consequent upon the passage of that law, although I believe that to have been the chief cause—the woolen industry all over this country was greatly depressed. In New England a very large proportion of our woolen mills were closed, the operatives were thrown out of employment, and that was equally true of other sections of our country.

It is also a fact, Mr. President, that immediately upon the accession of the Republican Party to power in 1896 and the enactment of a tariff law which gave adequate protection to the men who raise sheep and the manufacturing establishments which convert wool into cloth there was a wonderful development of that industry and an employment of laboring men to an extent that was very gratifying to those of us who believe in the doctrine of protection.

Mr. President, my only desire was to put in the Record the exact figures, so that Senators may examine them and in legislating on this subject, whether it be at this session or next year, the question as to the revision of the rates of duty on raw wool and on the manufactures of wool can be intelligently discussed.

I have suggested, Mr. President, and I suggest it again for the benefit of the Senator from Mississippi, that I do not say there ought not to be some reduction in the duty on some grades of woolen goods. I am willing to take that matter into very careful consideration at the proper time, but I do appeal to my Republican associates and to my Democratic friends as well not to legislate carelessly on this question or to do anything that will destroy an industry which is of so much moment to the happiness and prosperity of the people of this country.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. GALLINGER. I am through, Mr. President, and will be glad to listen to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Nobody in the United States could be more delighted than I to hear that even the Senator from New Hampshire is willing to revise the woolen schedule somewhat downward. I want to follow that admission upon his part by a question, Is he willing to reduce the duty upon wool to any extent at all?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I did not even say that I was willing to revise the duty on woolen goods downward. I said that I was willing to take the matter into very careful consideration, and if the arguments persuaded me that a downward revision to some extent ought to be made, I would not stand in the way so far as the duty on wool is concerned. I am not competent to speak of that until I give it further investigation and consideration.

I do know that I am not in favor of the removal of the duty entirely from wool, which the Democratic Party made in 1894, and which resulted in such disaster to the sheep industry of the country.

Whether or not the duty on raw wool will stand something of a reduction is a matter that I will likewise give consideration to, but I am not prepared to-day to give an opinion as to what my exact action will be on the subject.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the answer of the Senator from New Hampshire to my inquiry justifies the old exclamation, "What a delusive thing is human hope."

Just a moment ago I thought I had gathered, and I felt rejoiced to my inner heart, the idea that even the Senator from New Hampshire was willing to revise the woolen schedule downward. I jumped to the conclusion that in that he meant to revise it downward it seems, but it now appears that he would regard an expression about revising the tariff a good deal like the authors of the late Payne-Aldrich bill, as a pledge to revise it upward.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the Senator is not—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Perhaps I have been a bit unfair, and I will try to make it a fair statement. If what I have said be incorrect, then maybe this addendum will cure it. The Senator, as the leader of the majority upon that side of the Chamber, has either not had the opportunity or else has not had the willingness to come to a conclusion as to whether he would revise upward or revise downward. Now, I hope I have made the statement fair.

Mr. GALLINGER. First, let the Senator from New Hampshire disclaim any leadership on this side of the Chamber. He has never asked for it; it never has been bestowed upon him, so far as he knows, and he would not accept it if it was tendered in that form. He is simply a private in the ranks, a believer in the doctrine of protection, and with his Republican associates will, when this question of the tariff comes before this body seriously—because I do not think it is seriously before this body at the present time—be heard on the question in defense of the views that he holds on this and all other tariff duties.

Now, let me say to the Senator that I had no purpose of suggesting that I would be in favor of reducing the duties upward. I would not accept any such suggestion as that; but I will say to the Senator that there may be some items in the wool schedule that ought to be somewhat reduced and others that ought not to be reduced. I have not given the matter that careful consideration which I shall want to give it before voting on the different items. I think likewise that that may be true as to the cotton schedule. But I have looked upon this tariff discussion as a meaningless thing during the present session of Congress.

Nobody believes we are going to pass a tariff bill. Nobody believes seriously, I take it, that the amendments submitted by the Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] on the wool schedule are going to be crystallized into law at this session of Congress. But I apprehend that if the Senator from Mississippi and I both live until next year, and we both continue as Members of this honorable body, we will have a real tariff discussion, and we will very likely have legislation on the subject of the tariff. When that time comes I shall discharge my duty as best I can, and if I am persuaded, as I may be, that some of the duties in the Payne-Aldrich bill are too high, I shall not hesitate to vote to lower them. But I have no expectation that I will ever be able to bring myself to support any tariff bill that will commend itself to the Senator from Mississippi, who is, by and large, a free trader.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I shall not be deflected into a discussion as to whether the Senator from Mississippi is "by and large, a free trader" or not. I think we have finally arrived at this blind alley, to wit: That the Senator's response to my question may well be classed with the usual Washington departmental response to letters: "Yours of a certain date received and will receive due consideration at the proper time." And that was about all I expected from the Senator from New Hampshire.

Now, if I have made a mistake in designating the Senator from New Hampshire as the leader, the floor leader, of the Republican Party in this branch of the Federal Legislature, it has been a mistake that I have gathered from conversation about me and from the public prints. I had the idea that he had been elected chairman of the Republican steering committee.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is not correct, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is not?

Mr. GALLINGER. It is not correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thought that that was true. Then I will ask the Senator from New Hampshire, who is now chairman of the Republican steering committee?

Mr. GALLINGER. The committee that is ordinarily called the steering committee of the Senate has for its chairman the honorable Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM]. I was elected chairman of the committee on committees, but I never had the presumption to think that that made me the leader of the Republican side of the Chamber.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What I meant by that was the committee on committees; and in my ignorance as a new Member of this

body I thought it was the custom to select the man for that place who was to be regarded as the party floor leader. This conclusion I arrived at from a knowledge of the traditions and customs of the Senate. My apology is made fully and my regrets are expressed sincerely, modified by the gratification of learning that the place is occupied by the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM], whom we all revere and regard very highly. I asked the Senator from New Hampshire the question whether he would be willing to reduce the duties upon wool, because I am of the opinion, right or wrong, that the duties hitherto fixed upon wool have not been high enough and protective enough either to bring about or to promise in any definite future an increase of the wool production in the United States equal to the constantly increasing demand for wool and for woollens. I wanted to know whether the Senator, for himself, let us say, and not for his party, would go further upon the high road of protectionism, as he logically must from that standpoint, and increase the duties so that there might be a home sufficiency of the supply, or whether he would desert the logic of protectionism under those circumstances, and, in obedience to a very general popular demand, reduce the duties somewhat, and if any, how much.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

Mr. WILLIAMS. One other question, and then I shall not disturb my friend from New Hampshire—no; I do not mean that.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator never disturbs me.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I beg the Senator's pardon. I did not mean that. I understand that no question could possibly "disturb" either the set and fixed opinions or the equanimity of the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator is right.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But I meant simply that I would not further take up his time. I was not in the Chamber when the Senator began, but I heard him say that he had put certain tables into the RECORD. I think I gathered that he said he had put in a table showing the value of sheep.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; and their number.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The table of numbers I put in the RECORD myself yesterday.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator did so on yesterday.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And stated my reasons for putting in the tables showing the numbers rather than the so-called table of value.

What I wanted to ask the Senator was whether, when he used the phrase "a table of the values of sheep," he meant a table of the prices of sheep?

Mr. GALLINGER. I meant exactly what the Statistical Abstract gives, the number of sheep and the value of the sheep.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is the number of sheep multiplied by the market price of sheep.

Mr. GALLINGER. The aggregate number of sheep and the aggregate value of the sheep.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Now, I want to ask the Senator from New Hampshire to state, as near as he can, how much of that total market value—that is, the aggregate price of sheep—is due to the value of the sheep unaided by legislation, and how much of it is a factor in the price added by tariff legislation to the natural value—that is, the value which the same number of sheep would have had independently of governmental interference in restricting the supply by taxation?

Mr. GALLINGER. Well, Mr. President—

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am asking that question for information, because I should like to have it from a friend of the system. I should like really to know. Of course you say you are putting on a duty to encourage the industry, and the only way to encourage the industry is to raise the price. Now, I should like to have the Senator state for my information and for the information of the country how much of this so-called value is due to the tariff—what percentage or what aggregate amount, I care not how the Senator states it?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the Senator is asking a question that it is impossible for anyone to answer offhand. I will simply say to the Senator that under the protective policy sheep have increased in number every year since 1899.

Mr. WILLIAMS. They have increased 19 per cent in 14 years.

Mr. GALLINGER. Well, they have increased very much more than that in the last 25 years; but even if that be so, the Senator will be interested to learn that in the last year they have increased 1,132,000 in number. That is doing pretty well. The value during that year has increased \$40,442,500.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is what I desire to get at. How much of that so-called value is the natural value of the sheep

in a free, unhampered market, and how much is added by legislation to their price?

Mr. GALLINGER. My judgment is that in a free and unhampered market there would not be any value; the sheep would be practically extinguished. The Senator knows, if we had free wool, that within, say, 10 years the flocks of sheep in this country would practically be annihilated. Does he not know that?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from New Hampshire will not attribute to me such a very remarkable, radical, and unreasonable opinion as that. I do not think people will quit eating mutton or quit wearing woollen goods, and I do not think the demand for either wool or for mutton will cease because of the reduced rates of a tariff bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator from Mississippi is right about that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Moreover, I am thoroughly aware of the fact, and so is the Senator from New Hampshire, that the sheep industry in Great Britain, a thoroughly free-trade market, has not been extinguished. I am willing to admit that, of course, there will not be as high a price for sheep, that there will not be the same encouragement to the sheep herder, but that he will have just such encouragement and just such success as is due to his industry, to his intelligence, to the character of his pastures, to the caliber and the industry of his labor, and to such other natural factors as enter into the problem, including the conflict between demand and supply; but with wool upon the free list, of course, the sheep raiser would have no governmental encouragement, and there would be no governmentally added price to the price at which he could sell his sheep to the less-favored citizens of the Republic. I hope, however, the Senator from New Hampshire does not desire to attribute to me the idea that by withdrawing protection people would quit eating mutton or quit wearing woollen goods—

Mr. GALLINGER. No, Mr. President—

Mr. WILLIAMS. And that the sheep industry of the United States would therefore be "extinguished."

Mr. GALLINGER. I have no such purpose as that in mind. I think, however, people would be eating Australian and Argentine mutton and wearing clothes made out of Argentine and Australian wool. That is my judgment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. They are doing that now to some extent, are they not?

Mr. GALLINGER. To some extent, yes; but I do not want to increase it. The Senator from Mississippi tells us, and we believe that he always speaks sincerely—

Mr. WILLIAMS. I try to; but few men succeed in doing that always—heat of argument, excitement, and bias, all considered, I try.

Mr. GALLINGER. And that he practices intellectual honesty. He tells us that, and we believe it; but does the Senator from Mississippi believe that we can raise sheep and manufacture woollen goods in open competition with Argentina and Australia and continue to pay the wages that we are now paying in this country?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think we can, but we can not raise so many sheep upon as poor pastures as we do now, and upon as high-priced land, but we shall raise sheep all the same, and we shall raise them and sell them in competition.

Mr. GALLINGER. Undoubtedly, but—

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is exactly the same problem that arises now and then as to a duty in connection with a manufacturing plant. There is no doubt about the fact that when you reduce the duty and bring on a sharper competition by bringing on an increased importation the unfit, the men without foresight, the men without the requisite intelligence, the men who will not advantage themselves by all improved methods must go out of business, and the business will be carried on upon the principle of the survival of the fittest. The very trouble with protection is that it encourages and maintains in business the thriftless and unintelligent and those who have not provided themselves with the latest and most effective machinery and the latest and most effective labor—the highest priced and therefore cheapest labor.

Mr. GALLINGER. Well, Mr. President—

Mr. WILLIAMS. I did not intend to go into that. I was merely trying to get an answer to these questions. I have tried to give it from my standpoint, but I want it from your standpoint. Paul said he was a Pharisee of the Pharisees before his conversion. By the way, I made a mistake about Paul the other day. I had the buck agree so badly in speaking of "grave and reverend seigniors" that I spoke of the light that Paul saw on his way to Tarsus, actually getting the place whence Paul came mixed up with the place whither he was wending his way—

Mr. GALLINGER. I observed that slip of the tongue on the part of the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I meant Saul of Tarsus on his way to Damascus. But it is said that Paul was "a Pharisee of the Pharisees," and I regard the Senator from New Hampshire as a protectionist of protectionists, a Republican of Republicans, and chief in the Sanhedrin, in so far as strength of faith goes, at any rate, though he disclaims leadership.

Now, desiring an answer from that sort of a man, I should like to have, if you can not give me an estimate, a guess upon your part of how much of the so-called value—that is, the price—of sheep in the United States is due to the natural conditions of demand and supply and how much of it is due to the legislative interference of the Congress of the United States through the fixing of a tariff duty.

Mr. GALLINGER. As I said a moment ago, Mr. President, I do not think there is any man on either side of this Chamber wise enough, without very diligent and exhaustive investigation, to give the Senator an answer to his question. The Senator knows that it is very easy to ask a question that can not be answered.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I know that. A child—

Mr. GALLINGER. That the tariff does cut some figure in the price of wool and the price of sheep goes without the saying.

Mr. WILLIAMS. A child, I know, can ask questions that a philosopher can not answer.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; everybody admits that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And maybe I am filling that rôle to some extent; but in the figures which the Senator from New Hampshire has given I think he will find that the number of sheep increased about 19 or 20 per cent and the value of sheep—that is, their selling price—increased about what per cent? I think it was more than 200 per cent, was it not?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. The value of the sheep in 1910 was \$233,664,000, as against \$192,000,000 in 1900, and \$211,000,000 in 1908, and \$204,000,000 in 1907, and \$179,000,000 in 1906. It has been a fluctuating value. The tariff has not kept—

Mr. WILLIAMS. What is the increase by percentage, I will ask the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot], who has his pencil in hand?

Mr. GALLINGER. In what years?

Mr. WILLIAMS. From the year 1896 to 1910.

Mr. GALLINGER. In numbers or value?

Mr. WILLIAMS. In value.

Mr. GALLINGER. In 1896 the value of the sheep in the United States was \$65,000,000, and in 1910 \$233,000,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Now, that is an increase—

Mr. GALLINGER. And, in round numbers, the number of sheep in 1896 was 38,000,000 and in 1910 57,000,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The increase in value has been pretty nearly 300 per cent, has it not?

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; more than that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. More than 300 per cent?

Mr. GALLINGER. Between three and four hundred per cent.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; and an increase in numbers of about what? Twenty per cent?

Mr. GALLINGER. No; more than that. About 50 per cent. From 38,000,000 in 1896 to 57,000,000 in 1910.

Mr. SMOOT. Just 50 per cent.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The difference is 19,000,000, is it not?

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Call it in round numbers 50 per cent. The number of sheep, according to that statement, has increased 50 per cent, and the market price, the selling price, the so-called statistical value, has increased over 300 per cent.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If that be true, then the tariff has made the price of sheep increase about six times as fast as the number of sheep.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is where the Senator and I part company. Does the Senator think that the high price of everything in England and in every other country in the world, as well as in the United States, has been due to tariff legislation? The Senator knows that there has been an enormous increase in prices all along the line and all over the world.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, no; I do not say that is the only cause.

Mr. GALLINGER. Oh, yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But I am calling attention now to the fact that the value has increased over 300 per cent and the number has increased not 50 per cent.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; just 50 per cent.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And that, therefore, the so-called value has increased six times to where the number has increased one-half.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator very likely is aware of the fact—and if he is not I will call his attention to it—that the quality of sheep in the West has vastly improved since 1896, and the value of individual sheep is much greater now than then.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That has a great deal to do with another branch of this question, which we can not go into now.

Mr. GALLINGER. The tariff is surely not responsible for that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It has a great deal to do with what I was trying to call attention to a moment ago—that a certain sort of sheep industry would continue where there was a certain kind of sheep on certain kinds of pasture, with certain kinds of attention, although on the commonest and least attended to sheep the industry might go out of existence. Of course the Senator from New Hampshire is right in saying that the present enormous increase in market prices of most commodities, not in America alone, but all over the world, is not altogether due to the tariff laws of any particular country. It is very largely due to the annual increase of the output of gold, and it is very largely not an increase of value, but an increase of exchangeable price as expressed in terms of money. Things swapped against one another have changed in not nearly the same proportion as those swapped against money. But this gross discrepancy which we find in sheep is far above and beyond the average or index of increased prices. But what I am trying to arrive at is this, and I am trying to get it from the Senator because I want both sides as near as I can get it. I want to get as near as I can to the Senator's idea of how much of the so-called value or the aggregate selling price of American sheep is owing to natural causes outside of the tariff and how much is owing to the tariff. Of course, I understand that he can not make an absolutely mathematical accurate calculation.

Mr. DIXON and Mr. WARREN addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. To whom does the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. GALLINGER. I will allow both Senators to get in in my time in a moment, because this is an interesting matter. I will simply say, once more, in reply to the Senator, that it is an utter impossibility to answer the Senator's question categorically or intelligently—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Or approximately even?

Mr. GALLINGER. Or even approximately, offhand.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator can not make even a reasonable guess at it?

Mr. GALLINGER. No; I would not be willing to make a guess of any kind. I think that I would not do myself credit in making a guess. I know it is very much less than the Senator from Mississippi imagines it to be, but that it may have some bearing on the price is probably true.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then the Senator from New Hampshire means that he thinks that the present protective duties have benefited the sheep herder very much less than the Senator from Mississippi thinks they have?

Mr. GALLINGER. As affecting the sheep herders, yes; I am inclined to think that is so. One other thing that I want to say is this: There has been the wildest anxiety on the other side of the Chamber to help the poor farmer out. They are not helping him out in passing the reciprocity bill; they are doing him a great injury; but in addition to supporting that measure our Democratic friends are tumbling over each other to support a so-called farmers' free-list bill to help the poor farmer out. I think we are helping the poor farmer out pretty well when we are increasing the value of his flocks in this country in a single year, as we have done from 1900 to 1910, over \$40,000,000. I want the farmers to have that benefit. I would rather the sheep raisers—and they are all farmers—would get \$233,000,000 for their sheep at the present time than \$92,000,000 or \$100,000,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then, I would ask the Senator from New Hampshire this question, What proportion does the sheep-raising agricultural industry of the United States bear to the entire agricultural industry of the United States?

Mr. GALLINGER. That, again, I am unable to answer.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But the Senator from New Hampshire has just asserted that this amount of money gained by the sheep herder was gained "by all the farmers" of the United States.

Mr. GALLINGER. I did not say that. It was gained by the sheep herders and their employees.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Now, if it be true that the sheep-herding branch of agricultural industry forms a very small percentage of the total agricultural industry, then the statement that the Senator has just made, or the assumption that he has just taken, whichever it may be, is necessarily unsound, is it not?

Mr. GALLINGER. Not at all; and I will add to that this suggestion, that, even though the sheep herders are a small part of the agricultural population of this country, the so-called reciprocity bill, which the Senator from Mississippi is advocating with so much impetuosity, covers practically all the agricultural interests of the United States, and you propose to put all their interests under free trade.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I did not know that, and do not know it now.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think the Senator is not squaring himself—

Mr. WILLIAMS. I did not know that. I did not know that the reciprocity bill put all agricultural articles on the free list.

Mr. GALLINGER. It comes pretty near it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I did not know that it even put wool there.

Mr. GALLINGER. It does not; but the Senator—

Mr. WILLIAMS. I did not know it put, oh, a hundred articles—

Mr. GALLINGER. It comes pretty near putting all the agricultural articles—

Mr. WILLIAMS. In fact, I had an idea that the total value of the crops put upon the free list in our trade with Canada alone and not with the balance of the world would not make over one-tenth of the total agricultural production of the United States.

Mr. GALLINGER. In that suggestion the Senator is wrong; and I presume the Senator includes cotton in his calculation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; and I include corn, and I include sugar, and I include rice, and I include a great many other things; and I think, although I have not made the calculation, that the total value of the entire production of the several articles which are touched by the reciprocity bill and put upon the free list will not constitute much, if any, over one-tenth of the total aggregate production and value of the entire agricultural interests of the United States. And especially when the Senator remembers, as the Senator will remember with his usual clear business sense, that the Canadian reciprocity bill permits even those articles made free by it to come free from only one country in the world, and that a very small one.

Mr. GALLINGER. That has been discussed by Senators better qualified to discuss it than I. I am simply going to add the suggestion—I did not make a speech, I will say to the Senator from Mississippi; he will observe that I am not making speeches these days—that I simply put into the Record some figures from official sources, and I expressed the hope that Senators would give them careful examination. They may serve as texts for future discussions between the Senator from Mississippi and some of the rest of us.

I am not vain enough to believe that my position is always right. I am not foolish enough to contend that the position of the Senator from Mississippi is always wrong. We have different views, and it is well that we have. We develop thought by friction and attrition, and these discussions are to my mind very valuable, even by way of suggestion, and I hope that next year we will have a free field to discuss all these questions.

I wish that we might stop now in these discussions and vote on the three bills that are before the Senate and adjourn and go home. That is what I should like to do. I am very tired of the heat of Washington and I am not being greatly enlightened by the discussions which are going on in the Senate, although they are entertaining. But they cover matters that we are all thinking about more or less, and at some time in the future will be very seriously considered in this body, no doubt, when we have a tariff bill, which I suppose we will have next year if we live until that time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not share the pessimism of the Senator from New Hampshire. I have not yet reached the conclusion, if I ever reach it at all I would reach it very reluctantly, that the Democratic side of this Chamber added to those on the Republican side who profess a desire to revise the tariff downward, especially in connection with the woolen schedule, will be compelled to go home with the adjournment of this Congress without having accomplished any purpose and without having reduced any taxes that are now in my opinion bearing oppressively upon the people. If I thought with the Senator from New Hampshire I would agree with him that we ought to vote at once upon the several things that he has in his mind, whatever they are, and go on home. In fact if I agreed with him fully I think it would be wise to vote on reciprocity and go on home and leave the balance of it alone.

Mr. GALLINGER. That would suit me.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But I do not agree with the Senator. I have hope yet. I have hope in that recently budded and still, I hope, budding conversion of individual Republicans here

and there from the high-protectionist platform to a reasonable protectionist platform. Even if I can not get what I want, I shall feel very proud indeed if this Congress shall adjourn with a few laws upon the statute books which, if even protectionist in their character, are yet not so highly protectionist as the duties now standing are. I have hope of that.

Of course, I have no hope that the Senator from New Hampshire and I will cooperate along those lines any more than I would have any hope, if a Democratic majority was here, that he would join me in any vote expressing my ideas. My hope is that the progressives—the Senators who are called by their opponents the “insurgents,” though I can not for the life of me find what they are insurging against; I have been unable to locate the elective leadership of the Republican Party upon the floor, and therefore have been unable to find out what particular authority they were insurging against—I have hope that these so-called insurgents may insurge to the extent of bringing about some legislative enactment in the way of revising some tariff duties downward in the interest of the people whom they peculiarly and above all other public men claim to represent.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, it is not pessimism on my part; it is hope and expectation. I hope that we will have no tariff legislation at this session, and I do not expect we will have any tariff legislation at this session. I do expect that during the next session of Congress we will have presented to us a Democratic bill revising the rates of duties in the so-called Payne-Aldrich law. When that bill comes here we will then discuss it, and I promise the Senator from Mississippi that in that discussion, if I shall be here, I will try to be as sincere and careful in my consideration of the questions involved as the Senator from Mississippi will be, however widely we may differ.

I do not believe the Senator from Mississippi desires to destroy the industries of the United States, but the Senator has been educated in a school of political economy the application of whose principles would have a very disastrous result upon the industries of our country.

The Senator has been in the habit of telling interesting little stories during our debates that we have all liked to listen to. I want to tell a little story, because it was an actual happening. We had a Democratic family in New Hampshire who for more than half a century had been engaged in the woolen industry. They were most excellent people and made most excellent goods. They voted the Democratic ticket with great regularity and were potential in their community as leading and influential Democrats.

When the Wilson tariff law was passed and wool was placed on the free list those manufacturers, in common with some Republican woolen manufacturers in my State, believed that it was to be a great boon to their industry, and a workman was instructed to hoist a ladder on the front of that factory and paint over the front door the words: “In God we trust; Cleveland and free wool.”

In about six months that factory closed. The workmen were out of employment. The fires were out, the smoke ceased to ascend from the chimneys, and the blinds were drawn. That same workman, taking the same ladder and the same paint brush, went up and rubbed out that motto and inscribed instead these words: “In God we trusted. In Cleveland we busted.”

Mr. President, that is exactly what happened to the woolen industry of New England, and it was approximately what happened to the wool-producing industry of the Western States.

Mr. WARREN. The people of the West did not have money enough to paint a sign.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator from Wyoming says that the people in the West did not have money enough to paint a sign. But we had. That sign was actually painted, and that good family—and they were most estimable men—have been voting the Republican ticket ever since. They got enough of free wool to last them for a lifetime.

Mr. President, what I want above all things else is that when this impending Democratic legislation is inflicted upon this country, if it ever shall be, it will at least be conservative enough to save something out of the wreck that will necessarily come to the manufacturing industries of the United States.

I have not any question as to what will happen if the views of the Senator from Mississippi shall prevail. The Senator may think differently and does think differently, but the lessons of history and of experience have taught me that I am nearer right on this subject than is the Senator from Mississippi. But time will tell, and I am willing to wait.

Mr. DIXON. I wanted to interrupt the Senator from New Hampshire in his very interesting dialogue with the Senator

from Mississippi regarding the effect of the tariff on wool and sheep. I heard the table read showing the increase of 300 per cent in the value of the sheep in the United States between 1910 and 1896. During that time that they had increased about 19,000,000; in other words from 38,000,000 in 1896 to 57,000,000 in 1910. Undoubtedly the great increase both in numbers and in value was fundamentally due to the tariff.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Has not the Senator the figures wrong? What were the figures in 1896?

Mr. DIXON. About 38,000,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thought the Senator said 28,000,000. The Senator is right.

Mr. DIXON. Yes; after the full effect of free wool under the Wilson tariff bill had gone into force.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is an increase of 19,000,000, is it not, instead of 28,000,000?

Mr. DIXON. Nineteen million, I said—from 38,000,000 to 57,000,000.

But I want to say this to the Senator from Mississippi. I really think there is more widespread and honest misinformation about the wool tariff, the keystone of protection, as has been reiterated in the papers from time to time, than any other one thing.

Mr. GALLINGER. The woolen rates.

Mr. DIXON. The woolen rates. Now, to-day I do not believe my friend the Senator from Mississippi knows, as a matter of fact, the small difference between the price of raw wool in this country, in the Boston market, and in the London market. If I were to ask my friend from Mississippi what was the tariff on raw wool, what would he say?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The tariff on raw wool, unwashed, is 11 cents a pound.

Mr. DIXON. Eleven cents a pound on unwashed wool?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. DIXON. Does the Senator from Mississippi know that for the past six months there has not been to exceed 2 cents a pound difference between the price of raw wool in the United States and in London? Where does the other 9 cents of the tariff go?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Mississippi did not know that; and if that be true, then it proves that the whole policy of putting this protective duty on wool has failed for at least six months in its evident purpose.

Mr. DIXON. Oh, no; not at all.

Mr. WILLIAMS. A duty of 11 cent on unwashed wool, by the admission of the Senator from Montana, has raised the price of American wool in the home market only 2 cents. It has brought about a difference between the home price and the price of wool in the markets of the world of only 2 cents. It necessarily follows, therefore, if that be true—I do not mean if it be true as a fact, but I mean if it be a statement which can be relied upon, not a mere temporary condition owing to some outside cause, but as a permanent condition to furnish a basis of sound argument—if it be true that fixing a duty of 11 cents on unwashed wool, which amounts to 44 cents on washed wool—

Mr. DIXON. Thirty-three cents on washed wool.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; 44 cents, by protectionist estimate—has increased the price of American wool in the American market only 2 cents, then it follows with absolute mathematical and irresistible certainty that putting wool on the free list and taking off every cent of the 11 cents per pound duty could not decrease the price of wool in the American market more than 2 cents, because all it has raised it is 2 cents.

Now, you can take your choice—either your tariff act has had the effect which you purposed, to make the price of wool approximately as much higher than it would have otherwise been as the duty itself, or else it has failed and has made it only 2 cents higher. If the first proposition be true, then removing the duty will reduce the price 11 cents, untaxing the ultimate consumer to that extent; and if your second statement be true, then reducing the duty can reduce the price only 2 cents, and costing the sheep raiser in price only 2 cents.

Mr. DIXON. Now, has the Senator stated his proposition? Then, by the same rule of logic and reasoning, the Senator from Mississippi, as an honest man, is forced to say that the tariff on wool does not add to the cost of wool the measure of the tariff on wool. Does the Senator agree to that, if this statement be true?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Montana has just made that statement himself.

Mr. DIXON. Yes. Then, by the same logic, the Senator from Mississippi—

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Montana made the statement, not I. I have not seen the figures.

Mr. SMOOT. They are true as to to-day's quotations.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If they are true—

Mr. DIXON. They are true. The Senator will take my word for that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If it be true that the tariff of 11 cents a pound has raised the price only 2 cents a pound, then the removal of that tariff can reduce the price only 2 cents a pound and can hurt the sheep raiser only 2 cents per pound, or else it is a temporary condition due to some other disturbing cause and therefore not a fair basis for tariff argument. So that on one horn of the dilemma or the other the Senator from Montana has impaled himself.

Mr. DIXON. Now—

Mr. WILLIAMS. If—

Mr. DIXON. I yield for a question and a statement, but I do not want the Senator to make a full speech without giving me a chance to get in a word edgewise.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think we will be here until September, and you will have an opportunity to get in plenty of words.

Mr. DIXON. The Senator has not answered my question.

The whole argument here of the Senator from Mississippi yesterday was that the tariff always enhanced the value of the American article the full measure of the tariff duty.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, no; no Democrat has ever taken that position since the world began.

Mr. DIXON. Then I wholly misunderstood the interesting argument of the Senator from Mississippi for an hour yesterday.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The position that has been taken has been this, and nothing else: That under the tariff shelter the home producer gets as near the tariff fixed level of price as he possibly can and approximates it in nine cases out of ten. But he never gets precisely and exactly—

Mr. DIXON. Then why has not wool—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Because there are a thousand other factors besides the tariff which may enter into the question of price. The argument is good only when other things are all equal and the tariff alone operates.

Mr. DIXON. Why has not wool sold 11 cents higher here than in the London market if the American article has added to it here the full measure of the American tariff? Why does it not add 5½ cents if it added even 50 per cent of the tariff measure? I want to tell the Senator from Mississippi, and I think I know something about the actual working of the wool tariff, why the difference is. My State of Montana, I believe, raises more sheep and more wool than any other State in the Union.

Mr. WARREN. Except Wyoming.

Mr. DIXON. The Senator from Wyoming excepts Wyoming. I admit it is a neck-and-neck race, but I think the cold, actual figures will give Montana a little nose ahead in the race.

Mr. WARREN. I will say to the Senator that it would be true for the last two years, but we are clearly in advance now in both numbers.

Mr. DIXON. If the Senator from Mississippi will follow me, I say to him that notwithstanding there is a paper academic tariff on wool of 11 cents per pound in the grease, there has not been on an average—I want to get inside the line of safety—3 cents a pound difference between the London and Boston market within the last six months.

I will tell you what the matter is. The American woolen mills have not been running over two-thirds time.

Mr. SMOOT. Forty to 60 per cent.

Mr. WARREN. From 40 to 60 per cent.

Mr. DIXON. The Senator from Utah and the Senator from Wyoming say from 40 to 60 per cent under normal production. But when you hear men on this floor and newspaper editorials talk about the tariff on raw wool increasing the cost of clothing to the man who knows the actual condition it is a joke. There is not a suit of clothes in this Chamber on any Senator's back where the wool tariff to-day and for the last six months has made 15 cents difference in a suit. It has made a tremendous difference to the wool men of the West. About 500,000 people in this country are directly and indirectly interested in the growing of sheep and wool and mutton. I saw sheep in my State under the influence of the Wilson tariff bill of 1893 sell for 6 bits a head.

Mr. SMOOT. And the owners were glad to get rid of them.

Mr. DIXON. Translated into down-east-English, that means 75 cents.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Cotton sold that year at 6 cents a pound, too. Yet there was no duty on cotton and no duty removed from cotton at the time.

Mr. DIXON. That is true. The Senator from New Hampshire recited the instance of his Democratic friend who ran the woolen mill there. That terrible nightmare which settled over the West during that 4-year period converted not one man,

but literally converted them by the thousands in my State. The secretary of the Montana Woolgrowers' Association used to be a Texas Democrat. He is now the most rantankerous protectionist I know of. He faced bankruptcy and ruin during that 4-year period. It has softened and steadied the price of wool and mutton and sheep. It has not had the full percentage, as shown by the figures, with the great increase in the coinage of gold in this country and in the world during the past 15-year period, as I have attempted to show.

Mr. WILLIAMS. By your own confession you added only 2 cents—

Mr. DIXON. Undoubtedly; but the yardstick of the gold dollar was the unit of value.

Mr. WILLIAMS. By your own confession there has been added only 2 cents to the price of wool.

Mr. DIXON. No; for the six months' period.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then the Senator confesses he has picked out a period which is not fairly representative, and therefore could not be the basis of a fair argument.

Mr. DIXON. I am not stating that that has been the average difference in price. I say for the past six months' period that fact has existed.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

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

Mr. DIXON. I do.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to say to the Senator from Mississippi that the reason of the existence of that condition of affairs is the agitation that is going on for free wool.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, pshaw!

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say to him, whether he knows it or not, or whether he may say "pshaw" or not, that a woolen man who buys his wool to-day can not immediately transform it into goods and get his money, as in the case of buying and selling merchandise. He has to make the wool into goods, a long and tedious process, then find a market for it, and he has to give four months' time after dating his bill ahead. He can not afford to buy wool in a protected market, with the likelihood of having a free-wool market in the near future.

The same principle applied in 1896 before free wool, under the Wilson bill, was repealed. In 1896 nearly everybody expected the bill to be repealed and the price of wool advanced. Why? Because they knew just as soon as a tariff was placed on wool the price would advance, and they know to-day that if the tariff is taken off the price will be lower; and no manufacturer is going to take any chances unless he buys just as close as possible to a free-trade basis.

Mr. WILLIAMS and Mr. REED addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. To whom does the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. DIXON. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi to finish his statement and then to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. WILLIAMS. One Republican Senator has just attempted to prove that a tariff duty of 11 cents per pound on wool has robbed the American consumer of only 2 cents a pound.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the Senator—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Wait a minute.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Montana did not say that. The Senator from Montana said within the last six months.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Montana did say that taking the last six months the difference in the price of wool here and in the London market is 2 cents a pound, and he used it as the basis of his argument—

Mr. DIXON. To show why—

Mr. WILLIAMS. To disprove the Democratic contention that the duty does approximately measure the higher price of the article in the American market.

Mr. DIXON. That is exactly what I used it for.

Mr. WILLIAMS. According to my way of phrasing, it was the measure of robbery that the raiser was capable of perpetrating upon the consumer. That is merely my phraseology. But after one Republican Senator is through with that another Republican Senator—the Senator from Utah—steps to the front and says the first Republican Senator has taken an absolutely unfair basis, because the last six months have been totally exceptional, owing, according to the Senator from Utah, to Democratic "agitation" for the removal of the duty on wool. Now, in the name of common sense, both of you take one shoot or one of you get out of the argument; it does not make any difference which.

Now, one word more—

Mr. DIXON. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana has the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS. You can not take as the basis of fact for an argument an exceptional period. If you take it for a fair argument, you take a fair period. If it be exceptional and it is due to the fact that the people who have been robbed to the tune of 11 cents a pound raised their voices to such an extent that the robbery has been reduced to 2 cents, then the "agitation" has benefited the American people and the American consumer to the extent of 9 cents a pound.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. President, I must answer the Senator from Mississippi. I say to the Senator from Mississippi, not as a Republican Senator representing one theory of financial system to a Democratic Senator, but as one gentleman to another, there is no doubt but that the threatened reduction in the wool tariff has to-day cost the woolgrowers of this country literally millions of dollars. I have sent for a telegram which came to my office this morning. If the young man reaches me in time I will read it to the Senator from Mississippi. It is from one of the sheep growers at Billings, Mont. He says the price of wool under this continued threatened agitation has fallen to the terrible times of 1893. The wool market has literally been paralyzed under the threat of the House bill, which promises only about 2½ cents per pound on wool.

Any man who will take the patience to honestly investigate the conditions will find that what I am now saying is the absolute truth. The very threat of the passage of that bill by the House has cost the woolmen of this country literally millions of dollars in the past 60 days.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Of course, when the Senator from Montana makes a gentleman's statement to a gentleman of a fact I receive it, but you can not make a statement of that character about an inference, about a supposed cause. When the Senator states to me that wool has gone down to a certain price and is at a certain price, I accept his statement, but when he goes further and assures me as a gentleman that the reason for it is this or that—

Mr. DIXON. The Senator draws the line on reason.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then he transcends the lines of possible information given. I have as good a right to draw a conclusion as to the cause as the Senator has. But I am not quarreling about that. I am quarreling about this: That you now say the reason of the fact that the tariff of 11 cents made only a difference of 2 cents is that there was agitation. A moment ago you were using that six months' period as a basis of your argument that 11 cents duty did not raise the price of the home market approximately to the tariff level.

Mr. DIXON. I think I can convince the Senator from Mississippi of that fact. I want to say to the Senator from Mississippi frankly that under the operations of the Dingley tariff on wool, carried through into the Payne bill, there has been nominally 11 cents duty, but there has not been that much protection to the woolgrower. The average man—and I say this not in any egotistical spirit—the average man does not take the time—the average Senator does not do it—to investigate the real conditions surrounding the duty on free wool.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. DIXON. Just one minute.

Mr. REED. Right there on that question—

Mr. DIXON. All right; I will yield at this point.

Mr. REED. The Senator says that the difference in price is not represented by the tariff; that the difference does not approximate the tariff. How much did the tariff raise the price of wool per pound?

Mr. DIXON. Answering the Senator from Missouri in a perfect spirit of frankness, I would say to him it is impossible to determine that exactly. I saw wool sell in my State in 1895, under the terrible depression of the time, as low as 8 cents per pound. The Senator from Utah says he saw it.

Mr. SMOOT. I bought a million pounds at 6 cents a pound.

Mr. DIXON. The Senator from Utah says he bought a million pounds at 6 cents a pound. The actual condition was that the wool men were simply bankrupt and ruined. No man will dispute that.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. DIXON. There was very widespread devastation through that whole tier of the country. The corn farmers in Iowa, Missouri, Illinois, Minnesota, and Indiana, where the sheep are fed, only raise the sheep for the market; they are carried in great train loads down to the cornfields of Missouri, Nebraska, Kansas, and Illinois, and there corn fed for the Chicago market.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. DIXON. They suffered almost as severely as the sheepmen themselves when the great market was destroyed.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, if the Senator—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana is aware that the Senator from Missouri desires to interrupt him.

Mr. DIXON. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. I asked the Senator for a frank answer. He has been asserting with great force that the tariff did not increase the price of wool—

Mr. DIXON. Oh, no, no.

Mr. REED. To the amount of the tariff.

Mr. DIXON. Yes; I think it has not.

Mr. REED. He has asserted that at the present time it increases it only 2 cents a pound. Now, it seems to be admitted, or at least stated, by the Senator that this is an exceptional time. If the Senator can be specific as to the amount the price is increased and can assert it to be 2 cents a pound—

Mr. DIXON. I am merely quoting the London and Boston market.

Mr. REED. Can not the Senator give us some estimate of the amount of increase which results on the average? Can not that be answered by the Senator without doing as a Senator from another State did this morning when I asked him a similar question about wheat, going into a long argument involving the whole tariff question. Can not some of the men who ask for this tariff, and clamor for this tariff, tell us approximately how much it raises the price of wool in cents per pound? Will not the Senator enlighten us on that point?

Mr. DIXON. The Senator from Missouri knows, and I know, and every Senator in this Chamber knows, that no man on earth can answer that question. You might take all the tables and market reports and lead pencils on earth and you can not give a specific answer to that question.

Mr. REED. Then you can not exactly—

Mr. DIXON. I do say this, that the theory you pursued then in wiping out the tariff did bring bankruptcy to hundreds of thousands of people, and the bill you have reported from the House now, if it becomes a law, as to the tariff on raw wool, will bring about the same result.

Mr. REED. If the Senator can state that it is 2 cents a pound now, and can get at it in cents now and give us the figures, why can he not give us the same figures through those other years without going into the general question of whether it is widespread bankruptcy? That does not answer my question. I want to know if the Senator knows, and if the Senator does not know, then I want him to stand on this floor and frankly confess that he does not know whether an 11-cent tariff is necessary or a 2-cent tariff is necessary.

Mr. DIXON. I will say to the Senator from Missouri I do know that the Democratic tariff on wool that you gave us before put us out of business; but as to actual figures, fluctuations of the market, no man on earth can tell.

Mr. SMOOT and Mr. REED addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. To whom does the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. DIXON. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. I simply want to say to the Senator from Missouri that the day the wool bill was reported from the Committee on Finance to the Senate every purchaser of wool in the United States telegraphed to their buyers in Wyoming, Utah, New Mexico, Montana, and I believe in every Western State to stop buying wools.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator yield to me?

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

Mr. DIXON. When the Senator from Utah finishes.

Mr. SMOOT. The effect of that was that the demand for wool, which came through the feeling that there was not going to be a change in the wool tariff, at least until the next season, ceased.

Mr. REED. Did not that mean simply that the purchaser of wool believed if the tariff was reduced they would buy in a market that was less burdened by taxes and would buy somewhat cheaper, and hence, perhaps, they would wait until they found out whether that reduction would take place. That means, does it not, that the buyers of wool recognized the fact that the tariff does raise the price to the consumer, the purchaser, and is a tax upon the people of the United States?

Mr. DIXON. Mr. President, your revenue-duty tariff is a tax on the consumer and does raise the price.

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. DIXON. Your whole argument falls so far as—

Mr. REED. It is a revenue tariff.

Mr. DIXON. It is robbery just the same, but levied under a different system.

Mr. REED. It is a revenue tariff levied for the honest constitutional purpose of raising revenue. A protective tariff is

raised for the dishonest and unconstitutional purpose of enabling one class of citizens to pick the pockets of all the rest of the people.

Mr. DIXON. That is the difference between tweedledee and tweedledum. If tariffs are wrong levied under one theory, what difference does it make whether it is an incidental protection or levied for protection outright and open and aboveboard, acknowledged to be for the purpose of keeping the people of this Republic at work and not to depend on the importation of goods from other countries. I ask the Senator from Missouri whether the duty on zinc, which the last tariff bill carried to the great zinc-producing State of Missouri, added anything to the price of zinc and the steadiness of the zinc market in your State?

Mr. REED. My understanding is—

Mr. DIXON. Answer yes or no.

Mr. REED. I am going to answer you, sir. I never dodge a question, and it never takes me half an hour to answer a question by making an argument about something that happened 15 years ago. My understanding is that it has not raised the price of ore to the producers of zinc at all.

Mr. DIXON. Are you willing to have it removed?

Mr. REED. To have it repealed?

Mr. DIXON. Yes.

Mr. REED. Absolutely.

Mr. DIXON. And the Senator—

Mr. REED. And I shall never stand on this floor and cast a vote for the purpose of helping the people or any part of the people of my State rob the rest of the people of the United States. In that respect I differ from some of the Senators on the other side.

Mr. DIXON. Yes. And now, Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Missouri, in his zeal to stop this robbery, his zeal to prevent this great outrage on the people of this country, why he has not introduced an amendment here proposing a repeal of the duty on Missouri zinc ores?

Mr. REED. I have introduced no amendment on any matter, and for this reason: I want first to see passed this reciprocity bill, which captures one of the outposts of protection which a Republican President, driven by the exigencies of the political conditions, proposes to surrender. When we have taken possession of that position, I then propose to follow the lead of the House of Representatives and vote for those bills which have been sent here. When those bills are out of the way I shall be ready to join in going through the tariff and taking out of it every element except the simple element of revenue.

Mr. DIXON. Then why does the Senator—

Mr. SMOOT. Just a moment.

Mr. DIXON. Let me answer the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. DIXON. All right.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to ask the Senator from Missouri if I understood him correctly to say that the duty on zinc ore had not increased the price of zinc ore in Missouri a cent?

Mr. REED. I do not think it has.

Mr. SMOOT. I wanted to get that answer, because, Mr. President, I think I can show the Senator that he is mistaken.

Mr. REED. Zinc ore went up for a time and it went down again, but, taking the market as a whole, it is regarded by the best judges of that district, as I understand, to have been of no benefit. Now, this came about—

Mr. GALLINGER. If it has not affected zinc—

Mr. REED. Our friend Mr. CANNON went through that part of the country and made speeches. He said to the producers of that ore, "If you will vote the Republican ticket, if you vote for my friend Charley Morgan, who stands here on the rear of this platform with me, we will give your people protection; if you do not do it, you will get no protection." That bribe offered to the people is a part of the morality of your beautiful system of protection. Morgan was elected by a small majority; Mr. CANNON redeemed his pledge, and the bill was passed. Zinc ore went up for a little while, but, taking the prices as they have run, I do not think any man can demonstrate that there has been any benefit to that district.

Mr. DIXON. Then, Mr. President, if the tariff on zinc ores has not increased the price, the people of this country have not been robbed by this action in putting a tariff on zinc ores. If it has not increased the price of zinc ores, then by the same argument it would apply to every other article in the list.

Mr. REED. It did not increase the price, as I understand, for various reasons. Among them was the fact that this particular tariff was a subterfuge and a fake from the start; that the ores which came in prior to that time were of the character used in the smelting process, and that they were not in the true sense competitive ores. But that is too broad a question.

Mr. SMOOT. But, Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator—

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

Mr. DIXON. I do.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say to the Senator from Missouri that his statement is not correct.

Mr. REED. I will debate that with the Senator from Utah at any time he wants to, and on any occasion, but it is aside from this question.

Mr. SMOOT. But, Mr. President, all the ores which come into this country which carry more than 10 per cent of zinc pay a duty, while before August 5, 1909, they were free. Every zinc-ore purchaser in this country stated that the average amount of zinc that was in the ores that came from Mexico was near 40 per cent.

Mr. REED. I understand that.

Mr. SMOOT. The last tariff bill affects every pound of ore that is imported into this country.

Mr. REED. I understand that.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. President, I want to finish my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana declines to yield further.

Mr. REED. I trust the Senator will allow me to reply to the statement of the Senator from Utah, who did not understand me. I stated that my understanding of the facts was that the ore that came from Mexico was of a character which could be mixed with the native ores and used in smelting, and, therefore, any law that tended to shut it out did not in the long run benefit the miner.

Mr. SMOOT. Why, Mr. President, all the ore which is produced in Missouri is also of such a character that it may be used for smelting.

Mr. DIXON. I will have to shut off the zinc-ore debate, as I want to finish my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana declines to yield further.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

Mr. DIXON. I forgot the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. REED. It is not used for smelting, and I am talking about Mexican ores.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana declines to further yield.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President—

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

Mr. DIXON. If it is for a discussion of wool I will. I do not want to get off on side issues.

Mr. GORE. It is in reference to sheep. Mr. President, I dislike to disturb the complacency of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], but the Census Bureau issued a bulletin on the subject of sheep the day before yesterday, and I invite the Senator's attention to the figures. The official count of sheep and lambs in the United States last year, under the census, was 51,638,590, while the official census count of sheep and lambs in the United States in the year 1900 was 61,503,713.

Mr. DIXON. Somebody certainly has misread the figures to the Senator from Oklahoma. The Senator from Oklahoma knows that in 1896 there were 38,000,000 sheep. Does the Senator from Oklahoma think that in four years 38,000,000 sheep would develop into 60,000,000?

Mr. GORE. Within the last 10 minutes I conversed with the Director of the Census. The statement that there were over 61,000,000 sheep in 1900 seemed to me so incredible that I returned to the telephone, called up the Director's office, and had the Director verify the figures, the total number in 1900 being, as he reassured me, 61,503,713.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Statistical Abstract gives it at 41,000,000; and the Statistical Abstract, a Government publication, is supposed to be good authority.

Mr. GORE. Those are estimates of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; and sheep are agricultural products.

Mr. GORE. Those are estimates, whilst these, as I understand, are the official figures of the Census Bureau, taken by the enumerators assigned to their several districts throughout the United States, and, according to this advice, the number in 1900 officially counted was 61,503,713. The number last year, according to the census count, was 51,538,690, a falling off according to these official figures—I do not say whether they are right or wrong—of 10,000,000 head of sheep and lambs in the United States.

Now, justice requires me to say that the census of 1900 was taken in June, while the census of last year was taken in April.

There was, of course, a larger percentage of lambs expected in 1900 delivered when the census was taken and a smaller number in 1910, and, I take it, the estimate read by the Senator from New Hampshire embraces the estimate for the lambs which were born subsequent to April, 1910.

I ask leave to print in the RECORD, accompanying the table submitted by the Senator from New Hampshire, the preliminary bulletin which has just been issued by the Census Bureau.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, permission is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

SHEEP AND LAMBS ON FARMS AND RANGES.

[Preliminary statement of Thirteenth Census statistics issued by the Census Bureau.]

WASHINGTON, D. C., July 10, 1911.

Statistics relative to sheep and lambs reported on farms and ranges for the United States, by States and geographic divisions, at the Thirteenth Decennial Census, April 15, 1910, are contained in an official statement issued to-day by Acting Director Falkner. It is based on tabular summaries prepared under the direction of Dr. Le Grand Powers, chief statistician for agriculture in the Bureau of the Census. The figures are preliminary and subject to slight revision later, when a few other farms, whose returns are now incomplete, are included in the final tables.

NUMBER OF SHEEP AND LAMBS, 1910 AND 1900, FOR THE UNITED STATES.

In summing up the results Acting Director Falkner states that, for the country as a whole, there was no material change in the sheep industry in the 10 years between 1900 and 1910.

The total number of sheep and lambs in the United States reported for 1910 was 51,638,590, made up of 29,707,000 ewes, 7,148,366 rams and wethers, 12,168,278 lambs, and 2,614,946 sheep and lambs not classified by age or sex in the 1910 reports. In 1900 the total number reported was 61,503,713, comprising 31,857,652 ewes, 7,995,315 rams and wethers, and 21,650,746 lambs.

The public is cautioned that, owing to the different dates of enumeration in 1900 and 1910, the figures for lambs are not comparable for the two periods. As previously shown, the number reported in 1900 as of date June 1 was 21,650,746, while in 1910 the number returned as of April 15 was only 12,168,278. This decrease is said by the Acting Director to be more apparent than real. If the enumeration in 1910 had taken place as of June 1, the number of lambs at the two census periods would probably have been approximately the same as shown by the other statistics.

Excluding the lambs from consideration, the other figures are fairly comparable. Such action would leave a net total of 39,470,312 wool-producing sheep for 1910, as compared with 39,852,967 for 1900. The 1910 total will be slightly changed in the final reports of the Thirteenth Census by the tabulation of supplemental schedules for Arizona and New Mexico, which will add approximately 100,000 to the number stated. Hence, it is seen that there was actually a decrease of only 1 per cent in the net total number of wool-producing sheep in 1910 as finally to be compared with the corresponding total for 1900.

The figures in the present statement do not include the number of wool-producing sheep reported for cities and towns as distinct from those on farms and ranges given herein. Their total in 1900 was 179,600, while the preliminary tabulation now in progress indicates that the total for 1910 was approximately 255,600.

INCREASES AND DECREASES BY GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS.

The very slight decrease in the total number of wool-producing sheep was not uniform for all parts of the United States. The total number reported for the North Atlantic division was 1,566,033 in 1910, as compared with 2,533,579 in 1900, a decrease of approximately 1,000,000, distributed throughout all the States in that area. The South Atlantic division reported 1,552,284 in 1910, as compared with 1,706,199 in 1900, a decrease of about 154,000; the South Central division, 3,165,905, against 3,328,848 in 1900, a decrease of about 163,000; the North Central division, 10,069,451 in 1910, as compared with 10,055,721, an increase of about 14,000; and the Western division, 23,116,639 in 1910, against 22,228,620, an increase of nearly 1,000,000. The total change in the South Atlantic, South Central, and North Central divisions, therefore, was almost negligible and not at all uniform. A group of States, comprising Maryland, Virginia, Tennessee, Kentucky, Ohio, Illinois, Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, and Kansas, shows increases, whereas the States north and south of this central group show decreases. In the Western division Colorado, California, and Washington show slight decreases; Utah, a decrease of nearly 1,000,000; and New Mexico, a loss of 400,000. The other States show material increases.

NUMBER OF WOOL-PRODUCING SHEEP BY STATES.

In the North Atlantic division the number of wool-producing sheep reported for Maine was 149,934 in 1910 and 252,213 in 1900; New Hampshire, 31,201 in 1910 and 65,318 in 1900; Vermont, 84,360 in 1910 and 182,167 in 1900; Massachusetts, 22,672 in 1910 and 33,869 in 1900; Rhode Island, 4,206 in 1910 and 6,629 in 1900; Connecticut, 14,043 in 1910 and 23,021 in 1900; New York, 605,655 in 1910 and 984,516 in 1900; New Jersey, 16,593 in 1910 and 26,363 in 1900; and Pennsylvania, 637,369 in 1910 and 959,483 in 1900.

In the South Atlantic division the number of wool-producing sheep reported for Delaware was 4,415 in 1910 and 6,964 in 1900; Maryland, 126,251 in 1910 and 111,520 in 1900; District of Columbia, none; Virginia, 437,988 in 1910 and 392,125 in 1900; West Virginia, 564,378 in 1910 and 572,739 in 1900; North Carolina, 139,884 in 1910 and 208,812 in 1900; South Carolina, 28,024 in 1910 and 52,436 in 1900; Georgia, 154,442 in 1910 and 258,894 in 1900; and Florida, 96,902 in 1910 and 102,709 in 1900.

In the South Central division the number of wool-producing sheep reported for Kentucky was 776,894 in 1910 and 716,158 in 1900; Tennessee, 470,478 in 1910 and 307,804 in 1900; Alabama, 111,183 in 1910 and 229,298 in 1900; Mississippi, 156,506 in 1910 and 236,470 in 1900; Louisiana, 140,242 in 1910 and 169,234 in 1900; Texas, 1,364,554 in 1910 and 1,439,940 in 1900; Oklahoma, 48,766 in 1910 and 61,183 in 1900; and Arkansas, 97,282 in 1910 and 168,761 in 1900.

In the north central division the number of wool-producing sheep reported for Ohio was 2,892,272 in 1910 and 2,648,250 in 1900; Indiana, 812,427 in 1910 and 1,010,648 in 1900; Illinois, 661,484 in 1910 and 629,150 in 1900; Michigan, 1,545,241 in 1910 and 1,625,930 in 1900; Wisconsin, 628,539 in 1910 and 986,212 in 1900; Minnesota, 452,043 in 1910 and 359,328 in 1900; Iowa, 769,917 in 1910 and 657,868 in 1900; Missouri, 1,114,216 in 1910 and 663,703 in 1900; North Dakota, 239,114 in 1910 and 451,437 in 1900; South Dakota, 502,505 in 1910 and 507,338 in 1900; Nebraska, 245,195 in 1910 and 335,950 in 1900; and Kansas, 206,498 in 1910 and 179,907 in 1900.

In the western division the number of wool-producing sheep reported for Montana was 4,978,963 in 1910 and 4,215,214 in 1900; Wyoming, 4,676,206 in 1910 and 3,327,185 in 1900; Colorado, 1,313,048 in 1910 and 1,352,823 in 1900; New Mexico, 2,931,201 in 1910 and 3,333,743 in 1900; Arizona, 843,383 in 1910 and 668,458 in 1900; Utah, 1,670,890 in 1910 and 2,553,134 in 1900; Nevada, 810,973 in 1910 and 568,251 in 1900; Idaho, 2,160,029 in 1910 and 1,965,467 in 1900; Washington, 308,862 in 1910 and 558,022 in 1900; Oregon, 1,982,552 in 1910 and 1,961,855 in 1900; and California, 1,440,532 in 1910 and 1,724,968 in 1900.

NUMBER OF FARMS REPORTING SHEEP.

Although the number of mature sheep decreased very slightly during the decade, the number of farms reporting sheep decreased from 763,518 to 608,363, which is 155,155, or 20 per cent. The decrease in the number of farms in the North Atlantic States was at practically the same rate as the decrease in the number of mature sheep, leaving the average number of sheep per farm approximately 21 at both periods.

In the South Atlantic division, however, there was a decrease of practically 30,000 in the number of farms reporting, with only a slight decrease in the number of sheep. In 1900 the number of mature sheep

per farm in that group of States was 16, whereas in 1910 the average number per farm had increased to 20.

In the south central division the number of farms fell off about 44,000, which is a much greater relative decrease than that in the number of sheep. In 1900 the average number of sheep per farm was 22, whereas in 1910 it was about 29.

In the north central division both the number of farms and the number of mature sheep increased slightly, the number of sheep per farm being about 29 at each census period.

In the western division the increase in number of farms corresponds very closely to the increase in number of sheep; the average number of sheep per farm reporting being approximately 900 at each of the censuses.

WOOL.

The number of fleeces of wool and the total weight of the wool clip for 1909 has not yet been completely tabulated. The average weight per fleece for a group of 16 States already tabulated is 7.4 pounds. In 1900 the average weight per fleece for these States was 6.8 pounds, and for the entire United States 6.3 pounds. If the average weight for the entire United States for 1909 is 7.4 pounds, the aggregate weight of wool shorn in that year, including that clipped from the sheep on farms and in cities at the date of enumeration, and that shorn from sheep afterwards slaughtered in the spring of 1910, before the date of enumeration, will be approximately 296,000,000 pounds, while if the average weight for the farms of the country is only 7 pounds, the weight of the farm clip will not greatly differ from that returned by the census of 1900, or about 277,000,000 pounds.

SUMMARY FOR THE UNITED STATES, BY STATES.

The preliminary comparative summary follows:

Comparative summary—Sheep and lambs, by States and geographic divisions, April 15, 1910, and June 1, 1900.

States and geographic divisions.	Census years.	1 Farms reporting sheep and lambs.	2 Total sheep and lambs (number).	3 Ewes (number).	4 Rams and wethers (number).	5 Lambs ¹ (number).	6 Unclassified by age or sex (number).	7 Wool-producing sheep (columns 3, 4, and 6).
The United States.....	1910	608,363	51,638,590	29,707,000	7,148,366	12,168,278	2,614,946	39,470,312
	1900	763,518	61,603,713	31,857,652	7,995,315	21,650,746	39,852,967
NORTH ATLANTIC DIVISION.....	1910	71,470	2,273,478	1,345,750	219,458	707,445	825	1,566,033
	1900	120,377	4,247,100	2,259,823	273,756	1,713,521	2,533,579
Maine.....	1910	11,060	206,434	143,738	6,196	56,500	149,934
	1900	18,361	420,116	240,717	11,496	167,903	252,213
New Hampshire.....	1910	2,236	43,772	29,075	2,126	12,571	31,201
	1900	4,202	105,113	61,295	4,023	39,795	65,318
Vermont.....	1910	5,033	118,551	78,996	5,364	34,191	84,360
	1900	8,533	296,576	168,292	13,875	114,409	182,167
Massachusetts.....	1910	1,027	32,669	20,062	1,785	9,997	825	22,672
	1900	1,447	52,559	30,441	3,428	18,690	33,869
Rhode Island.....	1910	242	6,789	3,952	254	2,583	4,206
	1900	333	11,207	6,901	728	4,578	6,629
Connecticut.....	1910	741	22,418	12,781	1,262	8,375	14,043
	1900	1,258	36,987	20,655	2,366	13,966	23,021
New York.....	1910	24,830	929,547	508,414	37,241	323,892	605,655
	1900	40,625	1,745,746	938,315	46,201	761,230	984,516
New Jersey.....	1910	875	30,446	15,539	1,054	13,853	16,593
	1900	1,561	47,730	24,744	1,619	21,367	26,263
Pennsylvania.....	1910	25,426	882,832	473,193	164,176	245,483	637,369
	1900	44,057	1,531,066	769,463	190,020	571,583	959,433
SOUTH ATLANTIC DIVISION.....	1910	76,274	2,507,418	1,331,401	201,789	955,134	19,094	1,552,284
	1900	106,420	2,698,915	1,381,330	324,869	992,716	1,706,199
Delaware.....	1910	266	7,806	3,924	491	3,391	4,415
	1900	466	11,765	6,360	604	4,801	6,964
Maryland.....	1910	6,228	237,137	119,806	6,445	110,886	126,261
	1900	6,339	191,101	101,006	10,514	79,581	111,520
District of Columbia.....	1910
Virginia.....	1910	21,497	808,552	412,606	25,382	365,564	437,988
	1900	24,732	692,929	353,549	38,576	300,804	392,125
West Virginia.....	1910	26,014	906,093	496,623	67,755	341,715	564,378
	1900	30,266	968,843	497,247	75,492	396,104	572,739
North Carolina.....	1910	14,697	214,176	120,315	19,249	74,292	320	139,884
	1900	28,941	301,941	164,105	44,707	93,129	208,812
South Carolina.....	1910	1,732	37,434	21,844	5,425	9,410	755	28,024
	1900	3,921	71,538	40,478	11,958	19,102	52,436
Georgia.....	1910	5,180	187,589	101,239	46,474	33,147	6,729	154,442
	1900	10,891	336,278	162,704	96,190	77,384	258,894
Florida.....	1910	660	113,631	55,044	30,568	16,729	11,290	96,902
	1900	864	124,520	55,881	46,828	21,811	102,709
SOUTH CENTRAL DIVISION.....	1910	107,954	4,633,918	2,397,306	632,607	1,408,013	135,992	3,165,905
	1900	152,394	4,877,473	2,439,135	889,713	1,548,625	3,328,848
Kentucky.....	1910	45,707	1,360,004	719,591	54,343	583,110	2,960	776,894
	1900	50,835	1,297,343	647,838	68,320	581,185	716,158
Tennessee.....	1910	29,978	794,063	428,229	40,320	323,585	1,929	470,478
	1900	37,905	496,011	256,032	51,772	188,207	307,804
Alabama.....	1910	6,631	142,914	75,340	27,060	31,731	8,783	111,183
	1900	17,003	317,053	157,830	71,468	87,755	229,298
Mississippi.....	1910	5,723	194,285	106,315	45,518	37,779	5,673	156,506
	1900	14,430	312,632	162,188	74,282	76,162	236,470
Louisiana.....	1910	3,677	178,217	97,923	37,828	37,975	4,491	140,242
	1900	5,740	219,844	114,414	54,820	50,610	169,234
Texas.....	1910	6,929	1,757,963	851,371	404,391	393,409	108,792	1,364,554
	1900	6,416	1,889,298	924,174	515,766	449,353	1,439,940
Oklahoma ²	1910	877	62,282	40,561	7,189	13,516	1,016	48,766
	1900	804	88,263	45,959	15,224	27,180	61,183
Arkansas.....	1910	8,432	144,190	78,976	15,958	46,908	2,349	97,282
	1900	18,302	256,929	130,700	38,061	88,168	168,761

¹ Includes for 1910 lambs born between Jan. 1 and Apr. 15; for 1900, lambs under 1 year old June 1.

² Includes Indian Territory.

Comparative summary—Sheep and lambs, by States and geographic divisions, April 15, 1910, and June 1, 1900—Continued.

States and geographic divisions.	Census years.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		Farms reporting sheep and lambs.	Total sheep and lambs (number).	Ewes (number).	Rams and wethers (number).	Lambs ¹ (number).	Unclassified by age or sex (number).	Wool-producing sheep (columns 3, 4, and 6).
NORTH CENTRAL DIVISION.....	1910	326,329	14,600,315	8,542,271	1,454,883	4,530,864	72,297	10,069,451
	1900	358,569	16,180,556	8,675,532	1,380,189	6,124,835		10,055,721
Ohio.....	1910	71,523	3,907,055	2,178,544	697,693	1,014,783	16,035	2,892,272
	1900	73,636	4,020,628	2,090,093	558,157	1,372,378		2,648,250
Indiana.....	1910	38,191	1,336,967	742,576	69,851	524,540		812,427
	1900	48,046	1,742,002	940,387	70,261	731,354		1,010,648
Illinois.....	1910	26,262	1,062,846	586,487	74,997	401,362		661,484
	1900	25,422	1,030,581	548,853	80,297	401,431		629,150
Michigan.....	1910	54,865	2,306,476	1,433,263	111,978	761,235		1,545,241
	1900	63,339	2,747,609	1,508,503	117,427	1,121,679		1,625,930
Wisconsin.....	1910	30,040	929,783	588,628	39,911	301,244		628,539
	1900	47,061	1,675,453	918,638	67,574	689,241		986,212
Minnesota.....	1910	24,564	637,551	417,626	34,417	185,508		452,043
	1900	28,056	589,878	329,984	29,344	230,550		359,328
Iowa.....	1910	21,810	1,145,549	676,687	93,230	375,632		769,917
	1900	18,788	1,056,718	576,104	81,764	398,850		657,868
Missouri.....	1910	44,010	1,808,038	1,012,543	101,673	693,822		1,114,216
	1900	38,013	1,087,213	587,757	75,946	423,510		663,703
North Dakota.....	1910	3,723	289,354	178,973	52,617	50,240	7,524	239,114
	1900	4,957	681,952	340,273	111,164	230,515		451,437
South Dakota.....	1910	5,155	610,728	405,308	86,876	108,223	10,321	502,505
	1900	6,392	775,236	422,042	85,296	267,898		507,338
Nebraska.....	1910	3,043	293,496	160,955	56,317	48,301	27,923	245,195
	1900	2,764	511,273	279,073	56,877	175,323		335,950
Kansas.....	1910	3,143	272,472	160,681	35,323	65,974	10,494	206,498
	1900	2,095	262,013	133,825	46,082	82,106		179,907
WESTERN DIVISION.....	1910	26,336	27,623,461	16,090,272	4,639,629	4,506,822	2,386,738	23,116,639
	1900	25,758	33,499,669	17,101,832	5,126,788	11,271,049		22,228,620
Montana.....	1910	2,269	5,372,639	3,050,239	1,602,658	393,676	326,066	4,978,963
	1900	1,481	6,170,483	2,995,795	1,219,419	1,955,269		4,215,214
Wyoming.....	1910	1,670	5,194,959	3,413,975	792,921	518,753	469,310	4,676,206
	1900	1,076	5,099,613	2,498,914	828,271	1,772,428		3,327,185
Colorado.....	1910	1,794	1,424,187	1,022,834	178,923	111,139	111,291	1,313,048
	1900	1,255	2,044,814	1,089,680	263,143	691,991		1,352,823
New Mexico.....	1910	1,848	3,286,285	1,847,908	424,100	355,084	659,193	2,931,201
	1900	2,504	4,899,487	2,850,876	482,867	1,565,744		3,333,743
Arizona.....	1910	621	1,061,363	537,262	115,883	217,980	190,238	843,383
	1900	602	924,761	452,271	216,187	256,303		668,458
Utah.....	1910	2,419	1,827,180	1,340,595	330,295	156,290		1,670,890
	1900	3,544	3,818,423	1,893,802	659,332	1,265,289		2,553,134
Nevada.....	1910	316	1,103,889	602,780	125,906	292,916	82,287	810,973
	1900	255	887,039	434,574	133,677	318,788		565,251
Idaho.....	1910	2,996	2,950,534	1,598,734	259,800	790,505	301,495	2,160,029
	1900	1,936	3,121,532	1,611,090	354,377	1,156,065		1,965,467
Washington.....	1910	2,116	471,521	206,160	60,960	162,659	41,742	308,862
	1900	2,793	929,873	459,158	98,864	371,851		558,022
Oregon.....	1910	6,394	2,696,779	1,394,472	491,982	714,227	96,098	1,982,552
	1900	6,696	3,040,291	1,480,282	481,073	1,078,936		1,961,355
California.....	1910	3,893	2,234,125	1,075,313	256,201	793,593	109,018	1,440,532
	1900	3,616	2,563,353	1,335,390	389,578	838,385		1,724,968

¹Includes for 1910 lambs born between Jan. 1 and Apr. 15; for 1900, lambs under 1 year old June 1.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I now wish to ask one question of the Senator from Montana [Mr. Dixon] or the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot]. I myself do not know about the matter, and I desire either one of them to tell me the price in the United States to-day of the three grades of wool—fine, medium, and coarse—and the price of the same grades of wool in England to-day.

Mr. DIXON. I will say to the Senator right now that in the last 10 days or 2 weeks there has been a gradual decrease in the market, until to-day there is practically no wool market. It has gone. I want to say now—

Mr. BAILEY and Mr. SMOOT addressed the Chair.

Mr. DIXON. I must insist on having the floor some of the time. I will read the telegram I sent for awhile ago for the benefit of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Gore]. I see the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Williams] has left the Chamber. It is dated Billings, Mont., July 10, and is as follows:

Wool conditions worse than since 1893. Many clips unsold. Buyers will not buy until they know what action Congress will take upon the wool schedule.

The telegram is signed by a prominent citizen of Montana.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Montana if that telegram was sent in response to a telegram from him?

Mr. DIXON. Absolutely no.

Mr. GORE. Very well. Then I will ask the Senators from Montana and Utah to state the price of wool in the United States on June 20, the day before the bill revising the wool schedule was referred to the committee, and the price of wool in England on June 20. I do not know the prices, and want to find out.

Mr. DIXON. That would be just like asking a man how many grains of dirt there are on Pennsylvania Avenue between

here and the White House. Nobody can tell that. I will say generally, however, making a rough off-hand statement, that at that time the price of wool in this country was about 17 cents a pound and on the London market about 14 or 15 cents; that is, roughly speaking.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, of course—

Mr. DIXON. The Senator from Utah and the Senator from Wyoming can probably give more accurate figures than those I have given.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma asks for the prices of the three grades of wool on June 20 in this country and in England.

Mr. GORE. I do not mean that particular date, I will say to the Senator, but prior to the reference of the wool bill.

Mr. SMOOT. On the different classes of wool the prices vary according to the shrinkage of the wool and according to its length and fineness.

Mr. GORE. I realize that.

Mr. SMOOT. The price of first-class wool in London would run all the way from 16 cents up to 24 at that particular time, and perhaps it may have been a little higher; this, of course, is wool in the grease. In this country, in the Boston market, it would run all the way, I should say, from 18 cents to 22 cents, or about that. I could go on and tell the Senator the price for second-class and third-class wool, but the prices are all different.

Mr. GORE. Of course, I know of the varieties of grade, but I had been informed by a man in the wool business that wool in England was selling higher than it was in the United States, grade for grade.

Mr. SMOOT. That is not true.

Mr. WARREN. It is not true.

Mr. GORE. I did not know, but I wanted to find out.

Mr. DIXON. In the neighborhood of 2 cents has been about the average difference, as I remember, in the price.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. DIXON. Yes.

Mr. WARREN. With reference to what the Senator from Oklahoma has quoted, I will say, it is true that the latest figures of the census show a shortage in the number of sheep as compared with the number a year ago. Winter before last in Wyoming and in portions of the neighboring States—as, for instance, in Montana—was the most disastrous that has ever been known since the settlement of that country. Wyoming, which has more sheep than any other State in the Union, according to the records—

Mr. BAILEY. Not according to the records.

Mr. WARREN. According to the records. I assert it again.

Mr. BAILEY. Then the Government publications are wrong.

Mr. WARREN. Very well.

Mr. BAILEY. I thought the Senator from Wyoming was a little mistaken when he corrected the Senator from Montana, but I did not choose to interfere. The difference is small, but Montana—

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I want to say that Montana has led for a number of years; and it is only within two years that the claim of Wyoming has been that she has more sheep than Montana, and perhaps when I have finished—

Mr. BAILEY. On April 1, 1910—that is within two years—Montana had 4,800,000 and Wyoming had 4,650,000 sheep.

Mr. WARREN. From what is the Senator reading?

Mr. BAILEY. The Statistical Abstract published by the Government of the United States—not always accurate, I will grant you, but we must use it.

Mr. WARREN. I do not care to be led into that question just now, in the time of the Senator from Montana [Mr. Dixon], because the Senator from Montana himself and I have no quarrel as to that, and we all know that no other States in the Union have near as many sheep as either Montana or Wyoming. I want to say as to the number of sheep that the decrease in the State of Wyoming was considered to be by many more than 33½ per cent.

The loss was nearly as great in Montana. Not only was the weather in December and January more severe than we had ever known before, but the breeding season was so interfered with because of the cold that the lamb crop of the next spring was only about half the usual number, and that winter and bad lambing season was followed by the driest summer we have ever had. The tariff, of course, is not responsible for that in any manner. I am glad to say that the last winter was the best we have ever had, and that the lamb crop was the largest, and another year will show probably that we have made up that shortage.

As to the figures in 1900, that is a matter that has been up and discussed here before. That arises from changing the time of the count and counting lambs in one year that were not counted in another. For instance, lambs born in May are sold for slaughter oftentimes in September and October by the thousands and even by the millions, taken altogether; and so, if you make the count on the 1st day of July, you get quite a different number from that you would get on the 1st day of October or the 1st day of January or the 1st day of April. That is best proved by taking the number of sheep each year up to 1900 and from 1900 since, which shows conclusively that some error occurred in the computation for that one year.

Mr. DIXON. Now, Mr. President, I must finish my remarks. I did not get up to discuss the wool tariff. I was led into it incidentally; but on the pending motion, which is—

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, just one word.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana further yield?

Mr. DIXON. Only for a short question.

Mr. GORE. I wish to say that the explanation of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Warren] is entirely satisfactory to me. I did not know whether the falling off was due to panic, tempest, or drought, but I did know that the necessary disaster would be available and forthcoming.

Mr. DIXON. I want to say, Mr. President, a few words regarding the pending amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. Bailey], known as the free-list bill. I think it is superfluous for me to repeat the statement that I am a protectionist and have always tried to be consistent in my votes on the protective tariff. I voted for the Payne bill, not because I believed it was perfect, but because I thought it was the best that could be had at the time. At this time, however, I am compelled to cast my vote in support of the amendment offered

by the Senator from Texas, known as the free-list bill, and in perfect frankness I want to state why.

Any tariff, whether protective or for revenue, should cover all phases of industry. A minority of the Republican Party at this session of Congress is drifting from its ancient moorings. Evidently by the vote of this Senate, including all of the Democratic Senators but three or four and a minority of the Republican Senators from the great manufacturing States, by their votes are going deliberately and purposely, and I started to say with malice aforethought, to strip from the farmers of this country every vestige of the protective tariff as it applies to them except on the one article of wool, and yet hope to adjourn without revising the general tariff schedules.

I want to say if Canadian reciprocity passes and becomes a law I am ready to stay here until December and go through the whole list. I notice the so-called free-list amendment is grouped into four or five classes—agricultural implements, cotton bagging, cotton ties, leather, boots and shoes, barbed wire, and lumber. I remember two years ago in the discussion of the Payne bill, during that long, hot summer, a gentleman from Jersey City, N. J., or possibly Newark—one of the cities right near New York—was over here. He was a leather manufacturer over here lobbying for free hides. He came to my office and attempted to convert me to that theory. He said he was a Democrat in politics, and I asked him by what theory of equity or rule of reason he asked me to vote to remove the 15 per cent duty on hides and yet vote to maintain a duty on manufactured leather. He attempted to give me some kind of an argument that hides was a by-product of the farmer and that the tariff on hides was simply a subterfuge, a delusion, and a snare.

After the duty on hides had been removed he came back to my office in a very jocular manner. He exultingly called my attention to the fact that the duty had been removed on hides anyway, notwithstanding my opposition, and I then said to him that if, in the goodness of an all-wise Providence, I should ever happen to be a Member of the American Congress when tariff duties were again revised, remembering the propaganda entered into at that time by the manufacturers of leather, the tanners, and the shoe men to remove the little pittance that the farmer did receive from his hides of cattle—if I knew how to do equity, not in a spirit of revenge, but in dealing out cold-blooded equity to these same people I would never again vote for a duty on shoes or leather or any product of leather. I expect this afternoon thus to register my vote.

If these amendments came up under normal conditions, when the Republican Senators from the New England States were trying to do equity to all classes and all sections, it would be different, but when I see the principle of protection deserted by the very men representing communities in this Senate Chamber who ought to be its staunchest defenders; when I see Senators from New England united with the Democratic Senators from the South, deliberately destroying the protection of the Northwestern farmer by the enactment of the so-called Canadian reciprocity bill, while it may not be abstractly right, when I see that thing happen in this Chamber, then my vote will be cast for the free-list bill to bring home to these men and these communities and these industries the great lesson of doing unto others as you would have others do unto you. I am satisfied that in the present abnormal condition of tariff discussion and tariff agitation it is the only way you are ever going to invoke a square deal in writing a tariff schedule in this country, and for that reason I expect to support by my vote the amendment of the Senator from Texas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, just a word, and that not upon the pending matter.

Yesterday afternoon at the close of the session I uttered a rather bitter reflection upon the Hon. Robert J. Walker, accusing him of downright and positive falsehood. I had not at that time supposed there was any doubt in the mind of any man as to the correctness or accuracy of what I said. But the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Williams] surprised me by saying he had never before heard that accusation against Mr. Walker. That being true, I am sure I was mistaken in assuming that it was a matter of universal knowledge, and being mistaken in that supposition I feel that I owe it to myself to incorporate into the Record the proof of the charge I made.

I have here the great work of Jefferson Davis, entitled "The Rise and Fall of the Confederate Government," and in that book he alludes to this very misconduct of Walker. He does not mention him by name, but everybody familiar with the history of that time knows that he here referred to Mr. Walker by designation if not by name.

Discussing the Confederate Government's foreign debt in the preceding paragraph, he then says:

Great efforts had previously been made by agents of the United States Government to reflect upon the credit of the Confederate States by resuscitating an almost forgotten accusation of repudiation against the State of Mississippi, and especially by an emissary sent to Great Britain, than whom no one knew better how false were the attempts to implicate my name in that charge.

The emissary sent to Great Britain, of course, was the Hon. Robert J. Walker.

I have here the only history of Mississippi I have ever read, and so far as I know the only one of that State ever published. It was written by the Hon. John H. F. Claiborne, who was once a Member of the House of Representatives and was one of the contestants in the most famous contested-election case ever tried by the House of Representatives. He was one of the contestants in the famous case of *Prentiss and Word v. Claiborne and Gholson*. I ask the clerk to read the paragraph which I have indicated by pencil mark.

There is some bitter reflection on Mr. Walker that I would not myself care to incorporate into the RECORD, but it is the history, and I ask that it be read inasmuch as I made the charge.

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

The Secretary read as follows:

In his professional life, after his retirement from the Treasury, his practice was chiefly confined to a few large cases with heavy contingent fees, and he thus became associated with a class of reckless and sometimes not very clean speculators, more or less to his injury, though sometimes profitable.

Among these he got as a fee an interest in the celebrated "New Almaden quicksilver mine" in California. After protracted and expensive litigation his party won it, but the defeated party refused to give possession, and military preparations were made on both sides. A compromise, however, was effected by allowing a million and three-quarters for a peaceable relinquishment. Mr. Walker disposed of his interest for near \$500,000, and was about that time appointed by President Lincoln, on the recommendation of Secretary Seward, financial agent in Europe for the United States. The main object of his mission was to discredit the Confederate States and cripple their efforts to obtain money and recognition. In this he fully succeeded. Forgetting that all he was he owed to the generous people of Mississippi, who had lifted him from poverty and obscurity, he denounced her for repudiating just debts and implicated President Davis, who had never had any connection, direct or contingent, with the subject. But while, Casca-like, stabbing his best friend, he forgot to mention that the sinking fund, which had been set apart for this very debt, he had contrived to borrow, and afterwards refused payment except in depreciated warrants. The spirit of nationality might properly have induced Mr. Walker to adhere to the Federal Government, but he should never have accepted a service directly against his early benefactors and best friends. On this mission Mr. Walker appeared in great state. He traveled with a large retinue of attachés and servants, with the air of an imperial prince. How much of the public money and how much of his own he expended in this pageantry it is needless to inquire. This suddenly acquired fortune melted rapidly away, and the great financier, after this last crusade against his early friends, is understood to have died in embarrassed circumstances. He was indebted to Mississippi for his earthly honors, and it is painful to record that his last energies were earnestly employed to crush and destroy her.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Just one moment. I desire to ask the Senator from Texas a question. I desire to ask the Senator from Texas whether the adoption of this amendment, and its enactment into law will extend to the manufacturers and tradesmen of the world the free and unrestricted market in the United States for the articles enumerated in this amendment?

Mr. BAILEY. It was intended to do that, and I think it would do that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. By the sound the "noes" appear to have it.

Mr. BAILEY. It would be a waste of the Senate's time to call the roll. I shall not ask to do that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The "noes" have it, and the amendment is rejected.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I now intend to offer the woolen schedule. It is, however, about the adjournment time, and I hope the Senator from Pennsylvania will now move an adjournment. I can offer the amendment and have it pending.

Mr. PENROSE. I would suggest to the Senator from Texas that he offer the amendment and have it pending, if that is entirely agreeable to him.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas offers the following amendment.

Mr. BAILEY. As the other amendment would have been section 4, it having been defeated, I will ask the Secretary to number the first section of it section 4, and so on.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator desire to have the amendment read?

Mr. BAILEY. I will ask, instead of reading the amendment, to have it printed in the RECORD, so that it will appear there in the morning.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that course will be followed.

The amendment is as follows:

Add new section as follows:

"SEC. 4. That on and after the 1st day of January, 1912, the articles hereinafter enumerated, described, and provided for shall, when imported from any foreign country into the United States or into any of its possessions (except the Philippine Islands and the islands of Guam and Tutuila), be subjected to the duties hereinafter provided, and no others; that is to say:

"1. On wool of the sheep, hair of the camel, goat, alpaca, and other like animals, and on all wools and hair on the skin of such animals, the duty shall be 30 per cent ad valorem.

"2. On all noils, top waste, card waste, slubbing waste, roving waste, ring waste, yarn waste, bur waste, thread waste, garnetted waste, shoddies, mungo, flocks, wool extract, carbonized wool, carbonized noils, and on all other wastes and on rags composed wholly or in part of wool, and not specially provided for in this act, the duty shall be 30 per cent ad valorem.

"3. On combed wool or tops and roving or roping, made wholly or in part of wool or camel's hair, and on other wool and hair which have been advanced in any manner or by any process of manufacture beyond the washed or scoured condition, not specially provided for in this act, the duty shall be 30 per cent ad valorem.

"4. On yarns made wholly or in part of wool the duty shall be 30 per cent ad valorem.

"5. On cloths, knit fabrics, felts not woven, and all manufactures of every description made, by any process, wholly or in part of wool, not specially provided for in this act, the duty shall be 30 per cent ad valorem.

"6. On blankets and flannels, composed wholly or in part of wool, the duty shall be 30 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That on flannels composed wholly or in part of wool, valued at above 50 cents per pound, the duty shall be 45 per cent ad valorem.

"7. On women's and children's dress goods, coat linings, Italian cloths, bunting, and goods of similar description and character, composed wholly or in part of wool, and not specially provided for in this act, the duty shall be 30 per cent ad valorem.

"8. On clothing, ready-made, and articles of wearing apparel of every description, including shawls whether knitted or woven, and knitted articles of every description made up or manufactured wholly or in part, and not specially provided for in this act, composed wholly or in part of wool, the duty shall be 30 per cent ad valorem.

"9. On 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, on any of the foregoing made of wool or of which wool is a component material, whether containing India rubber or not, the duty shall be 30 per cent ad valorem.

"10. On Aubusson, Axminster, moquette, and chenille carpets, figured or plain, and all carpets or carpetings of like character or description, the duty shall be 40 per cent ad valorem.

"11. On Saxony, Wilton, and Tournay velvet carpets, figured or plain, and all carpets or carpeting of like character or description, the duty shall be 40 per cent ad valorem.

"12. On Brussels carpets, figured or plain, and all carpets or carpeting of like character or description, the duty shall be 30 per cent ad valorem.

"13. On velvet and tapestry velvet carpets, figured or plain, printed on the warp or otherwise, and all carpets or carpetings of like character or description, the duty shall be 35 per cent ad valorem.

"14. On tapestry Brussels carpets, figured or plain, and all carpets or carpeting of like character or description, printed on the warp or otherwise, the duty shall be 30 per cent ad valorem.

"15. On treble ingrain, 3-ply, and all-chain Venetian carpets, the duty shall be 30 per cent ad valorem.

"16. On wool Dutch and 2-ply ingrain carpets, the duty shall be 30 per cent ad valorem.

"17. On carpets of every description, woven whole for rooms, and Oriental, Berlin, Aubusson, Axminster, and similar rugs, the duty shall be 50 per cent ad valorem.

"18. On druggets and bockings, printed, colored, or otherwise, the duty shall be 30 per cent ad valorem.

"19. On carpets and carpeting of wool, flax, or cotton, or composed in part of any of them, not specially provided for in this act, and on mats, matting, and rugs of cotton, the duty shall be 30 per cent ad valorem.

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

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

"SEC. 5. That on and after the day when this act shall go into effect all goods, wares, and merchandise previously imported, and hereinafter enumerated, described, and provided for, for which no entry has been made, and all such goods, wares, and merchandise previously entered without payment of duty and under bond for warehousing, transportation, or any other purpose, for which no permit of delivery to the importer or his agent has been issued, shall be subjected to the duties imposed by this act and no other duty, upon the entry or the withdrawal thereof.

"SEC. 6. That all acts and parts of acts in conflict with the provisions of this act be, and the same are hereby, repealed. This act shall take effect and be in force on and after the 1st day of January, 1912."

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CULLOM. 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 4 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 6 o'clock p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, July 13, 1911, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 12, 1911.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

CAVALRY ARM.

Capt. Alonzo Gray, Fourteenth Cavalry, to be major from June 26, 1911, vice Maj. William C. Rivers, Cavalry, unassigned, detached from his proper command under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Capt. Alexander L. Dade, Ninth Cavalry, to be major from June 29, 1911, vice Maj. J. F. Reynolds Landis, Ninth Cavalry, advanced to the grade of lieutenant colonel under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

First Lieut. Henry Gibbins, Cavalry, unassigned, to be captain from June 29, 1911, vice Capt. Alexander L. Dade, Ninth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Henry R. Adair, Tenth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from June 26, 1911, vice First Lieut. Allan F. Pope, Tenth Cavalry, detached from his proper command under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Second Lieut. James S. Greene, Tenth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from June 26, 1911, vice First Lieut. Robert M. Campbell, Eleventh Cavalry, detached from his proper command under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Second Lieut. Gerald C. Brant, Ninth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from June 26, 1911, vice First Lieut. Henry C. Pratt, Ninth Cavalry, detached from his proper command under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

FIELD ARTILLERY ARM.

Second Lieut. Leonard C. Sparks, Sixth Field Artillery, to be first lieutenant from July 1, 1911, vice First Lieut. David C. Seagrave, Fourth Field Artillery, detailed in the Ordnance Department on that date.

Second Lieut. John A. Crane, Fifth Field Artillery, to be first lieutenant from July 1, 1911, vice First Lieut. John Lund, Fourth Field Artillery, detailed in the Ordnance Department on that date.

APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE ARMY.

CAVALRY ARM.

Second Lieut. John R. Lynch, Third Field Artillery, to be second lieutenant of Cavalry, with rank from August 17, 1910.

FIELD ARTILLERY ARM.

Second Lieut. Robert C. F. Goetz, Third Cavalry, to be second lieutenant of Field Artillery, with rank from August 17, 1910.

ADVANCEMENT IN GRADE.

Under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911, the officer herein named for advancement in grade in accordance with the rank he would have been entitled to hold had promotion been lineal throughout his arm of service since the date of his entry into the arm to which he permanently belongs.

CAVALRY ARM.

Maj. J. F. Reynolds Landis, Ninth Cavalry, to be lieutenant colonel from June 29, 1911.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Richmond Bryant, a citizen of Texas, to be a second lieutenant in the United States Marine Corps from the 6th day of July, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

Chief Gunner Arthur A. Phelps to be a chief gunner in the Navy, to rank with, but after, lieutenant (junior grade) on the retired list, from the 11th day of February, 1910, the date upon which he was transferred to the retired list, in accordance with the provisions of an act of Congress approved June 29, 1906.

Lieut. Commander Cleland Davis, an additional number in grade, to be a commander in the Navy from the 9th day of January, 1911, with the officer next above him.

Lieut. Walter G. Roper to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 14th day of January, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Edward L. McSheehy to be a lieutenant in the Navy to fill a vacancy occurring February 15, 1911, and to take rank from January 31, 1911.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1911, to fill vacancies:

Leigh Noyes and
Walter B. Decker.

Ensign Walter F. Jacobs to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 13th day of February, 1911, upon the completion of three years' service as an ensign.

Passed Asst. Surg. Howard F. Strine to be a surgeon in the Navy from the 2d day of June, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

Lieut. Commander Henry H. Hough to be a commander in the Navy from the 19th day of May, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

Passed Asst. Surg. Louis W. Bishop to be a surgeon in the Navy from the 24th day of August, 1910, to fill a vacancy.

Asst. Surg. Earle P. Huff to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy from the 12th day of July, 1910, upon the completion of three years' service as an assistant surgeon.

Asst. Surg. Lawrence M. Schmidt to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy from the 28th day of December, 1910, upon the completion of three years' service as an assistant surgeon.

Asst. Surg. Ralph W. McDowell to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy from the 18th day of May, 1911, upon the completion of three years' service as an assistant surgeon.

The following-named assistant surgeons to be passed assistant surgeons in the Navy from the 15th day of June, 1911, upon the completion of three years' service as assistant surgeons:

Lindsay C. Whiteside and
George C. Thomas.

COMMISSIONER OF IMMIGRATION.

Samuel W. Backus, of California, to be commissioner of immigration at the port of San Francisco, Cal., in the Department of Commerce and Labor, vice Hart H. North, resigned.

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

J. H. Mason to be postmaster at Columbiana, Ala., in place of James I. Abercrombie, resigned.

CONNECTICUT.

Marshall Emmons to be postmaster at East Haddam, Conn. Office became presidential July 1, 1911.

Grace W. Goddard to be postmaster at Essex, Conn., in place of Alfred E. Goddard, deceased.

FLORIDA.

Belle Booth to be postmaster at Panama City, Fla. Office became presidential July 1, 1911.

IDAHO.

Edmond M. Merrell to be postmaster at Soda Springs, Idaho. Office became presidential July 1, 1911.

ILLINOIS.

Eugene S. Coddington to be postmaster at National Stock Yards, Ill., in place of Thomas H. White. Incumbent's commission expired February 12, 1911.

Charles H. Mead to be postmaster at Augusta, Ill., in place of Joseph H. Coffman. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1910.

Merritt J. Platt to be postmaster at East Dubuque, Ill. Office became presidential July 1, 1911.

IOWA.

Frank Kreamer to be postmaster at Exira, Iowa, in place of Ernest D. Powell, resigned.

KANSAS.

Philip G. Kopplin to be postmaster at Hoisington, Kans., in place of Warren D. Vincent, removed.

KENTUCKY.

John J. Callihan to be postmaster at Russell, Ky. Office became presidential July 1, 1911.

MICHIGAN.

Jacob Erb to be postmaster at Royal Oak, Mich. Office became presidential July 1, 1910.

Charles J. Pailthorpe to be postmaster at Petoskey, Mich., in place of James Buckley, deceased.

Joseph O. Prosser to be postmaster at Palatka, Mich. Office became presidential July 1, 1911.

William H. Whittle to be postmaster at Painesdale, Mich., in place of Charles G. Kellow, resigned.

Algernon S. Young to be postmaster at Harrison, Mich. Office became presidential July 1, 1911.

MONTANA.

Howard M. Cosier to be postmaster at Poplar, Mont. Office became presidential July 1, 1911.

Ingeborg Jacobson to be postmaster at Cut Bank, Mont. Office became presidential July 1, 1911.

Edwin C. Spencer to be postmaster at Hardin, Mont. Office became presidential July 1, 1911.

Charles Weber to be postmaster at Thompson, Mont. Office became presidential July 1, 1911.

MISSOURI.

George Kells to be postmaster at Elvins, Mo., in place of Carr Hartshorn, resigned.

NEBRASKA.

John W. Steinhart to be postmaster at Nebraska City, Nebr., in place of Frank McCartney. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1910.

NEW JERSEY.

Charles Eichhorn to be postmaster at West Hoboken, N. J., in place of Charles Eichhorn. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1910.

William P. Ellett to be postmaster at Branchville, N. J., in place of George Phillips, resigned.

John M. Onderdonk to be postmaster at Montvale, N. J. Office became presidential July 1, 1911.

William H. Pfeiffer to be postmaster at Perth Amboy, N. J., in place of George H. Tice, removed.

NEW YORK.

Charles C. Horton to be postmaster at Silver Creek, N. Y., in place of Charles C. Horton. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1911.

OHIO.

Peter T. McLellan to be postmaster at Lucasville, Ohio. Office became presidential July 1, 1911.

Mary Sivals to be postmaster at Woodville, Ohio. Office became presidential January 1, 1911.

OKLAHOMA.

William R. Cowan to be postmaster at McCurtain, Okla. Office became presidential July 1, 1911.

Allas M. Gingrich to be postmaster at Marshall, Okla. Office became presidential October 1, 1909.

George W. Merrill to be postmaster at Stratford, Okla. Office became presidential July 1, 1911.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Peter W. Triebele to be postmaster at Willow Grove, Pa. Office became presidential July 1, 1911.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

Henry D. Lehmberg to be postmaster at Colome, S. Dak. Office became presidential July 1, 1911.

Joseph P. Purinton to be postmaster at De Smet, S. Dak., in place of Delbert W. Wilmarth. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1911.

Albert G. Richards to be postmaster at Morristown, S. Dak. Office became presidential July 1, 1911.

TEXAS.

Jack Alley to be postmaster at Tahoka, Tex., in place of Amagar B. McLoud, resigned.

John M. Cape to be postmaster at San Marcos, Tex., in place of John M. Cape. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1911.

Tolbert Hannon to be postmaster at Richmond, Tex., in place of Henry L. Somerville, deceased.

May Harrison to be postmaster at Rising Star, Tex., in place of May Harrison. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1911.

Andrew G. Hershner to be postmaster at Angleton, Tex., in place of Andrew G. Hershner. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1911.

D. G. Hunt to be postmaster at Eastland, Tex., in place of Johnnie J. Kelly. Incumbent's commission expired February 21, 1911.

A. W. Long to be postmaster at Childress, Tex., in place of U. S. Weddington, removed.

Gustave A. Pannewitz to be postmaster at Shiner, Tex., in place of Gustave A. Pannewitz. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1910.

VIRGINIA.

Susan H. Boswell to be postmaster at Burkeville, Va., in place of John H. Boswell, deceased.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Zephaniah J. Martin to be postmaster at Fairview (late Amos), W. Va., in place of Zephaniah J. Martin, to change name of office.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 12, 1911.

ASSISTANT SOLICITOR OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND LABOR.

Edward T. Quigley to be Assistant Solicitor of the Department of Commerce and Labor.

COMMISSIONER OF IMMIGRATION.

Samuel W. Backus, Commissioner of Immigration, San Francisco, Cal.

POSTMASTERS.

ILLINOIS.

Charles S. Mead, Augusta.

MICHIGAN.

Charles J. Pallthroe, Petoskey.

TENNESSEE.

Robert P. Sulte, Rockwood.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, July 12, 1911.

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

Prayer by Rev. Paul R. Hickok, of Metropolitan Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., as follows:

We praise Thee, O Lord, our God, for the assurance we have that Thou art present, that Thou art the rewarder of those who diligently seek after Thee. We come before Thee now confessing Thy sovereignty over us and invoking Thy blessing. Pardon all our iniquities, we pray, and fill us with a stronger purpose after righteousness. May we know Thy will, and may we earnestly desire to perform Thy will.

Give Thy richest blessings unto all Thy servants everywhere, and especially to the Members and officers of this House in their deliberations and in their enactments. Give Thy very special and merciful blessing to all those who are ill or burdened or tempted or who are passing through tribulations. Particularly would we ask Thy blessing for the household of that one of the Members of this House recently deceased, and we earnestly beseech Thee that the comfort which cometh from the Most High may come to each one of them.

Mercifully preserve and protect, O God, the loved ones who are far away. Increase our own love for our country and our devotion to our institutions, and in all our comings and goings let the words of our mouths and the motives of our hearts be acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord, our strength and our Redeemer. We ask it in the Master's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, July 8, 1911, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills and resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 77. An act to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge in and for the district of Colorado;

S. 955. An act to provide for the extension of the post-office and courthouse building at Dallas, Tex., and for other purposes;

S. 1069. An act to amend an act authorizing the widening and extension of Minnesota Avenue SE. from its present terminus near Pennsylvania Avenue SE. to the Sheriff Road, approved February 25, 1909;

S. 1650. An act to amend section 110 of an act to codify revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary, approved March 3, 1911;

S. 2600. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prevent the exhibition of obscene, lewd, indecent, or vulgar pictures in public places of amusement in the District of Columbia;

S. 2604. An act authorizing the President to appoint an additional circuit judge for the fourth circuit;

S. 2768. An act to authorize the St. Louis-Kansas City Electric Railway Co. to construct a bridge across the Missouri River at or near the town of Weldon Springs Landing, Mo.;

S. J. Res. 31. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to loan certain tents for the use of the Astoria Centennial, to be held at Astoria, Oreg., August 10 to September 9, 1911;

S. J. Res. 32. Joint resolution authorizing chief clerks in offices of surveyors general to approve and sign plats and field notes of public-land surveys; also

Senate concurrent resolution 6.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That the hearings held before the Employers' Liability and Workmen's Compensation Commission be printed as a public document, and that 3,500 additional copies be printed for the use of the Employers' Liability and Workmen's Compensation Commission.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions:

Resolved. That the Senate has heard with deep sensibility the announcement of the death of the Hon. ALEXANDER CLARK MITCHELL, late a Representative from the State of Kansas.