

Mr. STERLING. Making the same announcement as to my pair and its transfer as on the last vote, I vote "nay."

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Making the same announcement as before with reference to my pair and its transfer, I vote "nay."

Mr. MCKINLEY. Making the same announcement as before, I vote "nay."

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. ODDIE] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. NICHOLSON] are unavoidably absent. If present they would vote "nay."

The roll call resulted—yeas 12, nays 31, as follows:

YEAS—12.			
Harrison	La Follette	Sheppard	Swanson
Heflin	Owen	Shields	Underwood
King	Pepper	Simmons	Walsh, Mass.
NAYS—31.			
Bursum	Jones, Wash.	McKinley	Shortridge
Curtis	Kellogg	McLean	Smoot
du Pont	Kendrick	McNary	Sterling
Ernst	Keys	Nelson	Sutherland
Fernald	Ladd	New	Warren
Gooding	Lodge	Norbeck	Watson, Ind.
Hale	McCormick	Phipps	Willis
Johnson	McCumber	Rawson	
NOT VOTING—53.			
Ashurst	Dillingham	Moses	Smith
Ball	Edge	Myers	Spencer
Borah	Elkins	Newberry	Stanfield
Brandeggee	Fletcher	Nicholson	Stanley
Broussard	France	Norris	Townsend
Calder	Frelinghuysen	Oddie	Trammell
Cameron	Gerry	Overman	Wadsworth
Capper	Glass	Page	Walsh, Mont.
Caraway	Harreld	Pittman	Watson, Ga.
Colt	Harris	Poindexter	Weller
Crew	Hitchcock	Pomerene	Williams
Culberson	Jones, N. Mex.	Ransdell	
Cummins	Lenroot	Reed	
Dial	McKellar	Robinson	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] to the amendment of the committee the yeas are 12 and the nays are 31. A quorum not having voted, the Secretary will call the roll.

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

Capper	Jones, Wash.	McLean	Shortridge
Curtis	Kellogg	McNary	Simmons
du Pont	Kendrick	Nelson	Smoot
Ernst	Keys	New	Sterling
Fernald	Ladd	Pepper	Sutherland
Gooding	La Follette	Phipps	Underwood
Hale	Lodge	Pittman	Walsh, Mass.
Heflin	McCormick	Rawson	Warren
Hitchcock	McCumber	Robinson	Watson, Ind.
Johnson	McKinley	Sheppard	Willis

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LADD in the chair). Forty Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the names of the absent Senators.

The reading clerk called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. BURSUM, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. NORBECK, and Mr. POINDEXTER answered to their names when called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-four Senators have answered to their names; a quorum is not present. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

RECESS.

Mr. SMOOT. I move, in accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement, that the Senate take a recess, the recess being until Wednesday, July 5, at 11 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and at 2 o'clock p. m. the Senate, under the order previously made, took a recess until Wednesday, July 5, 1922, at 11 o'clock a. m.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, July 5, 1922.

(Legislative day of Thursday, April 20, 1922.)

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

THE TARIFF.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7456) to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes, the pending question being on the amendment of Mr. WALSH, of Massachusetts, to the amendment of the Committee on Finance.

The amendment was, in paragraph 754, page 110, line 13, before the word "cents," to strike out "12" and insert "15," so as to make the paragraph read:

Almonds, not shelled, 5 cents per pound; shelled, 15 cents per pound.

The amendment to the amendment was to strike out "15" and insert "6."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll to ascertain if a quorum is present.

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

Ashurst	Hale	McCumber	Robinson
Borah	Harreld	McKinley	Sheppard
Brandeggee	Harris	McLean	Shortridge
Bursum	Harrison	McNary	Simmons
Calder	Heflin	Nelson	Smoot
Cameron	Johnson	New	Spencer
Capper	Jones, Wash.	Nicholson	Sterling
Caraway	Kellogg	Norbeck	Sutherland
Culberson	Kendrick	Norris	Trammell
Curtis	Keys	Oddie	Underwood
Dial	King	Phipps	Walsh, Mass.
du Pont	Ladd	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Ernst	La Follette	Poindexter	Warren
Fernald	Lenroot	Pomerene	Watson, Ind.
Gooding	Lodge	Rawson	

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] is absent on account of a death in his family.

I also wish to announce that the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS] is unavoidably absent.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. FLETCHER] is absent on account of illness.

Mr. HARRIS. My colleague [Mr. WATSON of Georgia] is detained on account of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] to the amendment of the committee on page 110, line 13, almonds, shelled, where he moves to strike out "15" and insert "6," on which the roll call was proceeding when the Senate took a recess. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARRISON (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS] to the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] and vote "yea."

Mr. NEW (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] to the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE] and vote "nay."

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] to the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] and vote "nay."

Mr. TRAMMELL (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] to the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] and vote "yea."

Mr. WALSH of Montana (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. WATSON] and vote "yea."

Mr. WARREN (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair to the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] to the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. FRANCE] and vote "nay."

Mr. WATSON of Indiana (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] to the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. STANFIELD] and vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. FERNALD (after having voted in the negative). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES] to the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. POMERENE. I am paired for the day with my colleague the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS], but I find I can transfer that pair, which I do, to the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK]. I vote "yea."

Mr. HALE (after having voted in the negative). Has the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That Senator has not voted.

Mr. HALE. I transfer my pair with that Senator to the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CROW] and let my vote stand.

Mr. ERNST (after having voted in the negative). I transfer my general pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] to the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. WELLER] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. FLETCHER] is absent on account of illness. He has a general pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BALL].

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce the following pairs: The senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] with the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]; and

The junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] with the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN].

The result was announced—yeas 17; nays 41, as follows:

Caraway	Heflin	Sheppard	Walsh, Mass.
Culberson	King	Simmons	Walsh, Mont.
Dial	La Follette	Swanson	
Harris	Pomerene	Trammell	
Harrison	Robinson	Underwood	

YEAS—17.

NAYS—41.

Asburst	Hale	McKinley	Rawson
Borah	Harrell	McLean	Shortridge
Brandege	Johnson	McNary	Smoot
Bursum	Jones, Wash	Nelson	Spencer
Cameron	Kellogg	New	Sterling
Capper	Kendrick	Nicholson	Sutherland
Curtis	Keyes	Norbeck	Warren
du Pont	Ladd	Norris	Watson, Ind.
Ernst	Lenroot	Oddie	
Fernald	Lodge	Phipps	
Gooding	McCumber	Poindexter	

NOT VOTING—38.

Ball	France	Newberry	Stanfield
Broussard	Frelinghuysen	Overman	Stanley
Calder	Gerry	Owen	Townsend
Colt	Glass	Page	Wadsworth
Crow	Hitchcock	Pepper	Watson, Ga.
Cummins	Jones, N. Mex.	Pittman	Weller
Dillingham	McCormick	Ransdell	Williams
Edge	McKellar	Reed	Willis
Elkins	Moses	Shields	
Fletcher	Myers	Smith	

So the amendment of Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts to the amendment of the committee was rejected.

PETITIONS.

Mr. KEYES presented a resolution of the New Hampshire State Association of Letter Carriers, favoring the enactment of legislation enabling the Post Office Department to furnish protective insurance to letter carriers driving United States trucks from payment of damages caused by accident while assigned to such duty, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. ROBINSON presented a telegram in the nature of a petition from the California Almond Growers' Exchange, of San Francisco, Calif., favoring an adequate tariff duty on almonds, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SPENCER presented a petition of the Committee of Fifty and other welfare workers of St. Louis, Mo., praying for the passage of the so-called Hoch bill (H. R. 10291) to add confiscation to other penalties in case of interstate transportation of prize-fight films, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

MESCALERO APACHE INDIANS.

Mr. SPENCER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 3519) defining the rights of the Mescalero Apache Indians in the Mescalero Indian Reservation, providing for an allotment of certain lands therein in severalty to the Mescalero Apache Indians, and creating and defining the All-Year National Park, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 805) thereon.

UNITED STATES SHIPPING BOARD.

Mr. BORAH. I ask permission to introduce a bill, and desire that it may be printed and lie on the table for further call.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 3786) to amend section 3 of the shipping act, 1916, was read twice by its title and ordered to lie on the table.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. FRANCE:

A bill (S. 3787) to authorize the President, if he shall deem it consistent with the public welfare and the terms of the treaty obligations of the United States, to donate to Poland six of such ships of our Navy as under the terms of the treaties with Great Britain, France, and Japan will no longer be needed by the United States and are listed to be disposed of; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. NEW:

A bill (S. 3788) granting a pension to Julia A. Manzer (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

AMENDMENT TO TARIFF BILL.

Mr. POINDEXTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 7456, the tariff bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

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

On June 30, 1922:

S. 3396. An act creating the positions of Second Assistant Secretary and private secretary in the Department of Labor; and S. 3425. An act to continue certain land offices, and for other purposes.

On July 1, 1922:

S. 831. An act to amend the proviso in paragraph 10 of section 9 of the Federal reserve act amended by the act of June 21, 1917, amending the Federal reserve act;

S. 1033. An act regulating the issuance of checks, drafts, and orders for the payment of money within the District of Columbia; and

S. 3458. An act to authorize the Niagara River Bridge Co. to reconstruct its present bridge across the Niagara River between the State of New York and the Dominion of Canada, or to remove its present bridge and construct, maintain, and operate a new bridge across the said river.

CONSTRUCTION WORK—MUSCLE SHOALS DAM—CORRECTION.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I have here a letter addressed to me by Brig. Gen. H. Taylor, Acting Chief of Engineers of the War Department, in which he calls to my attention an error that I committed in making a statement in the Senate in regard to the official duty of Colonel Cooper, the engineer at Muscle Shoals. I have not examined my remarks since they have been printed, and I assume that General Taylor has correctly stated the facts.

It seems that I said that Colonel Cooper was in charge of the construction work. As I presume the Senate knows, my remarks on that occasion were entirely extemporaneous; I spoke entirely from memory; although, as a matter of fact, I knew at the time that Colonel Cooper was not in charge of the construction work, but that he was a consulting engineer, and that his duties related to the preparation of the plans and the necessary inspection to see that the plans were carried out. So if I made the statement, as I presume I did, which is mentioned by General Taylor, I was in error. I think, however, the matter may be best cleared up and corrected by having the letter of General Taylor read. So I send it to the desk and ask that the Secretary may read it.

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

The reading clerk read as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, June 22, 1922.

Hon. GEORGE W. NORRIS,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR NORRIS: I notice in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 17, page 8904, a statement by you that Mr. Cooper is now at the head of the construction of the Muscle Shoals Dam.

I wish to correct the impression which you have that Mr. Cooper is at the head of the construction of the dam and to advise you that the construction of the dam and power house and all structures connected therewith are now, as they have been since the beginning of the work, under the Chief of Engineers. Mr. Cooper is employed as consulting engineer. His duties relate solely to the preparation of plans for the work and such inspection of the construction work as is necessary to assure him that the plans are being carried out in accordance with his intent and in giving advice to the Chief of Engineers.

Mr. Cooper has nothing whatever to do with the construction work. This work is carried out by an officer of the Corps of Engineers, who is in full local charge under the Chief of Engineers. This officer takes all the necessary steps to carry on the construction work, including purchasing of material, hiring of men, and all other work incident to the construction.

Your misapprehension as to Mr. Cooper's connection with this work is quite easily understood, as Mr. Cooper has been given credit for being in charge of the construction of the dam in a number of accounts of the work, and on account of his prominence in hydraulic engineering work in the country the mistake is not at all unnatural.

Very truly yours,

H. TAYLOR,
Brigadier General, Corps of Engineers,
Acting Chief of Engineers.

ARTICLE BY SENATOR BORAH.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, there appeared in the New York Times of Sunday last a very interesting article entitled "Growing menace to integrity of States," written by the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH]. I ask unanimous consent that the article may be incorporated in the RECORD in 8-point type.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD in 8-point type, as follows:

GROWING MENACE TO INTEGRITY OF STATES—"A GOVERNMENT FROM WASHINGTON BY COMMISSION REDUCED TO ITS LAST ANALYSIS IS NO DIFFERENT FROM A GOVERNMENT BY SATRAPIES FROM ROME"—THE DIVIDING LINE.

(By WILLIAM E. BORAH, Senator from Idaho.)

The Government of Athens was a pure democracy. Its story is brief but marvelously brilliant. Day after day and year after year the people assembled, discussed and passed upon every question of foreign or domestic concern, of peace or war. They

gave instructions to their ambassadors and determined who should be received as such at Athens. They listened to contests by poets and dramatists, adjudged the prizes, heard the discussions of philosophers, listened to the appeals of orators, passed upon the proposed policies of statesmen, received the reports of generals fresh from the field, and determined who should longer command the armies. The citizens were trained and equipped in this democracy for the exercise of judgment and power as no people ever were in the same space of time. The decades which cover the period are the richest of all history in sculptors, poets, painters, philosophers, orators, statesmen, and generals.

That assembled multitude recognized no sovereign, owned no superior or supreme authority, delegated no power—it was the sovereign as it was there assembled—from its decree there was no appeal. But no one could be a citizen of Athens or participate in any way in the deliberations of the assembly who lived at such a distance as to be unable to regularly attend the meetings called within the walls of the city. Hence there was room for growth neither in territory nor political power. They understood well the lesson of local self-government, but the great central and controlling principle of civilization—that is, concentrated and harmonious action among separate States or communities on a large scale without destroying or forfeiting local self-government—was to them unknown. The representative principle, that system by which independent cities or States retaining full and complete control over domestic affairs, with a central and supreme authority for all matters of common interest, was yet undiscovered. So amid petty rivalries and constant jealousies, amid strife and conflict and perpetual war, this resplendent political system perished. There was a fatal defect—a defect which another people was to discover and remedy.

PRINCIPLE OF LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT.

Reflecting upon the rise of this remarkable civilization, its startling splendor, its exceptional wealth of mind and genius, one can not but conclude that after all there must have been involved, exerted, and exercised here a principle of government of incalculable worth. The principle which draws the citizen close to his Government, makes him know that he is part of it and responsible for its actions, arouses his pride, stimulates public spirit, and keeps pure and active the well springs of patriotism, was worked out to perfection at Athens. The preservation of that principle is indispensable to the permanent growth of every form of free government, and when this principle of local self-government shall have been combined and coordinated with a supreme and common political power, dealing with common interests, then the great secret of Federal Government thus revealed will constitute one of the greatest blessings known to men.

There was a time when to be known as a citizen of Rome was both a passport and a shield throughout the world. Conquest followed conquest. Towns and territories were added until universal power was located on the Seven Hills. At first the provincial towns and cities were governed by their local magistrates and governors, but year by year the central power of Rome, stealthily encroaching, absorbed all local rule. The people became divorced from and strangers to their Government, found fault and nursed their discontent. Before they knew it they were governed by prefects and responsible to the Emperor alone. Local magistrates and rulers retained their titles and nominally ruled, but they were in fact the satellites of the Imperial City and journeyed day by day to the capital to learn of the supreme ruler's pleasure. They found neither inspiration nor instruction among the masses, but hastened away to the capital to learn of their duties and their responsibility.

By the fifth century all local and political power had passed away. Here, too, the great principle of representative government was yet unlearned. The importance of keeping alive local self-government, of urging upon independent localities the control of their own affairs and of transmitting their judgment and needs to a central Government by selected agents was never realized. Local government was shorn of its power, stunted and starved, until at last under the domineering spirit of Dionysus it utterly perished. Everybody went to Rome. Thousands and thousands gathered in its assemblies until it became a mob incapable of deliberation. The people were charged with ignorance, carelessness, and improvidence while everyone looked up to the magistrates and rulers and officeholders as men who could bring prosperity and happiness by legislation. Instead of expecting to find virtue and progress and prosperity among the people worked out through the thrift, industry, and energy of the people, they supposed that in some way these things abided in statutes and imperial decrees. They thought that by legislation all things could be cured and that the Government must

take care of them all. At last this civilization came in conflict with that of the Teutons from the north, a people having among them the germs of local self-government in their tribal rule—a people independent, self-reliant, possessed of courage and initiative. When the conflict came the false and venal splendor of Rome also perished.

A THRILLING STORY.

It was among another people that the true principle of government was to be worked out. Time or space will not permit us to trace in detail the development of local self-government and the gradual growth of the representative principle in English history—how, prior to the Norman conquest, the Anglo-Saxon people met by thousands in the "great council of the realm," and there made their own laws; how, after a time, the several townships sent their most "discreet" men to represent them in the county assembly, the beginning of the House of Commons; how, through centuries, the common people struggled and sacrificed and fought to get back their local rights, filched and stolen from time to time by ambitious rulers—and in so doing fought the real battles of English civilization; how, at last, all was made reasonably secure by the Magna Charta and the "great Bill of Rights" of 1689. It is a thrilling story, full of the tragedy of personal sacrifice, rich in the romance of freedom. In all the realm of literature, peopled with those creations of genius whose words and deeds of incomparable wit and wisdom forever engage the minds of men, you will not find anything surpassing the story of the slow, patient, invincible growth of English law, the self-sacrificing and unconquerable fight for representative government. Like the chant of some great poem the story runs on through the years and through the centuries, telling of the patience, the endurance, the courage, the suffering, the sacrifice of men.

These rich inheritances our fathers brought to a new continent. If it could be well ascertained where the first New England town meeting was held, there the American people might well place a granite shaft of imposing splendor, for no single instance in our history is of more importance, none in these days better worth remembering and commemorating. It was a genuine, unmixed democracy. Once each year every man residing in the limits of the township came, gave full expression to his views, and had his vote counted. All affairs of government were here discussed and passed upon, policies were outlined, accepted or rejected—publicity in all public affairs was a reality and not a pretense. They chose their selectmen, town officers, and finally came to vote for their State and Federal officers—and were not haunted or harassed by the doubts and fears of the modern statesman whose erudition leads him to question the judgment and stability of the masses.

The principle of the New England town meeting has seamed our whole civilization with strength and durability. It is the foundation framework of our system of government. Without its active presence, its living pervading force, there could be no such thing as a truly republican government or Federal system. Local self-government in all the term implies, active, vigorous, vigilant, jealously guarding and governing all matters of local or domestic concern, drawing the citizen for a season away from private affairs and enlisting his energies in public matters, identifying him with the actual needs and doings of the State and Government, are indispensable to a healthy, durable Federal system. Our fathers understood this well, and were wise and cautious in jealously guarding it when they came to frame the Federal system. If they were wise to preserve it, their children will be wise to continue to preserve it. It is a remarkably short period from the time when a people cease to be active in the affairs of government until they are incapable of discharging the duties imposed by government, and no people incapable of self-government ever long bred a class of statesmen who were capable of governing for them. For it is nature's everlasting anathema on oligarchies that recruits from the walks of the humble and lowly must be had, or else follows a universal bankruptcy of intellect and character, a people enervated in body and mind, and from whose venal fingers soon fall the reins of government.

LOST BEST EFFORT OF CENTURIES.

When the fathers met in 1787 to formulate the great charter and give us a more perfect Union, one of the most delicate and yet one of the most essential and profound questions with which they had to deal was the adjustment and distribution of powers between the State and the National Government—the preserving in its full integrity the principle of local self-government and at the same time granting sufficient power to the Federal Government to insure efficiency and strength in all matters which affect us as one entire people. They were to combine with marvelous mechanism the principle of local rule and of a representative agency to carry the expression of that local power

into national affairs. Let us not forget that this great charter was neither an accident nor an inspiration—it was the last, best effort of centuries of eternal striving upon the part of the human family—the experiences of mankind hammered and fashioned into form by the greatest architects ever assembled at one time. The men who there fashioned, adjusted, and built were not theorists. They were stern, earnest, practical men, profound students of history and of government. They stood every hour of their lives upon the solid earth, felt and were moved and controlled by things practical, and dealt with all matters in that concrete way which marks the highest quality of statesmanship.

Nowhere in their work was greater wisdom disclosed, a more searching and judicious knowledge of the great truths of history revealed than in this matter of reserving and granting powers between the local or State and the General Government. With the utmost care and caution there was reserved for the States the control of all matters of domestic concern, of local interests, while there was granted to the General Government those great and general powers which encompass the welfare of all. We must not assume, we must not permit ourselves to believe that the reservation is of less moment or less beneficial to the American people than the grant. I am well aware that the phrase "State rights" has been discredited in our history. It is associated with unhappy days.

But the misuse or abuse of the term should not blind us to the great and inviolate political truth that upon the integrity of the States after all rests the integrity and permanency of the Union; that upon the principle of local self-government rests the perpetuity of republican institutions. In this way, and in this way alone, the people may retain those rights and keep alive that public spirit which furnishes the brain power and the moral force to run the entire machinery of government—keep alive and strong and healthy the principle of the New England town meeting, expanded and fashioned on a larger scale—a principle born of a complete faith in the integrity and judgment and self-governing capacity of the masses. God pity this Government in the hour in which we shall look to Washington for that economy in public expenditures, that comprehension of the common needs, that devotion to the general interests, the power and the willingness to correct abuses and distribute justice, all so essential to a democratic form of government, rather than to enlightened public opinion gathered up and crystallized into law through those agencies of government which reach back and down to the great body of the people—the sole sovereignty of the Republic.

WARNINGS OF GREAT LEADERS.

It does not seem amiss here to recall the words of some of our most profound jurists, our most exalted patriots, upon this subject. Chief Justice Marshall, in one of his great opinions, said: "No political dreamer was ever wild enough to think of breaking down the lines which separate the States and of compounding the American people into one common mass." I do not know whether the great jurist would be safe in saying at this time that no political dreamer was ever wild enough to think of breaking down the lines of the States—certainly their tendency is that way.

Mr. Lincoln said: "To maintain inviolate the rights of the States to order and control under the Constitution their own affairs by their own judgment exclusively is essential for the preservation of that balance of power on which our institutions rest."

Justice Miller, one of our greatest jurists, gave expression to the following view: "While the pendulum of public opinion has swung with force away from the extreme point of the State rights doctrine, there may be danger of its reaching an extreme point on the other side. In my opinion, the just and equal observance of the rights of the States and of the General Government as defined by the Constitution is as necessary to the permanent prosperity of our country and to its existence for another century as it has been for the one whose close we are now celebrating." That magnificent defender of the Constitution, our great Justice Harlan, one of the greatest men who has ever graced that great court, said: "A national government for national affairs and State government for State affairs is the foundation rock upon which our institutions rest, and any serious departure from that principle would bring disaster upon the American system of free government."

The makers of the Constitution did not grant to the General Government any powers which it is dangerous to exercise to the fullest constitutional limit. Moreover, I have a profound admiration for the men who would exercise those powers fully and completely in the interest of the Nation. But while extending and developing and building at the top, I would keep sound and safe and sure the foundation upon which the whole structure rests. For what shall it profit to enact laws, create

commissions, and unfold the ambitious schemes of men who dream of international prestige and power unless we know what the electorate yonder in the field, factory, and mine is doing or is electing to do; unless we know the measure of its ability, the worth of its patriotism. Responsibility alone gives strength and initiative to citizenship, contact with Government fosters public spirit and local rule is the great university in which is reared and trained and equipped the kind of statesmen who take care that no harm comes to the Republic.

A Government from Washington by commission, reduced to its last analysis, is no different from a Government by satrapies from Rome. And simply because the people of the States do not see fit at any particular time to exercise the powers reserved for them, that is in itself no justification for the General Government to exercise those powers. Such a doctrine is rank heresy. The wisdom of the people may be as fully manifested in the failure to exercise the powers of the State in a particular way or at a particular time as in the exercise of that power. Action is not always statesmanship. Legislation is not always an evidence of sound judgment. The belief so prevalent that every evil of the body politic can be eradicated by an act of Congress, every virtue restored or augmented by the creation of a commission, is the refined and codified creed of official egotism.

THE DIVIDING LINE.

Our richly rewarded experience of a hundred years and more, a greater distribution of justice and happiness among the people and a greater capacity of self-rule than are elsewhere to be found, will convince our people that we can afford to travel on in the same old way, holding fast and fighting true to that line of demarcation so wisely marked out by the greatest group of statesmen time ever assembled on one occasion. If there is anything now well settled, worked out through centuries of test and trial, it is that each member of the Federal Government must have complete and independent control of all matters domestic and internal and which relate alone to the individual members. That in turn all must be united and subject to a common power which is to deal with all matters affecting the members as a whole. It is a further teaching of experience and of history coming down to us through the shattered arches and broken columns of the splendid civilizations which have passed that, without the spirit, the life, the interest, the training, the responsibility, born alone of local self-rule, free government is an impossibility—simply the dream of an enthusiast.

I do not mean to say that industrial development may not affect the question of distribution of political power. Our industrial growth and our economic development, changes wrought in our social life, may necessarily require a redistribution of power between the State and the National Government. That which was wholly local a hundred years ago may have become national. That which was within the competency of a State may now require national administration. Nevertheless, that which is essentially local should be governed by the State. Under no circumstances should the National Government undertake to deal with those things which are essentially local. While I am by no means an advocate of no change in Government—for a government without the power of change is without the means of preservation—yet I do believe in keeping inviolate the principle of local government for local affairs and National Government for national affairs. And as we move on, assuming new duties and confronting new problems, we will bear in mind the words of wisdom given to us by the Father of our Country, in his ripened years: "If in the opinion of the people the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by amendment in the way in which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation, for though this in one instance may be the instrument for good it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield."

THE TARIFF.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, which will be stated.

The READING CLERK. In paragraph 754, page 110, line 13, before the word cents, it is proposed to strike out "12" and insert "15," so as to make the paragraph read:

PAB. 754. Almonds, not shelled, 5 cents per pound; shelled, 15 cents per pound.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I am opposed to the pending committee amendment because I do not believe that it can be

justified from any standpoint. I voted against the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] which proposed to restore the old Payne-Aldrich rate of 6 cents a pound on shelled almonds because I believe the almond growers in California are entitled to a higher rate than was imposed by the Payne-Aldrich law; but, Mr. President, I submit that the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] and his colleague, the junior Senator from California [Mr. SHORRIDGE], have not made out a case for the increase of duty which is now proposed by the committee—which is an increase of 275 per cent over the existing rate and an increase of 150 per cent over the Payne-Aldrich rate. I submit they have not made out their case upon their own showing, because in the speech of the senior Senator from California upon Monday he demonstrated that under the existing rate of the Underwood law the acreage planted in almonds in 1921, at the very lowest ebb of the industry, so far as the market was concerned, had increased almost 12½ per cent.

Mr. President, in the face of the growth of this industry during the existence of the present Underwood law, an increase of 275 per cent in the tariff duty can not, I submit, be justified by anybody. As is true in the case of so many of the articles covered by the pending bill, the proponents of the increased duty prove too much. In the brief of the Almond Growers' Association of California they undertake to set out the difference in the cost of production between the imported almond and the domestic almond grown in California, and, including interest upon the investment, they attempt to show that the foreign cost is just under 5 cents a pound, while the cost of production of the almond in California for 1920, the year for which the comparison was made, was just under 20 cents a pound, or a difference in cost of production of 15 cents a pound upon the unshelled almond. That, Mr. President, applied to the shelled almond, the item now before the Senate, according to their figures, must be multiplied by 3, and, therefore, the difference in the cost of production, based upon their own figures, between the imported shelled almond and the shelled almond produced in California would be 45 cents a pound.

If that be true, will 15 cents a pound protect the almond growers of California? If those figures are correct, will the proposed increase of duty give the market to the almond growers of California? If that be true, Mr. President, then I want to ask this question: If there is a commodity produced in the United States that permanently and through all the years will cost three times as much to produce as that article can be imported for, can such a rate be justified by any protectionist?

If we are to have any market, Mr. President, for our own surplus products we must permit some imports to come in. We can not raise a tariff wall that will keep out all imports if we desire any foreign trade, if we desire any market for our surplus crop of wheat and corn and other cereals and products of the soil. So that, from that standpoint, if these figures are correct, I submit that a protective rate equaling the difference in cost of production of the two articles can not be justified.

But what are the facts as to the present condition of the industry under the present law, the rate of duty of which is asked to be increased by 275 per cent? I read from the survey prepared by the Tariff Commission as follows:

The number of bearing and nonbearing trees, therefore, affords the best indication of the expansion of the industry. Prior to 1912 the number of bearing trees remained fairly constant, old orchards being discontinued as rapidly as new plantings replaced them. In the last nine years, however, the acreage has been rapidly increased. The first of these recent plantings have only begun to bear in the last few years. The census of 1909 reported 1,166,730 bearing trees, compared with 2,408,040 in 1919. In the number of trees not of bearing age there has been an increase of 400 per cent during this 10-year period—from 365,961 in 1909 to 1,407,901 in 1919.

Thus, Mr. President, there has been an increase of 400 per cent under a tariff rate from 1909 to 1914 of 6 cents a pound and since 1914 of 4 cents a pound.

Mr. President, could any protectionist ask for a better showing of growth under any tariff rate than has been exhibited by this industry under the Payne-Aldrich law and the present Underwood law? Furthermore, unlike most agricultural products, if the tariff wall in this instance be put up to the height now proposed competition within the country will not bring the price down; the cost of production will not be lowered, for the brief of the Almond Growers' Association of California shows that the difference in the cost of production which they set out is not due to war conditions, is not a temporary situation, but is a permanent one, and that the difference will rather increase than decrease because of the increased value from year to year of the land upon which the almonds are grown.

I said that this competition that we normally have between producers of agricultural products will not apply if this tariff rate be placed so high, because the Tariff Commission also re-

ports that the Almond Growers' Association of California today market 75 per cent of the almonds grown in the United States. They set the minimum price each year, and, therefore, it is sure to follow that the Almond Growers' Association of California, like the Raisin Growers' Association of California, if they have the market to themselves, will be able to increase their own prices to the level of the tariff rate that is imposed by Congress.

Mr. President, I am heartily in sympathy with these cooperative organizations throughout the country. The Raisin Growers' Association of California, the Almond Growers' Association of California, the Walnut Growers' Association of California, and other associations there have done wonderfully well for the growers of California, but if we are to raise this duty to the extent that is proposed by this amendment the Almond Growers' Association of California will be able to add the difference between 4 cents and 15 cents—or, in other words, 11 cents a pound—to the price that they receive for their product in California.

It is no doubt true that the almond growers of California have suffered during 1921, just the same as every other farmer in America has suffered, and it would not be surprising if the almond growers and the walnut growers of California had suffered in a greater degree than other farmers, because to a certain extent nuts for the table are a luxury; and yet they ought not to be considered such a luxury that they can not be occasionally found upon the poor man's table, and that is exactly what will happen if this rate be imposed.

California has a practical monopoly of almonds in the shell, because a better table nut is produced in that State than any nut that is imported; and when prosperity revives, the consumption will increase as it did increase, by leaps and bounds, during the war prosperity, and the almond growers again will have a market at a reasonable price for their products; but if this 11 cents a pound increase shall be voted into this bill, it will enter into the price of every 5-cent cake of almond bar—nutritious, cheap—but they will not be again sold for 5 cents if this duty be voted into the bill.

I submit that if we give the almond growers of California an increase of 100 per cent over the duty given by the Payne-Aldrich law, as the House bill does, they have no right to ask for any more and we have no right to give them anything more.

Now, Mr. President, just a word generally.

I have not made up my mind as to whether, when we come to a final vote upon this bill, I shall vote for it or not. I want to do so if I can. I want to resolve all doubts in favor of the bill; but if such rates as this are to be voted into this bill to any considerable extent, I want to say very frankly that I shall not support the bill when it comes to final passage. I want to stand for a reasonable protective rate. I want to stand for protection—I do stand for protection—to American industries; but, Mr. President, I have no sympathy with this system which seems to prevail here, that if the interests of a Senator in his State demand exorbitant duties, that Senator can go and ask and receive, and then, because of the interrelationship of the duties throughout this bill, that Senator will vote with the committee for every increase that may be proposed.

Mr. President, I do not propose to do that. I would not ask for a duty upon any product of my State that I could not show was fully justified, and I would not ask for a 150 per cent increase in duty upon any commodity produced within my State where the production of that commodity had doubled under the present Underwood law.

Mr. President, I hope that I shall be able to support this bill when it does come to a final vote. The vote upon this amendment, of course, will not be the deciding factor, but it will be one of them; and if many such are voted into the bill, I repeat that—giving credit to every other Senator for the same high purpose and motives in voting for the bill that I believe actuate me—I shall reserve the right to vote against it unless some of these duties be brought down somewhere within reason.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I want to say just a word on this subject.

In examining the Record for Monday, I find that a number of communications protesting against these high duties on almonds and other nuts were introduced into the Record. I have before me a letter containing a copy of the preamble and resolutions adopted by the National Confectioners' Association under date of June 2, 1922; and I am going to ask, without reading, the privilege of introducing the preamble and resolutions into the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. POMERENE subsequently said:

Mr. President, a moment ago I asked the privilege of introducing in the Record certain preambles and resolutions of the National Confectioners' Association. At that moment I was

not aware that the same had been introduced in the RECORD on July 3. I therefore withdraw the request for the reintroduction of those preambles and resolutions.

Mr. President, apparently these people believe that there ought to be some protective duty so far as almonds and nuts are concerned, but they protest against the enormous increase. They say—and I think this is correct—that the import duties on almonds and nuts which are being insisted upon are as follows:

- Almonds, not shelled, 5 cents a pound.
- Shelled almonds, 15 cents a pound.
- Walnuts, not shelled, 4 cents a pound.
- Shelled walnuts, 12 cents a pound.

They suggest unanimously that the following rates be recommended for substitution in place of the rates proposed in the pending tariff bill:

- Almonds, not shelled, 4 cents a pound.
- Shelled almonds, 6 cents a pound.
- Walnuts, not shelled, 3 cents a pound.
- Shelled walnuts, 6 cents a pound.

And they say that in their judgment these rates would be just and fair and would meet all requirements, both as protection and as revenue.

Mr. President, I have here a number of other telegrams and letters coming from confectioners in Ohio, everyone of them protesting against these exorbitant rates. I should like to know upon what theory all of these confectioners can be burdened in their business for the sake of some of these almond and nut growers in southern California and elsewhere. I am not finding fault because a certain amount of protection is asked; but when the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] has demonstrated, as he has, that this industry has advanced in the far west under the present protective duties, why should they be increased now? It may be said that I perhaps take one view of this tariff question and some of my friends on the other side take another view. We do differ in part. I am not a free-trader and I am not a rank protectionist. I do not believe in duties which are going to operate practically as an embargo.

Mr. President, in order that I may not be misunderstood as to this situation, I am going to read a part of a letter which comes to me from B. H. Kroger, of the Kroger Grocery & Baking Co., of Cincinnati. He is not a Democrat. He is a Republican, and at different times he has been invited to help finance Republican campaigns; and he was here, so I see by the newspapers, at one of the recent conferences which was held in Washington to raise funds to pay off the debt of the Republican committee incurred during the last campaign.

I am going to omit one or two paragraphs of this letter which refer to the activities of the distinguished senior Senator from California with respect to the duties on nuts. There is nothing in it to which he could take exception at all; it simply states the fact as I understand it; but the writer says with regard to these nuts:

The average quality of foreign nuts will satisfy the medium class of consumers, who should not be penalized by increase of duties because they simply can not afford to pay the prohibitive prices asked for nuts, as you can see by the following range of prices:

	1912 opening.	1921
California walnuts, soft shell.....per pound..	\$0.14	\$0.24½

Our objection is only in the interest of the consumer, and in the furtherance, quote you the following comparison of prices, which we believe you are interested in for the same cause:

	1912 opening.	1921 opening.	To-day's price.
Peaches, choice.....per pound..	\$0.5½	\$0.11	\$0.17
Apricots, extra choice.....do....	.9	.19	.30
Prunes, bulk—average basis.....do....	.4½	.08½	.10½
Raisins, fancy, 16-ounce, seeded.....do....	.6	.14½	.15½

This letter is dated April 29, 1922.

I want Senators to note the following paragraphs, which demonstrate in part what is being done by some of these associations:

The Raisin Association alone is responsible for holding up the present price of raisins, in spite of the heaviest stocks on hand at this season in many years, and never before in history has such a condition existed, without causing lowering of prices, but not this year. The association is holding up the price and the public is paying the penalty in spite of the tremendous crop that the Almighty has given to supply the American housewife at reasonable cost.

Nuts are distributed by the California Nut Growers' Association on an allotment basis, meaning, each city gets its proportion. This leaves within the hands of such distributors the allotment according to their

judgment, which favoritism means excess, and if not in good grace with the broker, a small proportion, or none at all. At Columbus, Ohio, last year we secured no walnuts from the association for the above reason.

It may be said that this firm has had some unpleasant experiences, and possibly it has. I know Mr. Kroger personally, and I know that a fairer-minded man exists nowhere, either in California, Ohio, or elsewhere. He is a big man, conducting an enormous business, trying to do it upon margins which will be just to himself and just to the consumers. There is no man in Ohio who stands better than he, and there is no Republican who stands better than he. That is a Republican view, and I am in sympathy with his moderate expression upon this subject.

I have here some other telegrams, one from a very large confectioner at Mansfield, Ohio, Voegelé & Dinning Co.; another from the Puritan Chocolate Co., of Cincinnati, Ohio; and another from the Dolly Varden Chocolate Co., of Cincinnati, Ohio, which I ask the privilege of introducing in the RECORD without reading.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MANSFIELD, OHIO, June 29, 1922.

Senator ATLEE POMERENE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
We protest vigorously proposed import duty on almonds and walnut meats; being a food product, if passed will mean unjust prices to the consumer and injury to our business.

VOEGELE & DINNING CO.

MANSFIELD, OHIO, June 29, 1922.

Senator ATLEE POMERENE,
Care of Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.
MY DEAR SENATOR: To-day we sent you the following telegram, which we now confirm:
"We protest vigorously proposed import duty on almond and walnut meats; being a food product, if passed will mean unjust price to the consumer and injury to our business."
Anything that you can do toward helping our industry out on this proposition will be duly appreciated.
I wish to thank you very much in advance for courtesies extended.
Respectfully yours,

THE VOEGELE & DINNING CO.,
C. H. VOEGELE, President.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, June 29, 1922.

Senator ATLEE POMERENE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
We respectfully protest against import duties on almonds and walnuts. This tax would impose an unjustified penalty on American business interests. It would mean an increase of 300 per cent over present duty without benefit to any American growers.

THE PURITAN CHOCOLATE CO.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, June 29, 1922.

Hon. ATLEE POMERENE,
United States Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
We vigorously protest proposed import duties on almonds and walnuts. Domestic nuts can not be used by many confectioners. Growers domestic nuts unable to take care of demand for many years to come. Entire almond crop of California will not supply three large manufacturers of candy. Imported nuts essential.

DOLLY VARDEN CHOCOLATE CO.

Mr. POMERENE. There are many other communications here, some from outside the State, bearing upon the same subject. I do think these increases are very unfair.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, between 1909 and 1914, when the Payne-Aldrich law was in effect, the acreage of almonds, I think, was about doubled. That acreage was increased under an expectation that probably the same protection would be continued.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] seems to think that because the trees which were planted from 1910 to 1914, which kept on growing notwithstanding the Underwood-Simmons tariff law, and which kept on producing almonds notwithstanding that law, were afforded adequate protection by that law. The law did not blight the trees. It did not stop the increase in the number of bushels and pounds of almonds. That is why the production increased; it was not by reason of their having sufficient protection under the Underwood-Simmons law.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, is the Senator aware that on Monday the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] stated that in 1921 the acreage planted increased 9,003 acres? That surely was under the Underwood law. That surely was under a depressed market. It is not the increased bearing of old trees, but the Senator from California stated that there were 9,003 additional acres planted in 1921 out of a total of only 78,000 acres altogether.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, there may be some acreage adapted to the raising of this kind of nuts and fruits which is not adapted, possibly, to anything else. The Senator must remember, however, that in 1920 the prices generally prevailing over the country were higher than any we have had in any season of any year. Let him also remember that in 1914 the labor

cost of production was not to exceed one-half what it was during 1920 and 1921. Therefore there must have been a very considerable increase in the cost of production.

I understand that most of the crop which is raised in any year is marketed the same year. The product ripening in August, September, or early October is generally disposed of before the 1st of January. If the producers could have raised the crop of 1920 at a good profit, why is it that they still have a great portion of the 1920 crop on hand? They say that it is because they could not sell the product for the cost of production.

So, as I stated the other day, we have the confectioners and the bakers on the one side making a very good profit, and it is admitted on the other side, and there is no denial of it, that for the last two years, even with the enhanced price of 1920, the producers made no profit. The whole question resolves itself into this: Are the bakers and the confectioners, who are still making very nice profits, willing to live and let live? Are they willing to allow the producers to continue to live? That is about all I can see in the proposition.

I have telegrams here from both sides of this question. I ask the Secretary to read one from Portland, Oreg., against the tariff duties we have reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GOODING in the chair). The Secretary will read the telegram.

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

PORTLAND, OREG., July 3, 1922.

PORTER J. McCUMBER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Proposed import duties on almonds and walnuts are unreasonable and unjustifiable and would impose onerous burden on our industry. Hope you will oppose these schedules.

PACIFIC COAST BISCUIT CO.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, here is another telegram, from the California Almond Growers' Exchange, which I ask to have read.

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., July 3, 1922.

PORTER J. McCUMBER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Understand confectioners and others opposed to tariff on almonds claim quality will not permit use of American almonds in confections and other purposes, and that America can not supply any large part of domestic demand. The quality of American almonds, produced by diligent tilling of soil, care of trees, and scientific selection of varieties, equals and excels that of Europe, where almonds are produced mainly without care and under most primitive conditions possible. We know our quality is splendid, and we know it to the extent of nearly \$50,000,000. As for ability to supply American demand, our best reference is the United States Department of Agriculture, whose conservative statistics show at least 70,000 acres planted, which, under minimum production, can supply present consumption of the United States. Our desire is a tariff to save our industry from ruin, as we can not compete with the pauper labor of Europe. We fear confectioners are unduly concerned over our plans to engage in manufacturing of almond products to permit distribution through economical channels of trade to consumers. As 3,000 growers, most of us with lifelong savings invested in this American almond industry, we appeal to you now in a just cause to save us by keeping the American market for American producers without cost to the consumers, with revenue to the Government, and at a loss of profit to the speculators and importers only.

CALIFORNIA ALMOND GROWERS' EXCHANGE.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I desire to occupy just a moment or two in responding to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin. I am not concerned with the motives which actuate the Senator from Wisconsin in reference to his activities concerning this bill, nor am I concerned with whether he votes for it or whether he votes against it. I take it that he will reach his decision concerning the bill in exactly the same fashion that every other Senator will reach his decision and that he will render that decision according to his judgment and as he believes he ought to act under his conscience and under his oath as a Senator.

There is no need for asseverations concerning his virtue or that of any of us respecting this measure—none at all. I shall vote as I please regarding it—favorably, of course, because I believe it is a measure which meets the requirements of the United States of America to-day. I shall vote for this duty, not because it concerns a locality which I love and in which I am interested, but I shall vote for it because it is a just duty, and as between the oburgations of the confectioners on the one hand, with the 300 per cent profit which they make in their business, and the prayers of the farmers and the almond growers on the other, selling their product at a loss, I am very glad, either as a Californian, as a representative of those who grow almonds, as a United States Senator, or a Republican in this body, to cast my vote with the almond growers, now selling at a loss, rather than to respond to any opposing class who are making inordinate profits. So much for that, Mr. President.

Oh, Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin cries, "These terrible duties!" Two hundred and seventy-five per cent is the

increase, he says, in this duty. The statement conveys an erroneous impression. What is it in ad valorem equivalent? I have seen the Senator from Wisconsin sit here day after day and vote for ad valorem duties greater than the ad valorem duty that is fixed upon this product of the soil, for men who have their all at stake, who have their whole lifetime imperiled, and who are asking only an ad valorem duty which, under the highest computation of their opponents, equals 48 per cent and under the computation which they themselves make equals 32 per cent.

Why, Mr. President, talk to me of an extravagant duty when in the bill constantly and continuously the ad valorem duties are far in excess of this. It is absurd, sir, to pretend that on this item, this item which means so much to those who are engaged in the almond culture of California, we are doing something extraordinary and that we should stop and hesitate and pretend it is far in excess of other items or other duties which are imposed by the measure. The ad valorem duty, the real test after all, is not as great as many, many duties imposed by the bill and for which the Senator has voted.

Of course the confectioners will give us a ratio of 4 to 6 or 5 to 8. Of course the confectioners are not opposed to a rate really of 5 cents on shelled almonds. What they do not want and what this fight is for is to prevent the real ratio between the unshelled and the shelled almonds, so that they will be able to purchase cheaply the shelled almonds of Europe. What they wish is to buy cheaply the shelled product. They do not care anything about the unshelled product.

They know that we can not, without a duty that is proportionate as between shelled and unshelled almonds, meet the labor situation abroad. They know that it is impossible, with women in California receiving a minimum wage of \$16 a week under the law, for the almond growers to meet those who shell almonds abroad and who receive practically no stipend for the work they perform. They know that we can not, in shelling almonds, meet that which has to be met if we come into the market with the shelled product of this country, because of conditions obtaining abroad. They are willing that we should have the ratio suggested by them, of course—rates by which what they use, the shelled product, they may import from Europe and buy at ruinous and impossible prices, so far as American production is concerned. We heard the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] say the other day that the importers are willing that we should have a shelled rate if they can only keep down the ratio so it will not be 3 to 1 as determined by the Department of Agriculture and as the Tariff Commission say the ratio exists.

It is true there have been great plantings of almond orchards in the State of California during the last few years. It is true that they were planted in great measure under the Underwood bill. But it is equally true that during the time the Underwood bill has been in force, for a great period of that time there have been conditions existing that rendered that planting not at all a matter of surprise or incredible under the circumstances, but the result of the sequence of events then transpiring—the World War, the lack of transportation, the disorganization of business conditions generally. It was believed that the land there was adapted to the purpose of almond planting. Now the conditions are entirely changed.

I have before me on my desk now a letter from Texas, for instance, saying that they can not use our almonds, although they are superior in quality, because they can ship from the Mediterranean into Texas ports more cheaply than we can transport them by railroad from California into the same Texas ports.

The condition now obtaining abroad, not with reference to unshelled products but with the shelled products, shelled after nightfall by women and children without compensation practically at all for their labor, is a condition that we must meet by a protective tariff, a protective tariff that gives an ad valorem such as the proposed duty gives to us, a protective tariff simply that will possibly enable us to live, not to gouge or to reap an undue profit, not to obtain a 300 per cent profit, like the confectioners, who oppose the rate, are reaping and have been reaping, but to enable our people simply to live. That is all we are asking. That is all the proposed tariff duty does.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I expressly stated, in giving my own position upon the pending matter, that I do not question the motive of any other Senator in voting for this high rate. I simply undertook to say, as I have the right to say, that while I feel an obligation to go with my party upon a party measure to a certain extent, there is a point beyond which that obligation does not extend. If rates like this are to be written in the bill in any great number, sir, I shall be

relieved of any obligation to support it. That was merely a statement of fact, a statement that I have a right to make, a statement that I shall take the liberty to repeat from time to time if occasion shall arise.

Now, Mr. President, with reference to the situation of the almond growers in California, the Senator from California does not deny, the Senator can not deny, that the increased planting has been under the Underwood law. The Senator can not deny that the almond growers of California never had a market for and never sold a single pound of shelled almonds; they never had the market which they are now demanding be given to them by this rate. The almond growers of California will still have their market for unshelled almonds, and when prosperity returns they will have their market; but when the planters of California planted these additional acres, sir, they had no right to assume that Congress would at any time give them a higher rate than was imposed by the Payne-Aldrich law.

When I say, Mr. President, that I am willing to give them a rate 100 per cent higher than the Payne-Aldrich law provides, but object to 150 per cent, as the Senator insists upon, is there anything unreasonable in that position? Am I less of a protectionist because of the position that I take? The industry has grown by leaps and bounds, and yet asks for an increase of 275 per cent over the existing law and 150 per cent over the Payne-Aldrich law. Mr. President, I repeat that this is one of the instances which to my mind the Republican Party can not justify if it shall be written into the law.

The Senator's plea of the profits of the candy manufacturers being 300 per cent I deny. He has no proof of it. It is not true, although he thinks it is; but he has some old figures of a time when they were making, no doubt, exorbitant profits during the war, as nearly everybody else was making exorbitant profits if they had the opportunity to do it. I do not doubt that the almond growers of California in 1919 and 1920 would have taken 25 or 30 cents a pound for their product if they could have secured it. But the candy manufacturers to-day are not making 300 per cent profit. If the Senator would make a little inquiry, he would find that the candy manufacturers have deflated as well as others, although they are not making the losses, I freely admit, that the farmers generally in America have been sustaining during the past two years. But, Mr. President, that is no reason for imposing such a duty as is now imposed to allow the almond growers of California to get into a market which they have never had, which they never expected to have, at the expense of the American people, at too great an expense to the American people.

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

Mr. LENROOT. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. The Senator has challenged what I said about the profits of the candy makers. What are their profits, may I ask the Senator?

Mr. LENROOT. At the time we had the internal-revenue law before us, when we had up the question of an excise duty upon candy, I took occasion to inquire into the profits of the candy makers. That was last year, 1921, and their profits then were not over 10 per cent.

Mr. JOHNSON. I have the statement which has been printed and which has been quoted here from one of the biggest candy men in the country to the effect that their profits were 300 per cent. That statement was made about six months ago, or at least during the last year.

Mr. LENROOT. Three hundred per cent in 1921?

Mr. JOHNSON. I do not remember the exact period. I will ascertain just the time when he said those profits were being made.

Mr. LENROOT. I happen to have some very prominent and reputable candy manufacturers in my State.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President—

Mr. LENROOT. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. If the candy manufacturers are making 300 per cent profit, how can any Senator on the other side of the Chamber justify an increase of tariff duty from 30 per cent to 40 per cent upon candy?

Mr. LENROOT. I will ask the Senator from California to answer that question. I can not undertake to do it myself.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. You ought to be cutting down tariff rates instead of increasing them on candy.

Mr. JOHNSON. I have before me the article to which I referred, an article from the New York Times of Monday, August 1, 1921, quoting Mr. Miller, of the Miller Candy Co., in which he said that the confectionery stores generally had been making a profit of 300 per cent on their goods, which are classed as luxuries. He believed that he could cut his price in two, and he was going to do it, because they had been making 800 per cent profit.

Mr. LENROOT. Undoubtedly that refers back to a time when they were doing it, but the Senator must know—

Mr. JOHNSON. That was August 1, 1921.

Mr. LENROOT. The Senator must know that in 1921 the prices of candy were very greatly reduced.

Mr. JOHNSON. I confess to the Senator I am not an expert as to prices of candy, and I am unable to say whether they were greatly reduced or greatly enhanced.

Mr. LENROOT. Does the Senator believe the candy manufacturers to-day are making a profit of 300 per cent?

Mr. JOHNSON. I have not the slightest conception what they are making.

Mr. LENROOT. But the Senator has stated that.

Mr. JOHNSON. I gave the Senator my authority for the statement.

Mr. LENROOT. Does the Senator think it is true?

Mr. JOHNSON. I think the statement was true that I have quoted, and that they are making exorbitant profits to-day without any doubt.

Mr. LENROOT. Then may I ask the Senator if he is going to vote for a duty upon candy?

Mr. JOHNSON. I think we have already voted a duty on candy.

Mr. LENROOT. Did the Senator vote for the duty on candy?

Mr. JOHNSON. I think I did, and I think the Senator from Wisconsin did also.

Mr. LENROOT. Oh, I did, because I do not agree with the Senator from California that there is any such profit being made; but if I had believed that there was a 300 per cent profit made upon candy, I assure the Senator from California that I would not have voted for a 40 per cent duty on candy.

Mr. JOHNSON. Let us go back and reconsider the vote whereby the duty on candy was imposed. I should be delighted to do so, in view of the fight of the candy makers on the tariff on almonds.

Mr. LENROOT. The Senator from California will have the opportunity, if he desires, to make the motion to reconsider the vote by which the duty was imposed.

Mr. JOHNSON. Will the Senator from Wisconsin join me in it?

Mr. LENROOT. No; because I do not believe the statement the Senator from California has made; that is why I will not do so.

Mr. JOHNSON. The Senator means he does not believe the facts set forth in the statement?

Mr. LENROOT. I do not, of course, mean to question the Senator's own integrity.

Mr. JOHNSON. I realize that, but I do not want the Record to indicate anything to the contrary.

Mr. LENROOT. That is understood. The Senator makes his statement on what he considers good authority, of course.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. LENROOT. I yield.

Mr. SIMMONS. In view of the facts which have been developed here, especially those which have been stated by the senior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], I hope that he will move to reconsider the vote by which we imposed the duty on candy.

Mr. JOHNSON. Is the Senator from North Carolina addressing a query to me? I did not follow him if he was doing so.

Mr. SIMMONS. I am not addressing a query to the Senator. I am simply making a suggestion. The suggestion is that, in view of the statement made by the Senator from California as to the enormous profits which are being made by the candy manufacturers, I hope the Senator from California might see fit to move to reconsider the vote by which we gave the candy manufacturers the high protective rate on their product.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. If the Senator from Wisconsin will yield to me for a moment, I desire to quote to him the prices of almonds and walnuts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LADD in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. LENROOT. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I hold in my hand a letter from the Lovell & Covell Co., confectioners in the city of Boston, which refers to the high price of almonds and walnuts. The letter is dated April 27, 1922, and it is addressed to myself and, in part, reads as follows:

The price of walnuts and almonds is now so high that we are not using anywhere near the quantity we would use if prices were nearer normal. The normal price on walnuts is 30 cents; the price to-day is about 60 cents.

In our small business here we thought nothing of buying 100 cases of walnuts when the price was around 30 cents; to-day we buy them in 5 and 10 case lots.

Mr. LENROOT. May I ask the Senator what is the date of the letter which he has read?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The letter is dated April 27, 1922, and is addressed to myself by this very reputable candy firm in the city of Boston.

I might add for the Senator's benefit that when we come to discuss walnuts I expect to show that the production of California walnuts was sold within one month after harvest.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, if this were a case where the imports were crowding out the market of our domestic producer, if it were a case where the industry was decaying, I would be satisfied, of course, to vote for any duty that was necessary; but the imports have decreased, and the acreage has increased, under the existing rates; and at this time, when there is no obligation of any kind upon the part of Congress to the almond growers of California to impose a very high rate of duty in order to give them a market which they never have had and never had any reason to expect to have, I say that this committee amendment is not justified. I want also to repeat that if the amendment is voted down, the almond growers of California will still have an increase of 100 per cent over the rate imposed by the Payne-Aldrich law.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President, because of the great principle which is involved, and a great industry which is imperilled, I crave the indulgence of the Senate to add a few words to the discussion which has already engaged our attention for many hours. I venture to repeat, in effect, the statement made by a great man, one, however, under whose banner I never walked, but whose reputation grows with the years. We are dealing here and now "with a condition and not a theory." If this great and growing industry is to survive, the protective duties which we ask must be granted.

It would be piling Ossa on Pelion, it would be to indulge in cumulative evidence, to proceed further to establish the facts which we are here to consider in applying a principle. Over and against the views of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, over and against the views of the equally distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, I place the knowledge of the people of my State, the men, the women, the practical growers; I place the opinions of chambers of commerce, of all kinds of farm organizations, of many individuals, of those who know the facts and bear witness to them in numerous, almost innumerable, telegrams, letters, and formal resolutions setting forth the true condition.

I make this statement not in a spirit of dogmatic assertion, but I make it to the Senate and to the country that under the present rates the growing and the marketing of almonds, shelled and unshelled, will perish, and that the rate which we ask and which the Senate committee has accorded and reported in this bill are not theoretically but absolutely necessary; and not to the end that the growers of almonds shall reap an exorbitant profit, not to the end that they shall extort from the consumers; not at all; but to the legitimate and just end that they may reap a fair and a reasonable profit on the capital invested and on the labor expended in this industry.

My distinguished colleague and I come here from California. We speak for that State and for certain other Western States whose climate and soil are adapted to the cultivation of the almond, and we tell Senators from New England and we remind the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] of facts existing, of conditions prevailing, and we bring here evidence of those facts and those conditions.

What an ungracious task has been set before the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH]. Upon what does the prosperity of New England rest? Upon her soil? Hardly. Upon her climate? Scarcely. It rests, in large measure, upon the intelligence of her people; but, in the final analysis, the prosperity of New England rests upon the great American protective tariff doctrine, and I and we of the West stand up for New England. Why? Because we love her? Yes. Yes, we remember New England. We know what she has contributed to this Republic. We do not forget Concord or Lexington or Bunker Hill or Faneuil Hall. We do not forget her great men who have contributed so much to the grandeur and the glory of this Republic. To every industry of New England which has asked for protection we give it gladly because she needs it and because we wish to give it to her for her sake and for our own. The prosperity of New England adds to the prosperity of California.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, does the Senator believe in giving protection to everybody who asks for it?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Certainly not; but we could sweep away the prosperity of New England in a season; we could

impoverish the cities of New England until grass would grow on the pavements of Boston. The protective tariff doctrine has made New England what she is—a pride and a glory to the Nation as a nation. Never will there be a time so long as I am here, never will there be a time so long as a thoroughbred Californian is here, when a friendly voice will not be raised in behalf of protection to every legitimate industry in Massachusetts which can show it is entitled to it.

Answering further the question of the Senator, of course we would not grant protection to everybody who asks it, but when it is shown to be needed in order to sustain a given industry whereby American men and women may be employed and whereby the American standard of life and living may be maintained, we will give protection to Massachusetts, and, if Wisconsin needs it, to Wisconsin, too. If I dwell upon this theme unduly, if I trespass on the indulgence of the Senate, it is because I feel very deeply on this question as applied immediately to this item and as applied to each and every one of the items set out in this voluminous tariff bill.

In one sense General Hancock was right; in a qualified sense he uttered a truth. The tariff question is local in the sense that it immediately affects a given State or a given industry; but in the larger sense, in the statesmanlike sense, one great industry of Ohio is a national industry. Here let me turn aside for a moment to observe a truth which is so often overlooked and so often forgotten—that no State, no nation, can be permanently great or prosperous when its prosperity or greatness rests upon one industry exclusively. Changing trade currents, the lightnings from heaven, a summer's drought may wipe out its prosperity in a moment or in a season. Wherefore the legislator whose vision takes in America seeks to multiply and to diversify industries, to the end that our people may find profitable and steady employment, so that in the exchange of the products of labor there may be a general prosperity smiling upon the whole Republic. According to my doctrine and, though not claiming to be its oracle, the doctrine of the Republican Party—with which, however, I am very familiar—an industry in Florida would rouse my interest as keenly as an industry in California. An industry in Utah will challenge my championship; an industry in Arizona will have my unqualified support. And why? First, because they are American States and fellow countrymen. If I put it upon the broad ground of patriotic devotion to each and every foot of soil in America and every man and woman in America, it would be sufficient unto me; but if I wanted to indulge in a justifiable motive of selfishness, I would support a great industry in Ohio or Massachusetts or Arizona or Utah or any other of the 48 States of this Union, because I know it is economically true that if New England, for example, prospers the West will prosper, and, conversely, if the West prospers New England will share in that prosperity.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, please?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Certainly.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I think I understand the Senator's position on protection. I think the Senator believes in high tariff duties and has voted for every motion made to increase the duties named in this bill. Am I correct?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I have voted for adequate protective tariff duties whether they be high or low. Those are purely relative terms. They mean nothing.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The Senator from Louisiana is in favor of increasing the duty upon sugar. He is also in favor of increasing the duty upon rice.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. So am I.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. And the Senator from California is in favor of both those increases.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Yes.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Does the Senator believe that any duty proposed by any Senator from a State where there is an industry seeking protection should receive his vote?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Why, if I may directly reply, I have said that the mere asking is not sufficient, but if you ask me for a rate and follow the request by facts, figures, and conditions which show that the rate you ask is necessary to sustain and encourage that industry I respond gladly, "I am with you and will vote for a rate which is adequate for those purposes."

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The Senator will not get many suggestions from this side of the Chamber in favor of increasing these rates.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. No; but the American people know what has happened when Democratic suicidal, theoretic, tariff bills have become law. You have forgotten the Wilson tariff bill, have you not? There was another Wilson, and the Wilson tariff bill bankrupted this country.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, if the distinguished Senator from California thinks that this tariff bill is meeting the approval of Ohio Republicans, I suggest that he go to Ohio and confer with Ohio Republicans. He will find that he is very, very sadly mistaken.

The Senator is so very specific when he tells us that he favors "adequate protection." That is a most interesting expression and it covers a multitude of sins. It is just about as explanatory as was the position of the southern Congressman who, when his opponent asked him where he stood on the tariff question, said: "When I get to Washington, and I find that the tariff is too high, I will lower it; and when I find that it is too low, I will higher it."

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I had the honor of going over to the imperial State of Ohio, the mother of Presidents, and I had the great pleasure, as it was a privilege, of addressing a magnificent audience in the city of Dayton, the home of one who thought he was running for President. He is still standing in his tracks, and with the same League of Nations flag fluttering above him.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, any Ohio audience is a magnificent audience.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I admit that. I admit it cheerfully. I was going to say that Ohio has been in the habit of giving birth to Presidents and great Senators, and I can not look into the future, but I am very sure—as sure as I know that the sun will gild this Dome to-morrow morning—that Ohio will have a son in the presidential chair for a good many years to come.

Mr. KING. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] is in good health.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. And I think I know who that son will be. He will be the broad-minded, luminous-minded, great-hearted, thoroughbred Republican American—Warren G. Harding.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Great applause.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Well, they applauded that until the roof almost came off when I uttered those sentiments in Dayton, Ohio.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. That is what I thought.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I wait for applause from the other side, which will come later on. I have no doubt.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Certainly.

Mr. ASHURST. The modesty of my friend, the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE], precludes him from replying. I am sure that all on this side join with the Senator in the idea that the next President will be from Ohio. We are not sure, however, that the distinguished Senator from California has not confused the names.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I wish the senior Senator from Ohio good health, happiness, and individual prosperity.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Not even reelection to the Senate?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Politically, I walk under the banner of another party. I could say more, but, as Hamlet says:

The rest is silence.

If I may return from this digression to repeat, perhaps, a thought, we are dealing with a condition, and as to the condition we bring here to the Senate what might be regarded in a court as conclusive evidence, and the legal mind would say we have introduced cumulative evidence. If the Presiding Officer here were judge of a high court, and we were here introducing evidence, the court, *sua sponte*, would check us and say, "You need not introduce further evidence. It would be but cumulative, and unnecessarily consume the time of the court." So the facts being as they are, as so clearly made manifest by my colleague [Mr. JOHNSON], and as the written testimony here further establishes, I come to this proposition, and rap at the very bosom of Democratic Senators, and I propound this question, Is it desirable, is it to be desired, that this industry should languish and perish? Is it desirable, is it to be desired by anybody—confectioner, baker, individual consumer—that this great American industry of almond growing should languish and perish?

That brings me, of course, to the next question: What is the rate which is sufficient or necessary—to indulge in synonyms—to give adequate protection to this industry?

You can very easily destroy this industry, even as many other American industries can be destroyed; but is there a Senator, no matter under which banner he walks, who wishes to destroy any legitimate American industry? Is it wise to do so? Is it just to do so?

I have said, and I beg to repeat—for others may be concerned with what occurs to-day—that the prosperity of California will

overflow and be shared in by other sections of the country, and immediately by those States which are here, through their spokesmen, opposing the rates which we ask. Under present conditions this industry is not prosperous. To repeat that statement again and again would add nothing to the argument.

I can only express my surprise that the usually well-informed Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] should reach the conclusions he has announced here in respect to conditions prevailing in California, and perhaps I ought to express my regret that he foreshadows an abandonment of the Republican reservation. It is to be hoped, of course, that we will survive his departure; but I venture here and now to predict that he will not carry out his prophecy of abandoning this tariff bill or leave the old, familiar reservation. Certainly he ought not to because of this item—and I am for the moment confining my thoughts to this item.

I said a moment ago, Mr. President, that in one sense the tariff question involved local issues. That must be understood, of course. A given industry may be limited to a given State. The soil, the climate, of Louisiana or Mississippi may bring about certain industries, and in the sense that the industry is limited in its territorial extent it is local. But the very fact that it is local entitles it to the protecting principles for which we stand. I have very little intellectual respect for a man, wheresoever he may be, who limits his vision to the horizon that surrounds him. I know there are those who, standing in a village, think that village is the center of the universe because the horizon does seem to settle down in a circle round about. I have very little intellectual respect for the man who holds an idea so close to his eye as to shut out all other ideas or principles, even as the miser who holds a small penny so close to his eye as to shut out all the glories of God's universe.

What I would call upon the Senate and the American people to do is this, to regard this Republic as one great, united family, every member of which is entitled to the love and the assistance of all the others; and as for myself, I have mapped out this course, that I will stand for any legitimate industry which gives work and wages to the American.

In this industry we can not compete with the foreigner, and the facts are before us. The cost of production at home and the cost of production abroad—both those items—have been spread upon the record. The quantity we are producing has been set forth. The increasing acreage, in amount, has been stated, and the reason therefor. As to the quality of the article raised, the record abundantly proves that the quality is equal if not in certain brands superior to the foreign.

As to the ratio which obtains between the unshelled and the shelled almond, there remains no further doubt as to that. That ratio is as 1 to 3. I repeat, and would emphasize, that the evidence upon all these points is conclusive.

In looking over the RECORD of Monday, I find that the distinguished, the learned, and the consistent Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] spread upon the RECORD approaching a hundred letters or telegrams addressed to him by those who oppose the rates which we ask. The adjectives I use in referring to the Senator from North Carolina properly and justly describe his long and distinguished career. For him I have the very highest regard. He holds to a theory, and he hews to the line. He is not, as there are some abroad in the land, a political maverick or a political paranoiac. He is an upstanding Democratic statesman, and maintains with great ability the position he takes.

To offset, however, in point of written evidence the evidence which he introduced in this discussion, and which appears of record, I beg to offer letters addressed to me, and doubtless to my colleague, from chambers of commerce of the State of California and from men who have to do with the business affairs of that State. I will not trouble the Senate to read them, but ask permission that they may appear in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF., August 1, 1921.

HON. SAMUEL SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I desire to call your attention to the appeal made by the almond growers of our State in order to save the 100,000 acres of almond orchards, representing an investment of \$65,000,000. It is not necessary for me to tell you how vital this matter is to one of our greatest California industries.

Believing, as you do, that one of the great policies of the Republican Party is the protection of American industries, therefore I would say if there was ever a time when an industry in our great State needed protection, which industry is now completely at the mercy of the peasant growers of southern Europe, with their cheap labor and wretched living, it is now.

The fate of this industry is now in the hands of the Senate, and we of California look earnestly to you to assist us in every way possible

to save to us this great industry. This industry will be worth \$15,000,000 annually within the next three years if the proper tariff is placed on it.

Recognizing your power in the Senate and thanking you for the many courtesies we have received at your hands, I am,

Sincerely yours,

KERN COUNTY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
C. F. JOHNSON, *Secretary*.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE AND
CIVIC ASSOCIATION OF PASADENA, CALIF.,
August 11, 1921.

HON. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This organization is strongly in favor of the application of the California Almonds Growers' Exchange for a 5-cent and 15-cent tariff on unshelled and shelled almonds, respectively, and will greatly appreciate your support thereof.

Yours very truly,

WM. DUNKERLEY, *Secretary*.

ROSEVILLE, CALIF., August 3, 1921.

Senator S. M. SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.

This organization stands squarely behind you in your able fight for a 5 and 15 cent tariff on almonds and feels sure you are doing all that can be done to get it.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS,
Placer County Chamber of Commerce.

SANTA ROSA, CALIF., July 31, 1921.

Senator SAMUEL SHORTRIDGE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

Your vigorous effort required to save California almond industry by insisting on 5 and 15 cent tariff protection on unshelled and shelled almonds, respectively. We have wired Chairman Penrose and urge you use personal influence with committee.

SANTA ROSA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
H. P. HILLIARD, *President*,
JAMES G. STAFFORD, *Secretary*.

JULY 30, 1921.

HON. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Failure of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives to recommend tariff duty of 5 cents and 15 cents on unshelled and shelled almonds, respectively, means that 4,000 almond growers of the State of California face the prospect of financial ruin and loss to their 100,000 acres of orchards, and decades of work, representing an investment of \$65,000,000 in almond orchards in California.

The schedule of 4 and 12 cents reported upon by the House Ways and Means Committee, while recognizing the contention of the almond growers of California that tariff protection for shelled almonds should be at least three times as great as for unshelled, due to the natural shelling ratio, is utterly inadequate to meet the cheap labor and low production cost of the peasant growers of southern Europe with their pauper labor and wretched living standards.

This tariff protection is utterly inadequate to give our California almond growers the share of our American markets for shelled almonds that our investment, our labor, and our years of effort entitle us to. While the confession of a three to one shelling ratio is a recognition of the principle, the rates of 4 cents and 12 cents proposed in the House Ways and Means schedule are utterly inadequate.

We are respectfully requesting that the schedule be revised in the Senate to meet the actual living conditions and producing costs in America of this essential food product, \$15,000,000 of which is produced annually in California.

You are respectfully requested to insist on a revision of this House Ways and Means Committee schedule and the adoption of a schedule of 5 cents and 15 cents on unshelled and shelled almonds, respectively, thus saving to the United States an industry that has been made possible only through years of labor, sacrifice, and effort on the part of American growers in this State.

Yours very truly,

SANTA ROSA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
By H. P. HILLIARD, *President*,
Attest: JAMES G. STAFFORD, *Secretary*.

SANTA ROSA, CALIF., July 30, 1921.

Senator BOIES PENROSE,
Chairman Senate Finance Committee, Washington, D. C.

California's \$65,000,000 almond industry in which 4,000 growers, 100,000 acres, and decades of arduous work are involved faces absolute ruin, and an annual income of \$15,000,000 to California will be cut off unless almonds are given a tariff protection of 5 and 15 cents on unshelled and shelled, respectively. Our growers are Americans, with American living standards, employing American help at American wages, and can not compete with peasant growers and pauper labor of southern Europe unless granted adequate tariff protection.

SANTA ROSA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

COLUSA, CALIF., July 30, 1921.

Senator SAMUEL SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.

This chamber at a special meeting to-day passed a set of strong resolutions demanding and imploring a tariff of 5 and 15 cents. A copy of this second set of resolutions along with a telegram has this day been sent to Senator Boies Penrose as chairman of the Finance Committee. This chamber has gone on record as sincerely appreciating your efforts in our behalf and again implore you to employ your strongest arguments to secure the necessary tariff rate before the Finance Committee.

COLUSA COUNTY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Per W. O. HYRUP, *Secretary-Manager*.

CHICO, CALIF., July 28, 1921.

HON. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

Appreciate your continued support of almond tariff fight for rate of 5 cents and 15 cents. Have wired Penrose urging Senate committee give matter consideration.

CHICO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

REDLANDS, CALIF., July 27, 1921.

SAMUEL SHORTRIDGE, *Senator*,
Washington, D. C.

To protect and save almond industry California must have ratio 3 to 1 and tariff rate no less than 5 cents on unshelled almonds and 15 cents on the shelled. We urge you stand out for above in Senate hearing, as it is vital to every almond district of State.

REDLANDS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

WILLOWS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Willows, Calif., July 26, 1921.

Mr. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In this part of California we are very much interested in the tariff on unshelled and shelled almonds. Our people are very much worked up over this matter, and we want you to give your attention to the bill that has passed the House and is now before the Senate, and ask you to give it grave consideration on behalf of the 4,000 almond growers of the State.

It is the consensus of opinion of all the almond growers that nothing but 5 and 15 cents will pay the almond growers and their orchards, and we therefore urge upon you to stand for this, if you can see your way clear to.

We are not asking any United States Senator to violate his conscience in any way, but we are perfectly sure that once giving this matter the consideration it deserves that you will be with us to the very best of your ability.

Yours sincerely,

F. W. LEAVITT, *Secretary*.

SACRAMENTO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
July 21, 1921.

HON. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SHORTRIDGE: Your fine action as set forth in your telegram of July 20 with reference to the bean situation is sincerely appreciated.

We hope that you will keep the fine work going, and particularly on the floor of the Senate, exerting every possible effort within your power to the end that the 15 cents per pound tariff on almonds will be put into effect, for this is vital to the industry, as I am sure you are well aware.

Very truly yours,

A. S. DUDLEY, *Secretary-Manager*.

SAN BENITO COUNTY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Hollister, Calif., July 14, 1921.

HON. SAMUEL SHORTRIDGE,
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SHORTRIDGE: There is now I believe before the House of Representatives the question of a tariff of 5 cents per pound on almonds not shelled, and 15 cents per pound on shelled almonds. San Benito County and its adjoining counties are vitally interested in this tariff, and our organization feels that the almond industry in our country should be protected, and to the end that a tariff should be imposed on foreign shipments.

Therefore it is the desire of this organization that you give same your consideration with the aim of protecting the industry in California.

Very truly yours,

W. M. JONES,
Secretary San Benito County Chamber of Commerce.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Live Oak, Calif., July 14, 1921.

HON. SAMUEL SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have been requested by the above organization to write you in regard to the proposed duty on almonds and respectfully urge you to use your best efforts to obtain the following:

	Cents per pound.
On shelled almonds.....	15
On unshelled almonds.....	5

As you know this district is a considerable producer in this line, and at the present time needs assistance in the above manner if we are to continue.

Thanking you for whatever you may be able to accomplish, I am,

Yours very truly,

T. C. SMITH

ESPARTO, CALIF., July 14, 1921.

HON. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Tariff 5 and 15 will save our almond industry. Your earnest support will be appreciated.

WESTERN YOLO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
FRED B. WYATT, *President*.

FRESNO, CALIF., July 14, 1921.

Senator SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.

The present tariff on almonds has been recommended by the Ways and Means Committee; entirely inadequate to afford any protection. The tariff of 4 cents on almonds not shelled and 8 cents on shelled almonds is disproportionate. The tariff should be three times as great for shelled almonds. The almond industry is to-day faced with immediate extinction unless relief is given in the tariff measure. This is an industry that affects the entire State. Can we count on your support?

FRESNO COUNTY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

ANTIOCH, CALIF., July 14, 1921.

SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The Antioch Chamber of Commerce earnestly request that you work for a tariff of 5 cents per pound on almonds in the shell and 15 cents per pound on shelled almonds. The tariff of 4 cents and 8 cents, as recommended by the Ways and Means Committee, would be ruinous to the almond industry of California.

Yours for prosperity,

ANTIOCH CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
R. V. DAVIS, President.

WINTERS, CALIF., July 12, 1921.

HON. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

The almond growers of Yolo County, representing approximately one-sixth of the State production, make urgent appeal for tariff on almonds 5 cents in shell, 15 cents shelled. Tariff bill, as recommended by committee, 4 and 8 cents, insufficient, and ratio is not correctly computed, since the shelling is three to one. California almonds are being carried one season to another on account of importations from Europe, which we can not compete with. Tonnage increasing yearly. Must have some relief or one of California's big industries will be ruined, affecting 5,000 growers and \$30,000,000 orchard property. We ask that you make every endeavor to get action on tariff asked by the California Almond Growers' Exchange of 5 cents for the unshelled and 15 cents for the shelled almonds.

WINTERS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

RIVERSIDE, CALIF., July 11, 1921.

Senator SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.:

California almond industry has 100,000 acres and fifty millions invested. We favor at least 5 cents per pound tariff on unshelled and 15 cents on shelled almonds imported. Respectfully urge your favorable support for this great industry.

RIVERSIDE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
IRWIN HAYDEN, Secretary.

COLUSA, CALIF., July 10, 1921.

Senator SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.:

Colusa County being vitally interested in the almond industry, with an investment representing \$4,000,000, the county chamber of commerce has passed strong resolutions requesting Congress to give us a necessary tariff protection, said tariff to be placed at a ratio of three times as much on shelled as on unshelled almonds. Unless an adequate tariff such as this is placed on imported almonds, both shelled and unshelled, the entire almond industry in the State of California faces ruin and destruction. We therefore implore you to use your best endeavor to secure a tariff of 5 cents on unshelled and 15 cents on shelled almonds per pound. Copy of resolutions above referred to is being mailed to you to-day.

W. O. HYRUP,
Secretary-Manager Colusa County Chamber of Commerce.

REDLANDS, CALIF., July 9, 1921.

Senator SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge protection almond industry with tariff suggested by growers' organization.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

STOCKTON, CALIF., July 9, 1921.

HON. SAMUEL SHORTRIDGE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

This organization, speaking in the name of the people of San Joaquin County, earnestly urges that you support the effort of the California almond growers to secure needful protection in the pending tariff bill. The tariff on shelled almonds should be at least three times as great as almonds in the shell. Please give this request your usual attentive consideration.

STOCKTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
A. C. OULLAHAN, Managing Secretary.

PASO ROBLES, CALIF., July 9, 1921.

Senator SAMUEL SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.:

Producers of almonds in California can not, under existing labor and transportation conditions, compete with foreign labor and low water rates. The existence of the industry demands a tariff fair to producer and consumer. Rate should be on a basis of 3 pounds of unshelled to 1 pound of shelled almonds. Your influence is necessary at this time to save the most important industry in this section.

SAN MIGUEL DISTRICT CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

CHICO, CALIF., July 8, 1921.

HON. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate, Washington, D. C.:

On behalf of almond growers of Butte County, one of two most important almond-producing counties of California, Chico Chamber of Commerce appeals to you to support and make every effort to secure tariff on almonds of 5 cents per pound unshelled and 15 cents per pound shelled almonds. This is vital if growing almond business of California is to be protected from European competition.

CHICO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
C. M. COFFING, President.

OAKDALE, CALIF., July 8, 1921.

HON. SAMUEL SHORTRIDGE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Oakdale is vitally interested in the almond industry and desires that you make every possible effort to have tariff on almonds 5 cents for unshelled and 15 for shelled. Thousands of acres planted to almonds around Oakdale will be rendered unprofitable unless proper duties are imposed on imports.

OAKDALE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,

ATASCADERO, CALIF., July 8, 1921.

Senator S. M. SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.:

The Atascadero Chamber of Commerce urgently begs that you will support the tariff on almonds, which is now being brought up for your deliberation. It is the opinion of this chamber that the almond growers of this country should be protected in every way possible, and this measure is vital to the rapidly developing industry.

ATASCADERO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
J. T. EDWARDS, Managing Director.

PASO ROBLES, CALIF., July 8, 1921.

HON. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.:

Twelve million dollars' worth of almond orchards in Paso Robles district will be unable to survive proposed tariff of 4 and 8 cents. Absolutely necessary that proportion shelled and unshelled almonds be 3 to 1, and should be 5 and 15 cents if almond industry is to be continued in California. We beg you to use your influence to establish a tariff which will protect and not disable one of California's important industries.

PASO ROBLES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
JOSEPH W. TANNER, Secretary.

HAMILTON CITY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Hamilton City, Calif., July 7, 1921.

HON. HIRAM W. JOHNSON, United States Senator,
HON. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE, United States Senator,
HON. CLARENCE F. LEA, Congressman,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: The Ways and Means Committee have recommended to Congress a tariff on almonds, not shelled, of 4 cents, and on shelled almonds 8 cents per pound.

Since European almonds shell out 4 to 1 and California almonds 3 to 1, we are entitled to a tariff on shelled almonds at least three times as great as almonds in the shell.

Unless we get a readjustment of tariff on shelled almonds of at least 3 to 1 it will mean the disintegration of the almond industry of California. Our only future market is for shelled almonds, which represents 80 per cent of the demand of the United States. This is a serious situation confronting the industry. Only with proper protection on shelled almonds can we bring to California the millions that are going to the shores of the Mediterranean.

A Congressman recently told a group of farmers that when agricultural interests talk loud enough they can get anything within the power of our Government. "If you will let us know what you want, the rest is easy," said the Congressman.

Speaking for myself, I have 100 acres in almonds. This 100 acres has cost me \$500 per acre, or a total of \$50,000, to put my orchard where it is to-day—seven years old—and all in bearing. If we do not get the proper protection under the tariff, you can easily see what it means to me, and not only myself but to hundreds of others in the almond-growing industry in the State of California.

As one of the many growers in this State I pray that you may do all in your power to give us protection under the tariff as above outlined. I am, gentlemen,

Yours very respectfully,

H. L. WEST.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., July 7, 1921.

HON. SAMUEL SHORTRIDGE,
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.:

Almond industry threatened unless 15 cents per pound tariff on shelled almonds requested by California almond growers be granted. California almond investment exceeds \$50,000,000. Ten million dollars coming to California annually for shelled almonds will be practically lost if suggested legislation fails. Please support legislation.

SACRAMENTO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

OTHER ORGANIZATIONS—CLEARING HOUSES—NEWSPAPERS.

CALIFORNIA ALMOND GROWERS' EXCHANGE,
San Francisco, Calif., May 29, 1922.

HON. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: We appreciate your telegram of May 26. Indeed we know that our cause has had your earnest attention and still continues to hold it at the present time.

We are asking Professor Taylor to furnish you with any data that he may have to dispute the groundless charge that California almonds are not equal in quality and fitness to foreign almonds. This is one of those sweeping generalities which are not supported by the facts.

Professor Jaffa has analyzed the various varieties of both California and foreign almonds, and his investigations prove conclusively that there is no truth in the charge made by the confectioners that the California almonds are not equal to the Mediterranean almonds for confectioners' use.

We feel that the Senate will not be willing to disturb the recommendations of the Finance Committee, as the question is a technical one, and the Senate will agree that the Finance Committee's recommendations, based as they are on the facts of the case, should be followed. I know that you will do everything possible to support our schedule if it is attacked on the floor of the Senate.

With kindest personal regards,

Very truly yours,

T. C. TUCKER, Manager.

CALIFORNIA ALMOND GROWERS' EXCHANGE,
San Francisco, Calif., January 31, 1922.

HON. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We attach hereto for your information copy of a letter sent by William M. Regan, president of Regan Bros., wholesale bakers, of Minneapolis, Minn., to the New York Dried Fruit Association.

The letter needs no comment other than that it is one of many similar refusals by reputable American bakers and confectioners to lend themselves to a cut-and-dried, printed-circular propaganda campaign to defeat the honest pleas of our farmers for that modicum of protection which our almond growers, for instance, are asking in a 5 and 15 cent schedule of import duties on the peasant-raised almonds of southern Europe.

Very truly yours,

T. B. WATERS,
Assistant to Manager.

REGAN BROS. CO.,
Minneapolis, Minn., January 10, 1922.

DRIED FRUIT ASSOCIATION,
New York Tariff Committee,
No. 6 Harrison Street, New York, N. Y.

GENTLEMEN: We have received, through Messrs. Birdsong Bros., a copy of your circular letter of January 3, 1922, and printed protest against the proposed increased import duties on shelled almonds, shelled walnuts, and shelled filberts in tariff bill (H. R. 7456), paragraphs 754, 755, 758.

The writer does not agree with your arguments at all. Personally, I am heartily in favor of higher rates of duty on the articles mentioned. I believe absolutely in the principle of protection of American industries, and believe that ultimately all the people of the United States will be very much benefited by a high protective tariff.

If Congress imposes a duty on the articles named above, it will have a tendency to justify the people in the States that can grow American almonds, walnuts, and filberts to invest in lands and build up the orchards and enable us to produce in our own country goods that we use here.

Almonds, walnuts, filberts, etc., are just the kind of articles that should carry a high tariff. They are luxuries, and the people who care to buy them can afford to pay the price.

I also believe firmly in a high tariff on eggs imported into this country. If there should be a fair profit, even if just a little bit higher than just a living profit, for the American farmer on his eggs, it will have a natural tendency to induce more people to go into the poultry business, and in time we will produce enough eggs and poultry in this country to supply our own wants; and we will keep our money here, instead of sending it to China and other foreign countries.

Last year, when the markets in the Eastern and Central States were flooded with lemons imported from southern Europe, millions of dozens of lemons rotted on the ground and on the trees in California because our own growers could not afford to pick, pack, and pay high freight rates on them. If we had had a high enough tariff on lemons, the foreign growers who wanted the American market would have had to pay the United States Government a reasonable amount of money for the privilege of doing business here, or our local markets would have been supplied with our home-grown fruit.

Yours truly,

(Signed) WM. M. REGAN.

FIRE ASSOCIATION OF PHILADELPHIA,
San Francisco, Calif., August 12, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We desire to express to you our thanks and appreciation for the manner in which you have assisted the almond growers of our State in the tariff on almonds. This, as you no doubt know, is one of the very best industries in our State, and a high tariff is of vital importance to the continuance of this class of agriculture.

Trusting the tariff will be increased so that our growers will have no further apprehension along these lines, with best wishes to you, beg to remain,

Yours very truly,

F. M. AVERY, Manager.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., August 8, 1921.

Senator S. M. SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.:

Tariff of 5 cents pound on unshelled almonds and 15 cents on shelled is essential to save California growers. Our members of Merced County planting about 2,200 acres to almonds, which represents their life savings. We appeal for your influence to pass above tariff.

FIGMOND GROWERS' ASSOCIATION,
P. M. ERWIN, Secretary.

STOCKTON, CALIF., August 5, 1921.

Senator SAMUEL SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

San Joaquin County Almond Growers' Association, consisting of 615 growers, are striving for 5 and 15 cents tariff to protect and keep alive their industry and seek your cooperation.

C. L. NEUMILLER.

Hon. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Almond growers looking to you to keep them from financial ruin. One-tenth of 1919 crop and almost half of 1920 crop still unsold. Scarcely received enough pay for gathering. Banks no longer willing to loan on almonds or almond land. Only relief 5 and 15 cent tariff.

DAVIS ALMOND GROWERS ASSOCIATION,
L. C. SCHMEISER, Secretary.

Senator SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.:

The passing of the Fordney bill in its present state would be fatal to one of the largest industries of California. Unless the tariff on almonds is raised to a ratio of 5 to 15, ruin is threatened for California almond growers, who have an investment in the State aggregating \$50,000,000. Urge your utmost efforts in behalf of the welfare of California.

ROBERT W. WALKER,
Vallejo Evening Times.

ROSEVILLE, CALIF., August 3, 1921.

Senator S. M. SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.:

The following almond growers of Placer County ask that you do all in your power to secure a 5 and 15 cent tariff on almonds.

ARTHUR BOOTH. MART. SCHELLHOUS.
EARL MURRAY. E. FARNHAM.
HARVEY GOULD. JOHN HERRING.
RIOLO BROS. FRANK CROWDER.
SMITH BROS. E. C. BEDELL.
CARRIE SCHELLHOUS. J. W. PRUETT.
ED SCHELLHOUS. JOE THORELL.
JOHN SCHELLHOUS.

ROSEVILLE, CALIF., August 4, 1921.

SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

The Antelope Almond Growers' Association appreciate your efforts in trying to increase the tariff and wish to further impress upon you that 4 12 means ruination of the industry, while 5 15 an even competition with importations.

G. P. DEKAY,
J. F. GLADNEY,
R. D. GOULD,
A. T. MCBRIDE,
A. VAN MAREN,
Directors.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., August 2, 1921.

Hon. S. M. SHORTRIDGE,
Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.:

We desire to advise you that it is of vital interest to the California almond industry that they have adequate tariff protection. We would ask your utmost support in behalf of a tariff of at least 5 cents on unshelled almonds and 15 cents on shelled almonds. The situation is critical and unless this industry is properly protected the growers will be unable to continue under present conditions.

SACRAMENTO CLEARING HOUSE,
Representing entire banking interest of Sacramento.

CONCORD, CALIF., July 31, 1921.

Senator SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.:

These resolutions unanimously passed to-day:
Whereas the almond industry of this country is in danger of being destroyed for want of an adequate tariff on foreign almonds, especially on shelled almonds, the ratio of which is 1 pound shelled to 3 unshelled; Therefore be it

Resolved, That we request the Senate of the United States to impose a tariff of 15 cents on shelled and 5 cents per pound on unshelled almonds.

CONCORD ALMOND GROWERS' ASSOCIATION,
A. C. GEHRINGER, President.
PERCY DOUGLAS, Secretary.

SEBASTOPOL, CALIF., July 31, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

After thorough investigation we are convinced that a duty of 5 cents on almonds in the shell and 15 cents on shelled almonds is necessary to save our growers from serious loss. We therefore earnestly urge you to use your influence to amend tariff bill as passed by House.

SEBASTOPOL APPLE GROWERS' UNION.

BANNING, CALIF., July 31, 1921.

Hon. SAM. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Ninety-four almond growers of Banning, representing very important orchard industry here, urge tariff not less than 5 cents on unshelled and 15 cents on shelled, this rate being lowest possible consistent with conditions of almond industry, due to foreign competition. Passage of 4 cents and 12 cents tariff would be equivalent to surgeon cutting out part only of cancer leaving portion of malignant growth to kill patient. Ratio must be 1 to 3 to offer protection most urgently needed by California growers, whose industry under present rates literally faces ruin.

BANNING ALMOND GROWERS' ASSOCIATION.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
July 29, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL SHORTRIDGE,
United States Senator from California, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: It is the plain duty of Congress to see to it that our industries, operated along good business lines, are protected against importations from foreign countries, and particularly is this applicable where products of the soil are involved. The prosperity, welfare, and happiness of our people are entitled to and must be shown such consideration. We Americans are too intelligent and too progressive to ever submit to the peasantry conditions existing in many European countries, where the standard of living, through the imposition of starvation wages, is the very lowest.

California is the center of the almond industry, and the well-being of thousands of our people, and as well the interests of our State, are seriously menaced in consequence of the failure of Congress up to this time to provide an adequate protective tariff. The total investment in the almond industry of California is substantially more than \$50,000,000, and unless a duty is levied on importations to enable the growers of almonds to market their crops at a fair margin of profit over cost of production and harvesting, the ruin of this important industry is a certainty.

The House of Representatives has voted a tariff of 4 cents per pound on almonds not shelled and 12 cents per pound on shelled almonds. It has been conservatively estimated by men who have made a close study of the situation in all its phases that the minimum protection required by American growers is 5 cents per pound on almonds in the shell and 15 cents per pound on shelled almonds. Unless this protection is afforded we are assured by almond growers of California that they will be forced to discontinue producing, as the European competition under present conditions can not be successfully overcome. This would result in throwing thousands of people out of employment, in depreciating land values, and inevitably numerous bankruptcies.

We feel confident you appreciate the importance, for the preservation of the almond industry of California, of a protective tariff on this commodity which will really mean adequate protection, and through the medium of which this industry may be enabled to expand and prosper. This would very naturally result in utilization of land now lying idle or of little value, and of increasing the population and prosperity of our great State. May we not hope for your active and vigorous support for a tariff of 5 cents per pound on almonds in the shell and 15 cents per pound on shelled almonds?

Yours very truly,

CALIFORNIA VEGETABLE UNION,
A. J. HOGAN, Traffic Manager.

Hon. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
Have wired all members of Senate Finance Committee copy of resolutions passed to-day regarding almond tariff, thinking it would assist you in your fight in our behalf.
ARBUCKLE COLLEGE CITY ALMOND GROWERS' ASSOCIATION,
By D. S. NELSON, Secretary-Manager.

ARBUCKLE, CALIF., July 29, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.:
DEAR SIR: I am going to ask you to help us all you can in regards tariff on almonds, as the almond growers surely need the help. Five cents on almonds in the shell and 15 cents per pound on shelled almonds—any lower tariff would be ruinous to all almond growers in California and would be a calamity for California.
We have not made anything on almonds on the last two crops, but have lost money; so will soon be broke without we get some relief.
There are 4,000 to 6,000 almond growers in California, and something should be done for them.
Mr. T. C. Tucker, of the California Almond Growers' Exchange, will give all the data and explain the situation thoroughly which almond growers are in.
Hope you will help him in every way and do all you can for him.
Now, hoping you will fight with all your might for a tariff of 5 cents on almonds in the shell and 15 cents per pound on shelled almonds—which the almond growers surely do need, I am,
Yours truly,

LINDEN, July 27, 1921.

T. D. BRYAN,

Vice President San Joaquin County Almond Growers' Association, Linden, Calif.

Senator SAMUEL SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Offices, Washington, D. C.:
Almond tariff positively necessary to life of industry in California. Urge your strong support.
CALIFORNIA PRUNE & APRICOT GROWERS (INC.),
H. C. DUNLAP.

SAN JOSE, CALIF., July 26, 1921.

Hon. S. M. SHORTRIDGE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
We earnestly solicit your support toward increasing duty to 5 cents on unshelled and 15 cents on shelled almonds. It is our belief that this tariff is absolutely necessary if the almond growers of our State are to continue in business.
GOLETA LIMA BEAN GROWERS' ASSOCIATION,
E. W. STOW, President.

SANTA BARBARA, CALIF., July 26, 1921.

Hon. S. M. SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.:
You are undoubtedly aware of the fight being waged by the Almond Growers' Association of California to secure 5 cents per pound tariff on almonds shelled and 15 cents per pound on almonds unshelled. We beg from you to do your utmost to assist Tucker, manager almond growers, win his fight. Know him personally, and by assisting them in their fight you are surely assisting one of the foremost industries of California. Thank you.
CALIFORNIA GROWERS & SHIPPERS (INC.).

FRESNO, CALIF., July 25, 1921.

Senator SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
Your State almond industry must be saved by tariff. At least 5 cents on unshelled and 15 cents on shelled. Will you save it?
MILK PRODUCERS' ASSOCIATION OF SAN DIEGO COUNTY.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF., July 25, 1921.

Senator SAM SHORTRIDGE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Almond growers need tariff based on natural shelling ratio. Almond growers must be protected if their industry is to continue.
NORTHERN CALIFORNIA MILK PRODUCERS' ASSOCIATION.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., July 25, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Understand tariff bill will be taken up by Senate Finance Committee Tuesday. Please give careful consideration to California almond growers' request, as they have approximately \$50,000,000 invested, and unless adequate protection is afforded this great industry will suffer serious loss, as they can not compete with cheap labor from southern Europe. Kindly use your best efforts to provide the protection requested by them.
CALIFORNIA PEACH AND FIG GROWERS.

FRESNO, CALIF., July 24, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL SHORTRIDGE,
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.:
DEAR SENATOR SHORTRIDGE: The almond industry in America, which is chiefly centered in California, is very severely threatened by the lack of a protective tariff.
Foreign cheap labor has undermined this industry in California, and the growers are not able to compete.
We would ask you to do everything in your power to get a tariff of 5 cents per pound on almonds, not shelled, and 15 cents per pound on shelled almonds. These figures will give the California growers a chance to develop this industry.
Thanking you for anything that you can do to help the almond industry,
Yours very truly,

NEWCASTLE, CALIF., July 23, 1921.

PLACER COUNTY FRUIT GROWERS,
By H. M. ELLIS.

THE RIVERSIDE ENTERPRISE,
Riverside, Calif., July 21, 1921.

United States Senator SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.:
MY DEAR SENATOR SHORTRIDGE: We are all greatly pleased with your success in securing the return of the Indian office to Riverside and other developments.
I also desire to express my personal appreciation of the manner in which you have fought for proper tariff for California products. There is still a feeling on the part of the California growers that 5 cents for unshelled and 15 cents for shelled almonds is essential to protect the California growers from cheap importations. I am sure that you have done, and always are doing, all in your power in this regard.
Thanking you again for the prompt responses you have always made to any request or suggestion from our community, I am,
Very truly yours,
J. R. GABBERT.

YUBA CITY, CALIF., July, 1921.

Senator SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
HONORABLE SIR: We, the undersigned officers of the Sutter Peach Growers, and representing the cling-peach industry of California, do hereby respectfully ask that you aid in every way the California Almond Growers' Exchange in their fight for an amendment to the tariff-rate recommendations of the Ways and Means Committee, as we believe that they are entitled to a 5-cent and 15-cent tariff rate. This judgment we base upon extensive research of past and present cost of production. Believing in the protection of our California industries and the help of our legislators, we submit this entreaty.
Sutter Peach Growers; Edward S. Moulton, president; J. L. Ames, secretary; J. W. Eager, director; J. G. Kussenberger, director; S. W. Walton, director; Geo. T. Boyd, director; G. C. Galbraith, director; M. D. McLeod, manager.

LOS ANGELES COUNTY FARM BUREAU,
Los Angeles, Calif., July 15, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.:
DEAR SIR: The Los Angeles County Farm Bureau, an organization of some 2,000 farmers in Los Angeles County, is desirous of calling your attention to the urgent necessity for adequate tariff protection to the California almond industry. From the published reports concerning the permanent tariff bill, it is apparent that this important industry, which represents a long-time investment of some \$50,000,000, is not being provided with adequate tariff protection.
Your attention is called to the fact that the main competition which the California almond industry suffers from is that occurring in southern Europe, where costs of production are much lower than those in California, largely due to the lower standard of living.
No doubt you are familiar with the brief prepared by the California Almond Growers' Exchange for presentation to the Tariff Commission. It is apparent to those familiar with the California almond industry that a tariff protection of approximately 15 cents per pound is absolutely necessary if the industry is not to suffer seriously. It is also apparent that the ratio of protection accorded the shelled product and the unshelled product should be at least three to one. Average market prices for shelled almonds over a long period of years are fully three times those quoted for unshelled almonds. This, together with the fact that on an average 100 pounds of unshelled almonds will yield about 30 pounds of the shelled article will make it apparent that the ratio must be not less than three to one.

You are therefore urged to do all that you can to see that this important industry receives the full measure of tariff protection which it must have if it is to endure.
Very sincerely yours,
J. B. VAILE,
Chairman Legislative Committee,
Los Angeles County Farm Bureau.

MARYSVILLE, CALIF., July 14, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
An extremely serious situation confronts all who have developed one of California's natural characteristics to produce almonds with practically entire demand for meats. We are denied this market, due to lack of protection, in spite of the fact we have at Sacramento the largest, most modern almond-shelling plant in world. Please help us secure 15-cent protection.
C. L. MOSELEY,
President Buttes Almond Orchards (Inc.).

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF., July 13, 1921.

Senator SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.:
We favor and urge your support on tariff as proposed by California Almond Growers' Exchange, thereby protecting our almond industry.
BAKERSFIELD CLEARING HOUSE ASSOCIATION.

MODESTO, CALIF., July 12, 1921.

Senator SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.:
The California almond industry is threatened with destruction unless tariff on shelled almonds is placed at 15 cents pound. Fifty million dollars invested here in the industry. Congress seriously considering adjournment and we insist on remaining in session until agricultural bills are passed.
STANISLAUS COUNTY FARM BUREAU
(Fifteen hundred farmers).

ANTIOCH, CALIF., July 12, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
DEAR SIR: We earnestly urge your best endeavor to change almond tariff to 5 cents in the shell and 15 cents on shelled almonds, as 4 cents in shell and 8 cents shelled is ruinous to almond industry of California.
Respectfully,
ARTHUR W. BIGELO,
Vice President Eastern Contra Costa County
Almond Growers' Association, Oakley, Calif.

SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
Proposed duty on almonds especially shelled insufficient to protect domestic industry, as almonds shell about three or four to one; the protection on unshelled almonds is therefore twice that of shelled. The duty on shelled almonds should be three times the duty on unshelled. We wish 5 and 15. Situation threatens industry.
CHICO ALMOND GROWERS' ASSOCIATION
(Two hundred growers).
B. F. HUDSPETH, Secretary.

SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
We as officials of Antelope Almond Growers' Association, representing growers of Sacramento and Placer Counties, ask you use your utmost efforts to have the tariff on almonds increased and the ratio of shelled and unshelled made 3 to 1; otherwise part of the crop will not be harvested.

G. P. DEKAY,
J. F. GLADNEY,
R. D. GOULD,
A. T. MCBRIDE,
A. VANMAREN,
Directors.

Senator S. M. SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.:
San Joaquin County farm bureau urges passage of tariff measure. Recommends increasing almond tariff to 5 cents in shell and 15 cents shelled.

GILBERT KEITLÉ, Secretary.

Senator SAMUEL SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
We ask tariff 5 cents unshelled, 15 cents shelled, almonds.
LAKE COUNTY ALMOND GROWERS' ASSOCIATION.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., July 9, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
California Development Board and California Industries Association merged and representing transportation agricultural business and manufacturing interests entire State insist upon amendment of House tariff bill to provide adequate tariff duties on almonds on 3 to 1 ratio between shelled and unshelled. This is absolutely vital to State as whole and to 4,000 working almond farmers, some of whose crops for 1919 and 1920 have not been sold, because American shelled almond market controlled by southern European growers. Three to one ratio vital also to entire State, because it means diversion of \$15,000,000 annually from European growers and foreign bankers to California.
CALIFORNIA DEVELOPMENT BOARD,
CALIFORNIA INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATION,
N. H. SLOAN, Manager.

PASO ROBLES, CALIF., July 9, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
The directors of Paso Robles Almond Growers' Association, representing 20,000 acres almond orchards, appeal to you for tariff 5 cents on unshelled and 15 cents on shelled almonds. This ratio of 3 to 1 is fair and necessary to success of almond industry.
C. BUTTERWORTH,
FRED IVERSON,
JOHN H. VANWORMER,
Directors.

ORLAND, CALIF., July 9, 1921.

SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
Inasmuch as this association still has a portion of its 1919 and 1920 crop of almonds unsold and, further, that to date we have received for our 1920 crop of almonds but 7 cents for Drakes and 10 cents for IXL almonds, and these are the leading varieties produced, and we know that these conditions are caused by too low a tariff on foreign almonds: Be it
Resolved, That this association petition Congress for a tariff of not less than 5 cents on almonds in the shell and 15 cents for shelled almonds. After a thorough investigation we find that it costs us from 10 to 12 cents per pound to produce almonds. We therefore petition you to give us a tariff that will enable us to get a living return for our labor. Unless we get adequate protection on California-grown almonds thousands of farmers will be ruined.

ORLAND ALMOND GROWERS' ASSOCIATION,
GEORGE W. STURM, Secretary.

BANNING, CALIF., July 8, 1921.

SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
Understand an 8-cent tariff has been set on shelled almonds. Altogether too low. We growers will be forced out of business unless tariff is raised. Favor tariff of 15 cents advocated by California Almond Growers' Exchange.

GILMAN HOME CO.,
C. MABEL GILMAN,
Secretary.

SAMUEL SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.:
California wants you to vote at least 5 cents on almonds not shelled and 15 cents on shelled.
P. D. FITZPATRICK,
Almond Grower and Locomotive Engineer on Santa Fe.

CHICO, CALIF.

CALIFORNIA ALMOND GROWERS' EXCHANGE,
San Francisco, Calif.:
Thanks for telegram. Will put forth every effort to secure adequate tariff on almonds.
SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE.

NEW YORK UNDERWRITERS' AGENCY,
Los Angeles, July 7, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
HONORABLE SIR: Many (writer included) in California are interested in the growing and marketing of almonds, but we can not bring this business to a successful issue unless a sufficiently high tariff is placed on almonds imported from foreign countries.
Knowing that you have the interest of California at heart, we feel sure that you will use your best endeavor to have foreign almonds placed behind a tariff wall so high that it will insure your State of California growers a fair price for their product.

Very sincerely yours,
A. C. ANDERSON.

WOODLAND, CALIF., July 5, 1921.

Senator SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.:
Almond growers of Yolo County, where nearly one-sixth of all almonds grown in United States are produced, urge California delegation to exert every possible effort for increased tariff protection. Growers insist industry representing millions of dollars invested interests would be ruined under present tariff schedule. Advise us as to what we might do to assist in any and every way. The situation is indeed critical for the industry.

FRED SHAFFER,
Secretary Yolo County Board of Trade.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., June 29, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
Understand committee recommends 4 cents in shell and 8 cents shelled. We are bitterly disappointed in recommendation, especially on our showing that European almonds shell four to one. We feel we are entitled to at least three to one, and we know that our request for 5 cents per pound on unshelled and 15 cents per pound on shelled is exceedingly reasonable and merited by all facts. We know you will help us fight.

CALIFORNIA ALMOND GROWERS' EXCHANGE.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I wish also to call the attention of the Senate to certain letters and telegrams addressed to me by distinguished men in California, men of affairs, not directly in all cases engaged in this industry but men who are familiar with the conditions and the facts, for it is upon the conditions and the facts we are here to-day standing. I will consume the time of the Senate to read a telegram addressed to me by the mayor of San Francisco, as follows:

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., July 27, 1921.

Senator SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
A leading California industry is languishing and is threatened with extinction. The almond industry, representing an investment of \$65,000,000, is being forced to the wall. Rehabilitation of the industry of prime importance not alone to our State but to our Nation. Imported products of pauper labor are absorbing our markets, bankrupting our industry, and rendering us dependent. Forty thousand people rely, in whole or in part, for livelihood on California almond culture. Substantial import duties, tending to equalize relative costs of production, can alone check this destructive avalanche. I fully endorse minimum effective tariff, as asked by our growers, and urge strenuous employment of all reasonable means to secure tariff of 5 cents per pound on all almonds imported in shell and 15 cents on shelled goods.
JAMES ROLPH, Jr.,
Mayor of San Francisco.

I have here a telegram addressed to me setting forth in substance the facts as stated by Mayor Rolph, which telegram I would beg Senators to note is signed by the California Almond Growers' Exchange, the California Lima Bean Growers' Association, the California Peach and Fig Growers, the California Cattlemen's Association, the California Fruit Growers' Exchange, the Poultry Producers of Central California, Sebastopol Apple Growers' Union, California Associated Raisin Co., Associated Dairymen of California, Cooperative Seed Growers' Association, Central California Berry Growers' Association, California Prune and Apricot Growers, and many, many other legitimate farm associations and producers in California. I ask that this be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., July 7, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.:
At a meeting of the principal producing interests of California, representing 60,000 growers, held in the office of the California State market director to-day a resolution was unanimously passed that the proposed tariff legislation contained in House tariff bill would not give the justifiable protection vitally needed. We view with the greatest concern the reported tariff schedules announced when we had been positively assured of schedules that would protect our basic agricultural industries which the reported rates fail to do. You are earnestly requested to secure the enactment of a tariff at least equal to the vari-

ous schedules asked for in the briefs and hearings before the Ways and Means Committee based on the details. Data already on file.

California Almond Growers' Exchange; California Lima Bean Growers' Association; California Peach and Fig Growers; California Cattleman's Association; California Fruit Growers' Exchange; Poultry Producers of Central California; Sebastopol Apple Growers' Union; California Associated Raisin Co.; Associated Dairymen of California; Cooperative Seed Growers' Association; Central California Berry Growers' Association; California Prune and Apricot Growers; California Fruit Distributors; California Growers' Association; Pacific Rice Growers' Association; Poultry Producers of Southern California; Fruit Growers of California; Mutual Orange Distributors; Associated Olive Growers of California; California Fruit Exchange; California Pear Growers' Association; Nurserymen's Bud Selection Association; California Walnut Growers' Association; Poultry Producers of San Diego, Calif.; Bean Growers' Association of California; Wool Growers' Association; Alfalfa Growers of California (Inc.); Sweet Potato Growers' Association.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. My immediate purpose is to show to the Senate that all these organizations realize the situation in respect to the almond industry. I here submit to the Senate a telegram from the Long Beach Chamber of Commerce, a city in Los Angeles County, Calif., and ask that it be spread upon the RECORD without taking the time of the Senate to read it.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LONG BEACH, CALIF., July 7, 1921.

Senator SAMUEL SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.:

We believe tariff legislation should fully protect all American industries. California is developing large almond industry. Without tariff protection, our growers and investors will be ruined. Fifteen cents per pound shelled 5 unshelled none too much. We urge your active support. Matter urgent.

LONG BEACH CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
L. W. BALLARD, Secretary.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I also offer a telegram from the president of the Merchants National Bank, of San Francisco, in which he, Mr. Summers, states the conditions prevailing in California.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., July 7, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

This bank, which has financed the almond growers in the past year to a large extent views with grave alarm the proposed tariff on almonds. Growers have quantities, and we hold as security 1919 and 1920 almonds not sold. Growers could not sell successfully entire 1919 crop under most prosperous marketing conditions. California growers have been unable to have any part of the shelled-almond demand of this country, which represents 80 per cent of the almonds consumed. Unless tariff on shelled almonds is at least three times as great as on almonds in the shell, can not see possibility of American growers undertaking development of shelled-almond market. Respectfully request in the interests of almond growers a tariff of not less than 5 cents per pound on almonds in the shell and 15 cents per pound on shelled almonds.

W. T. SUMMERS,
President Merchants National Bank,
San Francisco, Calif.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I hold in my hand a telegram from Mr. William H. Crocker, president of the Crocker National Bank, of San Francisco, which sets forth the facts and conditions. I also have here a telegram addressed to me by Mr. Fred J. Hart, the managing editor of the Farm Bureau Federation Monthly, a publication which is concerned immediately with practically one-half of the counties of my State, not the southern counties, but practically all the northern counties, in which the almond industry is situated.

I have here also a very considerable number of what I choose to call thoughtful, earnest letters and telegrams setting forth facts and conditions, and taking note of the revolving clock I ask that they may appear in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., July 7, 1921.

SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Am convinced committee has erred in recommending 4-cent tariff on unshelled almonds and 8 cents on shelled. Ratio should be three to one, which is natural shelling ratio of almonds. If allowed to stand, proposed schedules will work serious harm to California financial interests, not to mention virtual destruction of industry. Three hundred thousand dollar shelling plant in Sacramento now closed. Won't you stretch point and revise almond schedules on three to one basis at this late hour? One hundred thousand acres of California soil, on which are planted 7,000,000 trees, are at stake. California growers simply can not touch American market, for shell almonds representing 80 per cent of demand now in hands of European growers with 8-cent schedule.

WILLIAM H. CROCKER,
President Crocker National Bank, San Francisco.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., July 8, 1921.

SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Have investigated necessity almond growers secure tariff on basis 5 cents not shelled and 15 cents shelled. Shelled almonds must be at least three times as great as almonds in the shell. Failure to secure above tariff spells ruin to almond industry. Orchards, unlike field crops, can not quit business without tremendous loss. Important, therefore, tariff give proper protection now.

FRED J. HART,
Managing Editor of Farm Bureau Federation Monthly of Humboldt,
Glenn, Tehama, Placer, Solano, Merced, Madera, Tulare, Alameda, Santa Cruz, San Benito, Monterey, Ventura, Sutter, Orange Counties.

DURHAM, CALIF., July 9, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: At a meeting of the directors of the Durham Almond Growers' Association, representing an investment of \$2,000,000 in this immediate vicinity, a resolution was passed demanding a tariff on almonds in the shell of 5 cents per pound, and not less than three times this amount on shelled almonds.

We have never been able to compete with Europe on the shelled product.

The tariff recommendations of the tariff committee now before the House means ruin to our industry.

Respectfully yours,

G. W. JONES,
Secretary Durham Almond Growers' Association.

ARBUCKLE, CALIF., July 9, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are herewith inclosing a copy of a set of resolutions which this association has just adopted, and sincerely hope that it may assist you in your fight for us to gain proper protection for our industry.

Very respectfully yours,

ARBUCKLE-COLLEGE CITY ALMOND GROWERS' ASSOCIATION,
By D. S. NELSON,
Secretary-Manager.

Whereas the increase in production of almonds in the State of California has been about 500 per cent during the past eight years; and

Whereas the State is now able to supply all the almonds consumed in the United States; and

Whereas about 80 per cent of the almonds consumed in the United States are shelled almonds; and

Whereas it requires 3 pounds of unshelled almonds to make 1 pound of meats; and

Whereas the investment in this district now represents over \$3,000,000 and comprises over 10,000 acres of orchards; and

Whereas this industry is threatened with complete destruction unless an adequate tariff is placed on imported almonds, both shelled and unshelled; and

Whereas California has never been able to share in any of the shelled-almond business on account of inadequate tariff on imported almond meats: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this association, the Arbutle-College City Almond Growers' Association, go on record as demanding that the Congress give us necessary protection by proper tariff, and, further, that said tariff be placed at the ratio of three times as much on shelled almonds as on unshelled, and, further, that we respectfully ask the Congress to make this tariff 5 cents per pound on almonds in the shell and 15 cents per pound on shelled almonds.

Respectfully submitted.

ARBUCKLE-COLLEGE CITY ALMOND GROWERS' ASSOCIATION,
By D. S. NELSON,
Secretary-Manager.

BANNING, CALIF., July 10, 1921.

Senator SAM. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Whereas almond growers of California can not compete successfully against enormous production in Europe without an adequate tariff; and

Whereas if adequate tariff readjustment is not granted by Congress so that American growers can have a fair chance to compete with Europeans much of the hundred thousand acres of almond orchards in the State will be rendered worthless and an investment of over \$50,000,000 ruined; and

Whereas the Ways and Means Committee has recommended to Congress the establishment of tariff rates at 4 cents per pound on unshelled and only 8 cents per pound on shelled almonds in spite of the fact that searching investigation has proved a fair tariff would be 5 cents per pound unshelled and 15 cents per pound shelled almonds as recommended by the California Almond Growers' Exchange: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Banning Almond Growers' Association, representing 94 growers, or 98 per cent of local almond growers, with a total of about 900 acres, making up one of the chief industries of Banning, respectfully urge the passage of an adequate tariff bill fixing the rate on unshelled almonds at not less than 5 cents and on shelled almonds not less than 15 cents per pound: And be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to the Senators and to the Congressman representing this district with the urgent request that they leave nothing undone to bring about the desired result, namely the saving of one of the principal industries of Banning and one of the important investments of California ranchers.

BANNING ALMOND GROWERS' ASSOCIATION.

SUTTER, CALIF., July 9, 1921.

SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Whereas the almond growers of California have almond orchards planted on valuable land and are compelled to wait six or seven years for such almond orchards to come into commercial bearing; and

Whereas the acreage planted to almonds in California when in full bearing is sufficient to supply the markets of the United States; and

Whereas a greater part of these nuts is consumed in the shelled state and the relative quantity of shelled to unshelled is one to three; and

Whereas the Ways and Means Committee of Congress has recommended a tariff of 4 cents per pound on unshelled and 8 cents a pound on shelled almonds; and

Whereas shelled almonds are imported in great quantities because of the relatively low tariff on the shelled nuts thus injuring our present trade and destroying a business that has cost so much in time and money to over 4,000 American citizens and their dependents: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the South Butte Almond Growers' Association beg, pray, entreat, and demand of Congress for its continued existence a tariff in keeping with its need—that of at least 5 cents per pound on unshelled and 15 cents per pound on shelled nuts.

W. K. NORRIS,
R. F. HAVENS,
M. G. DEWITT,
F. E. FORDERHASE,
E. S. NORTON,

Directors of South Butte Almond Growers' Association.

ARBuckle, CALIF., July 11, 1921.

Senator SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR AND FRIEND: The almond industry of California needs your earnest and speedy help at this time.

We must have tariff enough on our almonds or make a sacrifice again that means a ruinous loss, from which we can not recover.

Work for a tariff of 5 cents on unshelled almonds and at least 15 cents per pound on shelled almonds.

I feel that you will realize this danger at this time and give us your earnest help.

Respectfully,

H. L. NICKELS.

ORLAND, CALIF., July 12, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Your telegram regarding the duty on almonds received and wish at this time to thank you for your message and endeavor to try and get us the protection that we need for the good of the almond industry of this State. As a matter of fact, I wish to state briefly the condition of the almond industry as it appears to this association. We still have a portion of our 1919 crop of almonds unsold. And we still have about 30 per cent of our 1920 crop unsold and have to date received but 7 cents for our drakes and 10 cents for the IXL almonds.

We believe that the above conditions are the outcome of too low a duty on foreign almonds. The reason that I mention drakes and IXL almonds is that they are the leading variety planted, at least in this locality. The last two years have been especially hard on the almond grower of this State. Further, that if it was not for the war making it almost impossible to find bottoms to ship foreign almonds we would have been in the same fix all through the war.

The reason that I am writing you a personal letter is that I fear some of the eastern Senators do not understand the almond situation as you do, and it might be well to explain to the Ways and Means Committee that we can not in this State stick a tree in the ground and have nature come along and irrigate the same for us. But we must irrigate the orchard two and three times each season, and then we have to cultivate after each irrigation. Then, too, we have to spray one to two times for the red spider each summer. Then there is the frost and other pests that we have to fight, and the almond grower has his troubles also.

The money that is sent out of the country each year amounts to an enormous sum, and this money should remain here to build up home industries. We do not feel that a tariff of 5 cents on almonds in the shell and 15 cents for shelled almonds is unreasonable, as the American grower can not begin to live on the same level that those people live in along the shores of the Mediterranean Sea and should receive a protection that they can get a fair return for their investment and labor.

As you know there are thousands of acres of almonds in this State, a good deal of which has not come into bearing and it has cost us considerable to bring the same to this stage. We further believe that whether an acre is bought outright or the land is bought level and planted to almonds it will cost that much per acre before it is brought to the stage of full bearing.

We do not wish to be unreasonable but after full discussion of the question we think that our request is but reasonable and will just give us a fair living out of the almonds, and every one should at least feel that they can expect to make a living out of an investment providing there is no bad luck like frost or some other thing that could happen to an orchard any one year. If we get fair price we tide over a bad year.

Further, if the rancher got a fair price for his almonds he could afford to put all of his time in on an orchard and keep the same in good state of cultivation, but as it is now some of the growers are discouraged and have not plowed the same as they should and there are weeds in many orchards, and they say they can not afford to spend the money keeping it clean as the revenue will not permit spending too much time or money in the orchard.

These thousands and thousands of dollars that are sent abroad every year should remain right at home and build homes for Americans and also help this country as a whole. It should help build the little red schoolhouses in this State and make this country a better place to live in.

It costs us from 10 to 12 cents per pound to grow almonds, and I assure you that there has not been much money in the almond game for the grower. Therefore we appreciate what you have done for us and hope that you can make the Ways and Means Committee see it in the light that we do; that is, that it is better to give the American grower a chance to make a fair living out of this industry. If we do not get a fair protection this industry will be forced to the wall.

Thanking you for any favor that you do us, we are,

Yours very truly,

ORLAND ALMOND GROWERS' ASSOCIATION,
Geo. W. STURM, Secretary.

ORLAND, CALIF., July 9, 1921.

SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Would you please do your utmost and fight for a tariff of 5 cents on unshelled almonds and 15 cents on shelled product?

It is absolutely necessary to have this tariff or else the American farmers and growers will have to stoop and kneel to the foreigners

forever. The foreigner can produce these nuts and send them across the ocean for less than we can even grow them.

Last year we had to accept 10 and 7 cents a pound for our nuts and it should have been three times as much.

As we Americans come first in the minds and hearts of our Congress we will expect desperate fighting on your part.

Hoping you will meet with success, I remain,

Your friend,

CHARLES A. TEMPLETON.

SAN FRANCISCO, July 9, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: May I not at this time take the liberty of specially directing your attention, as our Senator, to the paramount question, the tariff, in which the farmers and almond growers of California are so vitally interested at the present time, and upon this question to call your special attention to the amount of tariff that should be placed upon the importation of almonds grown in European countries sufficient in amount to protect adequately this great industry built up here in California by the farmers and almond growers in California? The facts upon which we almond growers base our contention for an increase of tariff duties on almonds grown in foreign countries are these:

It requires seven years after the almond orchard has been planted before it comes into bearing in sufficient quantities in production of nuts to commence to pay anything on the capital invested. During all of these seven years the cost of plowing, disking, harrowing, cultivating, pruning, spraying, and taxes on the land so planted requires an enormous expenditure of money before any returns are received from the almond orchard. This expenditure continues every year thereafter, and the almond crop in California is very uncertain, and many years almost a total failure of a crop. The now present excessive freight rates to be paid in shipping the almonds to market more than double what it used to be. We pay here in California \$3.50 per day to men working in the orchards, including their board, eight hours for hulling the almonds. Then they are placed on trays and dried, and when ready for market the shrinkage brings the actual cost of hulling the almonds to 4 and 5 cents per pound. Two and one-half cents per pound for commission to sell the almonds. In addition to this, the cost of sulphuring and bleaching the almonds, warehouse charges, hauling to market, sacks to hold the nuts, the heavy freight charges, brings the actual cost of production of each pound of almonds produced here in California, by the time it reaches the market, at from 14 to 16 cents per pound. I find this to be true from actual experience as an almond grower in the Sacramento Valley. This comes very close to the estimated cost made by our Government, which is 16 cents per pound, and these statistics so made are very near correct. We are compelled to pay high wages and to give the laboring classes good accommodations, and by so doing they are thereby enabled to live as human beings should live in this great American Republic. When the almonds are thus harvested they are then delivered to the California Almond Growers' Exchange, a corporation, as selling agent.

Bearing these facts in mind, if you will please be so kind as to do so, we will endeavor to point out to you as our Senator and representative from the State of California why there should be a revision of the present tariff on almonds.

And upon that question we present the following facts to you for your kind consideration on behalf of the American almond grower:

The European countries last year shipped right into the heart of the American markets for almonds 45,000,000 pounds of almonds, grown and produced with cheap labor and with the benefit of cheap water transportation. These almonds came in direct competition with the almonds produced and grown in the State of California, with high cost of labor and freight rates nearly three times as great, with the result that the almond growers here in California and elsewhere in the United States could not compete with prices for which these millions of pounds of foreign almonds were sold here in American markets. The American markets offer a lucrative field for the foreign-grown almonds, produced upon cheap land with cheap labor and cheap water transportation. The result of this large shipment of foreign-grown almonds here into the American markets at such cheap prices, with cheap production and cheap freight rates, completely shuts out the American almond growers, operating under high cost of labor, high freight rates, high rates of interest on the capital invested, high rates of taxes paid to our State and Government to support and maintain this great American Republic, resulted in the fact that a part of the 1919 crop of almonds and a large part of the 1920 crop of almonds remain unsold by reason of this gigantic competition. The merchants and consumers buy these almonds from foreign countries for less money than we California almond growers can lay them down in the American markets. The answer to this question is not hard to find. We pay high wages, high taxes, and high freight rates and high operating expenses, and, not least of all, high rates of interest for money to operate the almond industry in California.

The farmers have labored hard to develop this great industry here in the great State of California. The State and counties have levied a large and heavy assessment on the real property used for growing almonds. Last year the taxes on my farm in the Sacramento Valley—that is, upon the land in almonds alone—was increased an additional \$100.

The price of almonds has depreciated nearly 50 per cent; I mean the selling price of almonds. We find that the future market for about 80 per cent of the almonds to be sold will be shelled almonds as against about 20 per cent of almonds to be sold in the shell. It takes 3 pounds of almonds in the shell to produce 1 pound of shelled almonds, a ratio of 3 to 1. The almond growers of California have erected at Sacramento a shelling plant, at a cost of about \$300,000, for the purpose of producing shelled almonds to meet the market demands. We ask you to bear these facts in mind, and we hope that you will be able to reach the conclusion that the present tariff on almonds, either shelled or unshelled, is wholly inadequate to protect the American almond growers against this cheap foreign competition. That the almond growers, to have simply a fair and just protection under the tariff, should have a tariff of 5 cents on each pound of almonds in the shell and 15 cents a pound on the shelled almonds. Please remember, it takes 3 to 1. If such a tariff is given to the American almond grower, then the competition would be fair and equitable; it would in no instance of the almond industry be prohibitive.

If the present tariff as now proposed should be fixed on the almond industry, then the California almond growers must of necessity dig up their almond orchards and try something else on the land. They can not pay such enormous taxes on the almond lands to the Government, county, and State; high wages, high freight rates; and excessive operating expenses necessitated in growing and producing almonds.

It is, I take it, a case where sufficient tariff protection must be given to the almond growers here in America, and if not given them, then this great industry, built up and developed here in America by the farmers, will be absolutely destroyed. It means the destruction of an industry in which millions of dollars are invested, and which investment furnishes employment to thousands of people. You know work for the American people means happiness; lack of employment and idleness means but one thing—discontentment.

If this great industry is destroyed then this State, county, and the United States Government must lose thousands of dollars in taxes, as the almond lands are taxed far and beyond the land used for grain cultivation.

I feel and know that you now stand for the protection of American interests in America, and I have noted with great pleasure that you have adhered to that strictly during your short time in the Senate and feel that you stand for America and for protection to American interests as a true, loyal American.

We almond growers appeal to you now for your kind assistance as our representative in the United States Senate (our Senator) in conjunction with your colleague, Hon. HIRAM W. JOHNSON, to all that you can conscientiously and justly do for us in securing sufficient protection for this great industry here in the State of California, and thereby save the almond-growing industry from absolute destruction to the great loss and detriment of the farmers in the State of California. Your best efforts along this line are needed now in order to make the slogan "back to the land" a reality and not a farce.

I trust that I have not intruded too much on your valuable time in this matter, and if I have I beg your kind indulgence, as the matter is a serious question to me and all other almond growers in California.

Yours most sincerely,

W. C. CAVITT.

SACRAMENTO VALLEY DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION,
Sacramento, Calif., July 12, 1921.

HON. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Herewith I hand you copy of a resolution by this association which is self-explanatory. We are very much interested in this almond matter, this valley being a large producer of almonds, with extensive areas planted and yet to come into bearing. We have a very vital concern in the matter and will greatly appreciate any efforts you may make to secure adequate tariff protection for the California almond growers.

Yours very truly,

W. A. BEARD,
Vice President and General Manager.

Whereas the almond industry of the State of California is seriously threatened by cheap almonds imported from Europe; and

Whereas this State has a great acreage devoted to almonds, much of which is recent planting and not yet come into full bearing, and there is certain to be a rapid increase in production of this crop in this State within the next few years; and

Whereas, on account of the high cost of labor and other commodities entering into the production and preparation for market of the almond crop, and because of the high standard of living prevailing in California and other States of this Union, California almonds can not compete in the markets with almonds imported from Spain and other European countries unless there be applied to such imported almonds rates of tariff sufficiently large to represent the difference in production costs; and

Whereas the State of California has extensive areas suited to the production of the almond and is capable of furnishing all the almonds required or to be required in the United States; Now, therefore, be it Resolved by the Sacramento Valley Development Association, That we respectfully request and urge that the Congress of the United States afford protection to this important California industry by placing a duty on imported almonds of not less than 15 cents per pound for shelled and 5 cents per pound for unshelled; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to California Senators and Representatives in Congress.

CHICO, CALIF., July 12, 1921.

THE HON. SAMUEL SHORTRIDGE,
Senator, Washington, D. C.

From 20 years' experience handling almonds for growers this locality can truthfully say the life of this industry depends on protection. A ratio of three to one of shelled almonds as against unshelled is fair, and a minimum tariff of 5 cents per pound should be given the unshelled. I personally know of sales of shelled almonds in San Francisco last season that were made by foreign markets that were 25 per cent below cost of production even if based on present cost of labor. It has taken many years of care to bring these orchards to production, and the investment now depends upon prompt and fair action. Trust that we will have your help in holding this industry in America.

S. A. REYNOLDS,
Mayor, City of Chico.

CHICO, CALIF., July 12, 1921.

SENATOR SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Washington City, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As one of your constituents I want to appeal to Congress through you on behalf of the thousands of almond growers of California, who, like myself, are threatened with financial ruin if the tariff as reported by the Ways and Means Committee to Congress goes through. I have 60 acres of almonds just coming into bearing this year. I have spent five years of labor and all my money developing this orchard, and now to be knocked in the head and told by Congress that my line of farming is not worth the consideration of Congress to the extent of giving us a tariff of 5 cents on unshelled and 15 on shelled almonds, which would only give us an even break with our foreign competitors, is not encouraging to the farmer. The Government from the President down has been long on promises of relief to the farmers, and now at the first showdown we, the almond growers, get a direct knockout blow, which will give us the relief of the dead. I trust you will do your utmost to see that this crime against the almond growers is not committed.

Yours truly,

E. E. FX,
Route 1, Box 22a, Chico, Calif.

CALIFORNIA ALMOND GROWERS' EXCHANGE,
San Francisco, Calif., July 12, 1921.

In the city of Sacramento stands an establishment unlike anything in the world. The citizens of Sacramento may well be proud of it. We know you will if you see it.

It is California Almond Growers' Exchange shelling and manufacturing plant at the corner of Eighteenth and C Streets. We want you to visit it, and therefore extend to you this invitation to call at the plant any day this week between 9 and 5 o'clock or on Sunday afternoon.

This plant was built by 4,000 California almond growers after original plans of machinery and equipment. We mean what we say literally—there is nothing else like it in the world.

The 4,000 almond growers of this association built this great manufacturing plant expecting that Congress would readjust the tariff on almonds so that when their acreage was bearing they could have a part of the American demand for almonds. As it is now, the foreigners of Europe have monopolized the entire market for shelled almonds in America and they are to-day supplying shelled almonds produced by pauper labor and under living conditions which we hope we shall never be forced to experience.

This great plant in the city of Sacramento will remain idle and can not turn a wheel unless the almond growers are placed in a position where they can compete with the cheaply produced and inferior almond of Europe, by means of a protective tariff. The almond growers' fight for protection is vital to Sacramento and to you.

See for yourself the plans that have been made for shelling almonds and for the manufacture of products from shelled almonds. If a protective tariff is granted, the growers will install additional machinery, and Sacramento will become the world's most famous almond center.

Visit us and see what we have in your city. Then you will fight with us for American markets for American farmers.

Yours very truly,

T. C. TUCKER, Manager.

CHICO, CALIF., July 13, 1921.

HON. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Go ahead, Sam, do your best. I have 150 acres of 8-year old almonds, and if you don't get a decent tariff on them, out they come; hundreds of others in the same boat.

Yours truly,

H. C. COMPTON.

CHICAGO, ILL., July 12, 1921.

HON. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

I earnestly ask your unending support of a tariff of 5 cents on unshelled and particularly 15 cents on shelled almonds as the means of keeping the American almond grower alive, instead of foreign cheap labor. On adequate protection for the shelled product rests the life of the industry.

M. S. SCOVILL.

AUBURN, CALIF., July 10, 1921.

SENATOR SAMUEL SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As an almond grower among hundreds of similarly minded almond growers of California, I wish to say that present Congress must enact 15-cent tariff on shelled and 5-cent tariff on unshelled almonds or the industry is practically doomed in this State.

Personally, I am about ready to pull up my trees unless something of real value is done soon. I have stood a loss each year since my trees came into bearing.

Very truly yours,

E. W. LOCHER.

BUTTEVIEW FARM,
Yuba City, Calif., July 10, 1921.

HON. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: What did Spain ever do for the United States of America? What did Spain do for the Allies? What did Spain do for the Maine? Why feed Spanish almonds to the American people? Why not give California almond growers a chance to live right? We pay living wages and do not work 14 to 16 hours a day in the fields. Give us a 15-cent tariff on shelled almonds and we will live and let live. Refuse and we can not exist.

The consumer pays the same for California almonds as those grown elsewhere. The middleman pockets the difference.

Yours truly, for right and justice to all,

CHAS. L. WILBUR,
Member Farm Bureau and Deputy Sheriff, Sutter County.

THE CITIZENS NATIONAL BANK OF LOS ANGELES,
Los Angeles, Calif., July 11, 1921.

HON. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

SIR: We desire to urge your consideration of proper tariff upon almonds, both shelled and not shelled. It is our understanding that the shelled almond business requires more protection on account of foreign competition, and also due to the fact that 80 per cent of the almonds consumed are shelled almonds.

Please give the industry every consideration possible, and oblige,

Very truly yours,

A. J. WATERS, President.

LOS ANGELES, July 11, 1921.

HON. SAMUEL SHORTRIDGE,
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Am writing you regarding the almond industry, which is very seriously threatened by lack of tariff protection. Unless the almond industry receives proper consideration this American industry will be ruined.

The Ways and Means Committee recommended a tariff of 4 cents per pound on almonds not shelled and 8 cents per pound on shelled almonds. The California almond growers have petitioned Congress for a tariff of 5 cents per pound on unshelled and 15 cents per pound

on shelled almonds. This differential between shelled and unshelled is in proportion with the tariff on almonds in the shell, as it takes about 3 pounds of unshelled to make 1 pound shelled almonds, and unless protection is granted California can not compete with Europe.

The interests of the American almond industry appeal to you for your earnest help.

With assurance of our very high regard, we are,

Yours truly,

SIMON LEVI CO.,
J. B. JACOBS, *President.*

SIMON, MINERAL COUNTY, NEV.,
July 11, 1921.

HON. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE.

DEAR SIR: For the past 15 years I have been living close and putting all my savings in an almond orchard situated in Citrus Heights addition, near Fair Oaks, Calif. I have an orchard of 30 acres almond trees coming 6 years old.

I still owe \$4,000 on my property. Mr. J. J. Stenuff cares for my orchard, and I pay him \$44 a month. My sixty-fourth birthday is near at hand, and my wife is 10 years younger.

I do hope you will do all you can to get us a tariff of 5 cents on unshelled almonds and 15 cents on shelled almonds, so we will be able to soon get to California to live. I have all my money at stake, and unless we have a protective tariff California almond industry will suffer.

Very truly yours,

C. H. LASKAMP.

COLUSA COUNTY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Colusa, Calif., July 14, 1921.

HON. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: Your telegram in reference to the tariff on imported almonds received.

I want you to accept the sincere thanks not only of this county chamber but of the entire populace of the county for your prompt reply and your untiring efforts in our behalf.

The almond industry, especially in and around the Arbuckle district, is one of our important industries and with proper tariff protection will grow to an immense magnitude.

The benefit the consumer derives from foreign competition of this kind is only very short lived for the reason that as soon as our own industry has been effectually throttled by the underselling of our product by the foreign product, just that soon will the price of the foreign product advance, and the consumer will be compelled to pay in most cases a higher price than our product could have been sold for had our industry been allowed to exist. In addition to this, the thousands of American citizens that were employed in this industry have had their means of livelihood taken away from them in favor of the foreigner, with whose standard of living our American citizens can not and should not be asked to compete.

Thanking you again in behalf of all good American citizens, I am,
Respectfully yours,

W. O. HYRUP.

N. B.—Inclosed please find copy of resolution as mentioned in the telegram.

Whereas the almond industry represents an investment of \$4,000,000 in the county of Colusa, and covering approximately 11,000 acres, and \$50,000,000, covering approximately 100,000 acres in the entire State; and

Whereas the industry is increasing, and will continue to increase if given the proper tariff protection; and

Whereas the entire consumption of almonds in the United States of America can now be supplied by the State of California; and

Whereas about 80 per cent of the almonds consumed in the United States of America are shelled almonds; and

Whereas it requires 3 pounds of unshelled almonds to make 1 pound of shelled almonds; and

Whereas California has not been able in the past to share in any of the shelled-almond business on account of the inadequate tariff on imported shelled almonds; and

Whereas the entire almond industry in the State of California, representing an investment of \$50,000,000, is threatened with ruin and destruction unless an adequate tariff is placed on imported almonds, both shelled and unshelled; and

Whereas the destruction of this industry will cause a tremendous loss and work great hardship on the great number of people now employed in the cultivation, harvesting, handling, and packing of this product: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this Colusa County Chamber of Commerce go on record as demanding and praying that the present Congress of the United States of America enact proper tariff laws governing almonds, both shelled and unshelled, thereby giving this industry the necessary protection so vital to its existence, and, furthermore, that the tariff so placed be 5 cents on unshelled almonds and 15 cents on shelled almonds per pound.

COLUSA COUNTY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Per W. O. HYRUP, *Secretary-Manager.*

COLUSA, CALIF., July 9, 1921.

LODI, CALIF., August 3, 1921.

Senator SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:

As president San Joaquin County Almond Growers' Association, representing over 600 of 4,000 California almond growers, I express the pleasure and renewed courage we have, knowing you have stripped for a fight to a finish in our behalf for 5 and 15 cent tariff on almonds. As an ex-service man, who when over 50 years old left wife to care for orchard, joined our Navy as lieutenant engineer, and helped preserve those very peasants whose cheap labor in producing almonds now threatens our very existence as almond growers, I appeal to you in interest of ex-service men, California almond growers, to preserve their right as Americans to earn living in accordance with American conditions. Tariff of 5 cents on unshelled, 15 cents on shelled almonds is the lowest on which we can stay on our orchards. We know you as a fighter in a just cause. This gives us great encouragement in our fight against speculators and middlemen who are trying to swamp California orchards.

Lieut. A. R. STEPHEN.

ANTELOPE, CALIF., August 3, 1921.

HON. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senator from California, Washington, D. C., U. S. A.

DEAR SIR: In regard to the almond situation I would like to present my own case:

After teaching school for 20 years, I managed to save enough money to buy 10 acres of land in Antelope, a favored almond spot about 14 miles north of Sacramento.

Friends of mine, with whom I had boarded while teaching in the country, planted my trees for me and cared for them till I married. I was fortunate enough to have honest friends, good soil, and good trees, which have made me a fine orchard, of which I am, as you can understand, very proud. It almost took my life's blood to save the money to get it. A one-time pupil of mine asked me how I ever did it, and I told her the exact truth when I answered: "By giving up nearly everything in the world that I ever wanted."

Now, that those trees could repay me in part for my sacrifice, I feel sure that if our own lawmakers, elected by us, the people, could understand the situation they would give us the 5-cent tariff on unshelled and the 15-cent tariff on shelled nuts, which will keep my orchard from becoming worthless. I am only one of many. People who have small places are struggling hard to live. Why, if you kill the industry, think of the despair and discouragement!

My husband's family are also interested in almonds; in fact, it is the only crop we have. What are we going to do this year? In one week the harvest begins. My husband, who is 60 years old, will work with the men, and I shall do the cooking. All we can hope to do under present conditions is to pole only the trees that are loaded with nuts and let the others go; and if we can come out even, after paying taxes, plowing, and cultivation, pruning, and the men's food bill and wages, we shall be doing well. The wages will count up too high to pole any but the fullest trees. Is not that an awful predicament? How about it for an encouragement to the young to go back to the soil? Hoping and believing we shall get justice,

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH WINN GLADNEY.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. My friends on the other side will now realize why I suggested that this testimony was cumulative, but I justify myself in offering it because I want the decision to rest upon facts established. The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts concedes protection. Our difference would seem to be as to rates; wherefore, as I ventured to say the other day, I hoped to convince him that conditions were as we claimed, and that the rates we ask are the necessary rates. It is for that purpose that I am attempting here to establish without controversy the facts involved.

I have here quite a number of communications from other organizations in California—clearing houses, boards of trade, associations of farmers, and so forth. I wish to call particular attention to an editorial which appeared in the San Francisco Chronicle, a great newspaper, a great protective-tariff newspaper, owned and published by Hon. M. H. de Young. Mr. John P. Young, author of works on political economy, was managing editor of that great paper for many years, and I think it is largely due to the advocacy of protection by the San Francisco Chronicle that California is a thorough protective-tariff State. I ask that this editorial be incorporated in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DUTY ON ALMONDS—5 CENTS A POUND AND 15 CENTS ON SHELLED IS ACTUALLY NEEDED.

In the tariff bill as passed by the House of Representatives the duty on almonds stands at 4 cents a pound on the natural nuts and 12 cents a pound on the shelled product. It requires 3 pounds of the natural nut to get 1 pound of shelled almonds.

The shelled product is the main product. There is a rather lively sale of the unshelled almonds at the holiday season, but 90 per cent of the crop is shelled and sold to the confectionery and other trades using them.

The principal trade being in shelled almonds, that is the principal duty to be considered, and 12 cents a pound is not a sufficient duty.

At the present time there are very large stocks of imported shelled almonds, which have been rushed in under the advantage of the present exchange rates and which are offered at rates which are ruinous to California growers, who have an actual investment of between \$60,000,000 and \$70,000,000 in orchards and plants for carrying on this industry. The almond growers have a strong association, excellently managed, which never speculates with its members' crops. It always sets reasonable prices acceptable to the trade and moves its crop promptly.

But as conditions are now it can not compete with the combination of importers who bring over the cheap products bought with money of trifling value at home, which they sell at gold value in this country and get rich.

Our almond growers need and must have a duty of 5 cents on unshelled almonds and 15 cents on the shelled product.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I have here an editorial which appeared in another great California newspaper, the San Francisco Examiner. It is entitled "Almond men need tariff" and sets forth the conditions prevailing in California. I also have an editorial from the San Francisco Call and Post, a very extensively circulated evening newspaper, the editorial being upon the same subject and corroborating and fortifying what I have ventured to state and what all these various telegrams have made known to us. I ask that they may be printed in the RECORD without reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

The editorials referred to are as follows:

[From the San Francisco Examiner].

ALMOND MEN NEED TARIFF.

California almond growers are in danger, their orchards menaced by a sinister and greedy force that would destroy a State industry with an investment of \$50,000,000. A blight, as destructive to the welfare of the 100,000 acres of almond groves as would be an insect pest, is facing the California almond men in Washington.

The situation is this:

The Fordney tariff bill, now before the United States Senate, sets an impost of 4 cents a pound on unshelled almonds and of 12 cents a pound on shelled almonds.

Under California farming conditions such a tariff does not protect the almond crop of this State against foreign-grown almonds, which come chiefly from Spain into the eastern market. A tariff of 5 cents a pound on unshelled and 15 cents a pound on shelled almonds is essential to save the California growers. Anything less—that is, the proposed Fordney tariff of 4 and 12 cents—is below the margin of protection for these orchardists.

The California Senators, JOHNSON and SHORTRIDGE, are prepared to put up their strongest fight to give the California growers the protection which is essential. Combating them is the rich lobby of eastern speculators and their allied interests who are determined the California growers shall be helpless before the importations from abroad. A great fund is said to have been raised by these speculators to defeat California's growers.

The proposed and essential duty of 5 and 15 cents a pound on almonds does not mean that California almond growers will be able to monopolize the American market. Experience can dispute that claim. But it means that California growers, after having paid the high farm wages current in this State and the freight rates from California to the eastern markets, will be able to put their product on the eastern markets on a parity with the imported nut.

The tariffs of 5 and 15 cents a pound simply represent the difference in the standard of living between California and south European farming communities.

California interests, California citizens, must support Senator JOHNSON and Senator SHORTRIDGE in the fight they are making to save the California almond orchards.

The speculators' lobby may be large and resourceful and rich, but it can not have the power behind it that California can wield if it is united.

California industries, particularly the farming groups, know they must stand together against any invasion of their property. They must unite behind the almond growers in this fight to save the orchards.

The California Senators must be able to show this is not a fight of one group of orchardists, but a State movement to protect a developing industry, to maintain American living conditions in the orchards, and to give these California growers a chance to improve their product, to the end of making the almond cheaper and more common for the American consumer.

The tariff will not raise the price of almonds in America. It will take the market out of the hands of speculators who consider only manipulation that will bring them the most profit.

[From the San Francisco Call and Post.]

SAVE THE ALMOND INDUSTRY.

The House of Representatives seemed to think that when the California almond growers requested a tariff of 5 cents a pound on unshelled almonds and 15 cents a pound on the shelled they didn't mean what they said. They acted as if they thought California was haggling for a profit—asking for a high tariff in the expectation of receiving a slightly lower one.

But that isn't the case. The California almond industry depends absolutely for its existence on the tariff that the growers request. They asked for a 5-15 tariff because they had to have it to save them from the cheap-labor, cheap-transportation competition of European almond growers. And without that tariff they will lose the battle and California will lose an industry in which \$65,000,000 is invested.

The old tariff on almonds was 4 cents on the unshelled and 8 cents on the shelled. The House of Representatives amended the bill to raise the tariff on the shelled from 8 to 12 cents, but left the tariff on the unshelled unchanged. It paid no attention to California's pleading for tariffs of 5 and 15 cents.

But California must have this protective tariff. Three thousand tons of almonds from the 1919 and 1920 crops are still unsold, and one of the heaviest crops in history is now ripening. If there is no protection from the annual flood of European almonds and if the Senate does not amend the bill properly, 100,000 California acres will be ironically unproductive.

Mr. T. C. TUCKER, representative of the California almond growers, wires from Washington that a tremendous combination of important speculators and allied interests are lobbying against California's interests in behalf of European growers. If they succeed a California industry goes into bankruptcy. California must have that tariff.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I have certain individual letters, some brief, some a little elaborate, but all coming from men or women actively engaged in this languishing and threatened industry. They are respectful in tone, they are earnest, and many of them are tearful. I ask that they may appear in the RECORD also.

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

The letters referred to are as follows:

BANNING, CALIF., August 4, 1921.

Senator SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We have elected you to the Senate to secure for us a tariff which would be a protective tariff in every sense and form. Please do not disappoint us. Do not allow anything less than 5 and 15 cents on almonds to pass. We should have 7 and 21 cents to stop the stump puller, which has already started in Banning almonds, and to make almonds pay somewhere near what other fruits are paying in this locality. Very few, if any people have their harvesting expenses paid out of last year's crop. Please do not stand for the importers in New York State to ruin the resources of California. I remain,

Yours truly,

L. W. WILLMAN.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., August 2, 1921.

Senator SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The members of the Senate Finance Committee hold the salvation of the almond growers of America in their hands, and as one of the 4,000 growers of California I want to appeal to you to assist in securing adequate tariff protection.

I urge that you use every effort in your power to the end that a 5-cent-a-pound tariff be placed on unshelled almonds and 15 cents a pound on shelled almonds. This represents the minimum under which the almond growers can compete with the growers of the Mediterranean States. The unbalanced competition which exists to-day has made it impossible for the entire amount of the 1920 crop to be marketed, while there is also some of the 1919 product remaining unsold in the California warehouses. The situation is critical, and unless the growers receive immediate protection to the end that they may be able to market the crop which is now in the warehouses the \$50,000,000 investment in orchards in California will have to be abandoned.

Again I appeal to you to use your utmost efforts to have the 5 and 15 cent rate made a part of the tariff measure which is now before the committee.

Yours very truly,

JOHN DONAHUE.

FAIR OAKS, CALIF., August 1, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: As one of the 4,000 almond growers of California, I feel that the members of the Senate Finance Committee hold the last hope for saving the California almond industry by adequate tariff protection.

Knowing that every Californian will appreciate it, I am asking you to use your utmost influence to get at least a 5-cent tariff on unshelled almonds and a 15-cent tariff on shelled almonds, which represents the minimum under which we can operate and live. We could not sell all of our crop of 1919 and have yet unsold approximately 10 per cent, and of the crop of 1920 we have on hand nearly 40 per cent, having received only 10 cents per pound for 30 per cent of the 1920 crop and 7 cents per pound on the balance, which does not pay for harvesting to-day, to say nothing of other costs of production.

I am, like yourself, all for America, and ask nothing beyond a fair return for my efforts. It is my opinion that the California almond grower can not continue under present conditions.

Respectfully yours,

HARRY DEWEY.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., August 2, 1921.

United States Senator SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.:

We have almond orchard of 208 acres in Merced County, Calif., and unless a tariff of 5 cents per pound on unshelled and 15 cents on shelled it will be impossible to compete with imported product with labor at 50 cents per day. We can't more than break even with cost of land, plus high-priced labor for intensive cultivation, spraying, pruning, irrigation, gathering, marketing, and taxes are not figuring. Interest on the investment and the upkeep alone amounts to \$5,500 per year. Have to operate two tractors, which requires efficient mechanics. Can't continue this outlay, and must ask you to conscientiously recommend this protection. Thank you.

J. & W. C. SHULL.

GRIDLEY, CALIF., August 1, 1921.

Senator SAMUEL SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

You are doing a noble work for us almond growers, and I am sure you will continue to let me impress on you that we must have 5 and 15 cent tariff to continue, as we only received 10 cents for our almonds last year. Your effort before the Finance Committee will be appreciated.

W. E. SIMPSON.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., July 30, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Have been selling California almonds in the shell in the San Francisco market for the past 12 years. Have been urging growers to shell almonds, since demand is mostly for shelled almonds. Growers gave me opportunity this year to sell few shelled almonds, and I found that the price on imported article was depressed to such an extent that shelled almonds would have to be sold here approximately at value of certain grades of almonds in the shell, and that California growers could not shell in face of this competition. Shelled almonds were brought into San Francisco this year and sold at extremely low prices. Understand that many of inferior imported shelled almonds were mixed with the higher grades of California, and this mixture sold to trade. I am absolutely convinced as a broker in almonds that the future of industry in America depends wholly upon proper protective tariff.

WM. G. GOLDBERG.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., July 27, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

California almond industry earnestly appeals to you for much-needed assistance. House tariff ratio 3 to 1. Recommended base of 4 cents too low; 5-15 minimum duty that should be considered. Underwood tariff putting us down and out, and is a losing game for our Government. Present contest actually between importers of pauper-labor products and California producers.

GEO. W. PIERCE, 311 California Street.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., July 26, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.:

In the interest of the American almond industry we seriously urge you to use all your influence to get a tariff rate which will fully protect this industry. It is of vital importance that we get a 5-cent duty on almonds in the shell and 15 cents on shelled almonds.

RIVERS BROS. CO. (INC.).

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., July 25, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.:

In view of the fact that despite the return of last year's almond crop failing to realize cost of harvest, there still remains unsold some 3,000 tons of 1919 and 1920 almond crops. It seems imperative, in order to save this important industry of California, that the 5 and 15 cents a pound duties on unshelled and shelled almonds should prevail. You will render California an invaluable service if you can secure these protective tariffs through and with the aid of the Senate committee. I bespeak for such efforts your usual earnest activity and your influential aid in this grave situation, affecting as it does the welfare of the State and the economic life of thousands of its farm producers.

HARRIS WEINSTOCK.

NEWCASTLE, CALIF., July 25, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am addressing you on behalf of the almond industry in California. The past three years, the average annual production of almonds in California totaled a valuation of approximately \$3,500,000 to \$4,000,000. On account of the heavy importation of the foreign shelled almond in the past year the present values of the California product have been depreciated approximately 40 to 50 per cent.

With 3,000 tons of last year's crop unsold in the warehouses, the probability is that this year's increased tonnage of the California product will be marketed at a total income of less than one-half of the past three years' income from this product—a basis of valuation that not alone seriously jeopardize the producer but eventually means bankruptcy.

The almond-growing industry in California is in its infancy. The number of trees planted the past five years is three times the number of almond trees that five years ago were in orchard. In one district alone, in San Luis Obispo County, there were more nonbearing almond trees planted within the last four years than the entire bearing acreage of the State preceding that period.

In the almond-growing districts of such counties as San Luis Obispo, Monterey, some of the southern counties, both the west and east side bench lands of the Sacramento, and San Joaquin Valleys there are many tens of thousands of acres of land adapted to the production of almonds that can not be equally profitably employed in the production of any other crop.

This industry having averaged an income to the State, in its infancy, of approximately \$4,000,000 annually, which, with the trees now planted, will within the next five years be increased threefold, with unlimited potential possibilities for future development, to a degree that will enable California to supply the entire United States with this splendid nut food—this industry is now being seriously injured by the importation of foreign shelled almonds, grown under present European conditions and standards of life, and, under the proposed 4-cent rate for unshelled almonds and 12-cent rate for shelled almonds, will not be adequately protected.

This industry in the present situation is seriously jeopardized; yet, under a protective tariff of 15 cents for shelled and 5 cents for unshelled almonds, sufficient to offset the difference between European standards of life and labor and American, with this adequate protection, this industry can be made to grow and prosper to a degree that will not alone be an asset to the State but to the Nation.

The demand for a tariff of 15 cents on the shelled and 5 cents on the unshelled nut on the part of the almond industry is conservative and absolutely necessary to its continued life and growth, and to that extent, as a fruit grower, fruit shipper, and nurseryman, and one largely interested in the horticultural interests of the State, I bespeak your hearty support of this contention of the industry.

Very truly yours,

J. E. BERGTHOLDT.

CHICAGO, July 24, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL SHORTRIDGE,
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am endeavoring through this communication to approach you on the subject of the duty on imported almonds, particularly the shelled ones.

You may remember me and you may not. I performed on the ball fields of California for a great many years in the late eighties and early nineties and I make my home during the winter in Oakland. Many a day in the days gone by I have parked with your brother at the lunch table and listened to his vocabulary, which you no doubt knew was quite extensive.

For the past three years I have been coming East earning my living here, and the money that I have been able to get ahead I have been putting into 240 acres of almond land. Now, when that land is about to give me its first production, which will be very slight, it is no more than natural for me to look for protection from you and other representatives of California in our Halls at Washington.

From the information that I picked up last winter during my stay in Oakland and what I have learned during the summer out here it seems as if it is absolutely imperative that we should be protected with a 15-cent duty on shelled almonds coming from the cheap labor centers of Europe. Most likely you have been approached by men a great deal higher advanced in financial technique of what is necessary for the protection of the California almond growers, but I thought that it would not be of any harm for me to add my mite to the others, who, like myself, are interested in the development of California.

Thanking you very kindly for any attention that you might show this communication, and maybe some day I might run across you on the shores of the golden State, I beg to remain, as ever,

Sincerely yours,

W. L. O'NEILL.

MERCHANTS' NATIONAL BANK OF SAN FRANCISCO,
San Francisco, July 22, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senator from California, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have pleasure in acknowledging your letter of the 14th instant, and note with satisfaction that you will offer and support an amendment to the tariff bill giving 5 and 15 cents, respectively, on unshelled and shelled almonds.

This is most encouraging news and will be thoroughly appreciated by the large army of almond growers in this State. Our delegation in

Congress from this State has cooperated most heartily in this matter, and we feel a full sense of gratitude to them.

Faithfully yours,

W. T. SUMMERS, President.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., July 21, 1921.

Senator SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

My life's savings invested in almond orchard. Last year and part of previous crops still unsold. Imperative we have tariff of 5 cents on unshelled and 15 on shelled almonds to save us from utter ruin. Lowest possible rate under which we can exist. Use every effort to have the above tariff passed; also do all you can for walnut growers.

J. E. PETZ.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., July 21, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL SHORTRIDGE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Almond industry of California seriously threatened unless relief is forthcoming. Strongly urge your good offices in supporting the almond men in the increased tariff asked.

TOM A. NERNEY,
San Francisco.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., July 20, 1921.

To the honorable the SENATOR FROM CALIFORNIA,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: As an owner of an almond orchard in the State of California I would respectfully request that you use your utmost influence in behalf of the almond industry of the State toward the passage of a bill which will give the protection requested by the California almond growers and necessary to save the said industry; namely, a tariff of 15 cents a pound on shelled and 5 cents per pound on unshelled nuts.

Although not financially interested, I would also urge proper protection for the walnut industry.

Thanking you for your efforts,
Yours respectfully,C. P. OPPERMAN,
Post Office Box No. 978.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., July 20, 1921.

Mr. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Being interested in almond growing in California, would like to see you give the bill for 5 and 15 cents tariff on almonds due consideration.

Yours truly,

MATT POLL,
415 South Gates Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., July 20, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The people of this district are very vitally interested in a tariff of at least 5 cents on unshelled almonds and at least 15 cents on shelled almonds, and would greatly appreciate every effort you can make to secure a tariff to this effect.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT A. WARING.

THE CARMICHAEL CO.,
Sacramento, Calif., July 18, 1921.

The Hon. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: I am the owner of 100 acres of almonds, and it is important first to myself and secondly to the other hundreds of almond owners in California, practically the only place in the United States that almonds can be successfully grown, to have a tariff of at least 5 cents on unshelled almonds and 15 cents on shelled almonds.

Without this we can not compete with our eastern competitors; and I earnestly ask, not alone for myself but the other farmers in our State, that you give this matter your attention to see that we have the protection we are entitled to.

Thanking you, I am
Respectfully yours,

R. J. MORRISSEY.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., July 14, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: In the behalf of an industry in which our State, as you well know, is greatly interested, we respectfully ask that you use your best efforts toward having the tariff on almonds increased to 5 and 15 cents per pound, respectively.

The differential between the shelled and unshelled nut as fixed by the Ways and Means Committee is not great enough, figuring on the result after the nut is taken from the shell. A ratio of at least 3 to 1 should be the basis to work upon in naming the duty.

Your cooperation will be very much appreciated and remembered by,
Yours respectfully,

ENNIS-BROWN CO.

SAN FRANCISCO, July 14, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: We would like to call your attention to the fact that California needs protection in the almond industry. There is probably over \$50,000,000 invested in this industry, and it is quite necessary at this time to have a protective tariff on almonds.

It is recommended that a tariff of 5 cents per pound on not shelled almonds and 15 cents per pound on shelled almonds be put into effect. We believe it is justifiable to increase the tariff three times as much on shelled almonds, as they are being largely imported.

We sincerely trust that you will give this matter your due consideration, and we assure you that your efforts will certainly be appreciated.

Yours very truly,

JACOBS, MALCOLM & BURTT,
A. P. JACOBS.

BUFFALO, N. Y., July 14, 1921.

HON. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE.

DEAR SIR: I take this liberty of writing to you in regard to that section of the Fordney tariff bill pertaining to the almond industry of this country. I therefore ask that you do all within your power to have a fair and just tariff placed upon shelled and unshelled almonds, so that the grower may receive a just and fair return upon their investment and labor, so that the American grower can live and raise their families as true and loyal Americans should live and be educated. I earnestly believe that in order to save the almond industry of California that there should be a tariff of 5 cents a pound on unshelled and 15 cents a pound on shelled almonds, which would not in any way place an additional cost per pound to the consumer.

Hoping that you will do all within your power to have this just and reasonable tariff placed upon imported almonds, and thanking you for the same,

I remain, yours,

R. J. MILLS,
315 Riley Street, Buffalo, N. Y.

WINTERS, CALIF., July 13, 1921.

SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Ask your best consideration increase tariff shelled almonds. Growers desperate.

E. C. SNAVELY.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., July 13, 1921.

HON. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Have been selling California almonds in the shell in the San Francisco market for the past 12 years. Have been urging growers to shell almonds, since demand is mostly for shelled almonds. Growers gave me opportunity this year to sell few shelled almonds, and I found that the price on imported article was depressed to such an extent that shelled almonds would have to be sold here approximately at value of certain grades of almonds in the shell, and that California growers could not shell in face of this competition. Shelled almonds from Europe were brought into San Francisco this year and sold at extremely low prices. Understand that many of inferior imported shelled almonds were mixed with the higher grades of California and this mixture sold to trade. I am absolutely convinced as a broker in almonds that the future of industry in America depends wholly upon proper protective tariff.

WM. G. GOLDBERG.

MARSHUTZ OPTICAL CO.,
Los Angeles, July 12, 1921.

HON. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,

United States Senator, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: I am interested in the almond industry of California. I have about \$25,000 invested in an orchard near Paso Robles. Owing to the strong European competition, particularly on shelled almonds, the growers have made a failure of that industry so far, because the cost of the production is greater than the earnings of the almonds at the price at which both unshelled and shelled almonds had to be sold to compete with the imported article.

To save the almond industry in this State, in which \$50,000,000 have been invested, it is absolutely necessary that the new tariff will provide 5 cents a pound on imported not shelled almonds and 15 cents per pound on imported shelled almonds. European almonds shell at the ratio of four to one, and California almonds at the ratio of three to one, which means, of course, that it will take three pounds of California almonds in the shell to produce one pound of unshelled almonds. Therefore I strongly believe that almond growers are justified and entitled to a tariff protection on shelled almonds at least three times as great as the almonds which are not shelled. Inasmuch as the shelled almonds represent 80 per cent of the consumption of the almonds in the United States, the California almond industry would disintegrate if Congress would not protect us at the ratio of three to one, as above outlined for shelled almonds, making the basic rate of 5 cents per pound on almonds not shelled and 15 cents per pound on shelled almonds.

I believe it has been the policy of the United States Government to protect the farmers and ranchers to the fullest extent against foreign competition, and while an increase in tariff increases the cost of our products to the people, is that increase on the other hand not returned to the people by the higher wages which we are paying in California for farm labor and all other work required in connection with the tilling of the soil?

I hope that you will see fit to use your great and good influence in behalf of this important industry and demand a tariff of 5 cents per pound on almonds not shelled and 15 cents per pound on almonds shelled.

I am a resident of California for 40 years, and of Los Angeles 34 years. I would appreciate and thank you for a reply to this letter in which you would tell me your position in this matter.

Yours respectfully,

S. G. MARSHUTZ.

LIVE OAK, CALIF., July 12, 1921.

HON. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SHORTRIDGE: As an almond grower of California I wish to call your attention to the extreme need of your help to save the almond industry of this State.

Some 5,000 families depend on this alone for a living, and have millions of dollars invested. We only ask for a fair return, and can get this only from a tariff of at least 5 cents per pound on not shelled and 15 cents on shelled.

We have faith in our representatives in Congress, and am sure that they will realize that this industry should be saved.

Thanking you for past favors.

W. E. MCMURTRY.

BANNING, CALIF., July 12, 1921.

HON. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,

DEAR SIR: Please use your influence to secure for us a tariff of 5 cents on the pound for almonds in the shell and 15 cents on the pound for shelled almonds. We do not ask freedom from competition, but com-

petition on a fair basis with European almonds. We can not duplicate European labor conditions, and the industry will die unless protected.

Yours truly,

CARRIE W. EGAN.

LOWER LAKE, CALIF., July 12, 1921.

Senator SAM SHORTRIDGE,

Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SENATOR: Considering it to be your duty to protect the almond industry of California, I kindly beg of you to help the almond growers of this State in getting the tariff of at least 5 cents on unshelled and a 15-cent tariff on shelled almonds.

This is an urgent request of an almond grower.

Respectfully your grateful

L. E. BETZ,
Orchardist, Lower Lake, Calif., Box 134.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., July 12, 1921.

SAM SHORTRIDGE, Senator,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

To prevent the uprooting of our trees and to save the industry from complete ruin it will be necessary to have a tariff of 5 cents a pound on almonds in the shell and 15 cents on shelled almonds. Our demands are just. From grower and constituent.

F. M. METZGAR.

ANTIOCH, CALIF., July 12, 1921.

SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Whereas under present conditions high cost of labor, heavy transportation charges, and low tariff prevailing on almonds California almond growers will be forced to dig up their almond orchards, being unable to compete with foreign-grown almonds grown under cheap labor and un-American conditions. This would mean a loss of millions of dollars to the almond growers of California; therefore the directors of the Eastern Contra Costa Almond Growers' Association ask that you work for the passage of a tariff on almonds of 5 cents in the shell and 15 cents on shelled almonds, therefore saving for us our homes and business.

MRS. NELLIE PARCHINI.
MRS. J. B. BLISS.
S. B. L. NORCROSS.
B. B. HERR.
A. W. BIELOW.
W. J. O'HARA.
JOHN TREMBATH, Secretary.

PASADENA, CALIF., July 12, 1921.

SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

California wants and should have at least 5-cent tariff on unshelled almonds and 15 cents tariff on the shelled product. We own 40 acres of bearing almonds at Paso Robles. Do all possible to accomplish same.

Yours truly,

L. S. AND R. H. FEY.

DURHAM, CALIF., July 12, 1921.

Senator SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I write to ask you to urge that the tariff on almonds be increased to at least 5 cents per pound on almonds in the shell and 15 cents per pound on shelled almonds.

The future of our almond industry in California depends upon such aid, and I thank you for your efforts to assist us.

Very truly yours,

ANNETTA WELDIN.

DURHAM, CALIF., July 11, 1921.

Senator S. M. SHORTRIDGE,

DEAR SIR: I own a 140-acre almond orchard at Durham, Calif. It has cost 12 years' time and expense to bring it to full bearing, and is practically valueless without a protective tariff.

In particular, we require a duty of 15 cents on shelled almonds. It would be quite unnecessary to repeat all the arguments, as you must be familiar with them. I will merely make an earnest appeal for myself and neighbors.

Very respectfully,

C. M. WINGATE.

MARYSVILLE, CALIF., July 12, 1921.

HON. SAMUEL SHORTRIDGE,

Washington, D. C.:

Properly safeguarded we can supply United States with almonds, thereby keeping American dollars in America. Difference in standards of living compared to foreigners cost us more to produce and to harvest almonds. We need a higher protective tariff.

LLOYD C. HOENIG,
Sutter, Calif.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., July 12, 1921.

Senator SAM. M. SHORTRIDGE,

Washington, D. C.:

As an almond grower in Orland, Calif., I am looking to you for protection against European almonds that are being shipped into United States by a just tariff of 5 cents on unshelled and 15 cents on shelled almonds per pound.

A. I. ELLIS,
534 Battery Street, San Francisco, Calif.

LODI, CALIF., July 12, 1921.

SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

If the recommendation of Ways and Means Committee of 4 cents tariff on unshelled almonds and 8 cents on shelled almonds should be passed, our almond industry in California will be ruined. We must have tariff of 5 cents on unshelled and 15 cents on shelled almonds to enable us to compete against European imports. All California growers are looking to you to save our industry from ruin.

LEWIS WALKER.

1221 MARENGO AVENUE, SOUTH PASADENA.

Senator SAMUEL SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: California depends on you to support a tariff of 5 cents on unshelled almonds and 15 cents tariff on the shelled product. This is very important, as to many of us it means our all—our means of support. We have not yet sold all of our last year's crop for lack of a tariff that will enable us to compete with the Spanish product.

Kindly give this your most serious consideration and give your best endeavor to save the almond product to this State and the means of livelihood to hundreds of orchardists who have this as the only means of support.

My almond orchard is in Chico, Butte County.
Very truly yours,

J. H. SWANN.

CHICO, CALIF., July 11, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We beg Congress to not place less than 5 cents on almonds not shelled and 15 cents on almonds shelled. Unless there is a readjustment immediately we growers will not make expenses this season. A tariff on almonds in no way affects the living standards of the poor. For future prosperity do what you can in justice for the producer.

Yours truly,

H. C. COMPTON.

WINTERS, CALIF., July 11, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Please use utmost influence to increase tariff on shelled almonds. Growers desperate.

GEORGE H. CALDWELL.

GILROY, CALIF., July 11, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Unless we get a readjustment of tariff on shelled almonds of at least 3 to 1 of unshelled it will mean the deterioration of the almond industry of California. Our only future market is for shelled almonds. This situation is serious. I am an almond grower of California and appeal to you to lend your aid to adjust this tariff.

W. L. COTTMIRE.

ROSEVILLE, CALIF., July 11, 1921.

Senator SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This note is sent you hoping that it will help California get at least a 5-cent tariff on the unshelled almonds and a 15-cent tariff on the shelled almonds.

Thanking you and hoping you will use your efforts to help the almond growers, I remain,
Yours truly,

J. V. MACIEL,
Almond Grower.

VALLEY HOME, July 11, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL SHORTRIDGE.

DEAR SIR: As an almond grower of California it is my duty to ask of you and your colleagues to get a tariff of 5 cents per pound on unshelled almonds and 15 cents on shelled almonds. If we do not get this tariff, the almond industry in this country is doomed.

We appreciate what you have done for the farmers in the past, and trust to you to use your influence now on a higher almond tariff. Thanking you,
Yours very truly,

HERBERT KLEENE,
Valley Home, Calif.

SPENCERVILLE, CALIF., July 11, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I earnestly request that you do your utmost to have the tariff placed on unshelled at least at 5 cents per pound and on shelled almonds at 15 cents per pound.

To pay the prices asked for manufactured articles, especially farming implements, the farmer must be as fully protected as the manufacturer.

Myself and family can not compete with the pauper labor of Europe and live like an American.

The farmer has always stood by the Government and should be treated fairly.

Again asking you to do your utmost,
I am, very truly, yours,

J. H. EICKHOFF.

LE GRAND, CALIF., July 11, 1921.

Hon. SENATOR SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE.

DEAR SIR: Would greatly appreciate your help toward the levying of a tariff on shelled of 15 cents and unshelled 5 cents in order that we growers make a success of the almond industry.

Thanking you for the best help you can give.

Truly yours,

J. SOUTHWARD.

GEORGE H. HOYT Co.,
Berkeley, Calif., July 11, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am an almond grower and a member of the California Almond Growers' Exchange. I have made considerable study of the almond situation and am absolutely convinced that the position taken by our exchange is sound. The full tariff on the shelled almonds is vital for the life of this industry, as only a small percentage of almonds can be sold in the shell. Your efforts in behalf of the almond growers of California will be greatly appreciated by the undersigned.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE H. HOYT.

SAN FRANCISCO, July 11, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

FRIEND SAM: Of course, I appreciate you know all about conditions, but write you nevertheless.

Want higher tariff on shelled and unshelled almonds. Can not pay American wages and compete with Europe. Have not cultivated my 5-acre Guinda, Yolo County, place this year. Cost of production too great.

Respectfully,

J. W. HUDSON,
159 Sutter Street.

TEMPLETON, CALIF., July 11, 1921.

Mr. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.:

I am appealing to you to save the almond industry of California and our homes. In order to do so we must have a duty on foreign almonds of at least 5 cents a pound on almonds in the shell and 15 cents a pound on meats. We hope you will see that it is right and just that we should have it, and that you will help us in this matter.

Thanking you, I remain,
Respectfully yours,

C. J. LAMB,
An Almond Grower.

CORNING, CALIF., July 11, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am an almond grower at this place, and if we do not get a tariff on unshelled almonds of 5 cents and 15 cents on shelled almonds it looks to me that the almond industry is doomed; and you know very well yourself what that means to us growers in California. Sincerely,

H. E. HORTING.

GRIDLEY, CALIF., July 11, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: May I as an almond grower ask you as a Senator from this State to use your best endeavor to secure a tariff of 5 cents on unshelled and 15 cents on shelled almonds. I am sure this is not asking anything unreasonable. And I am sure you are quite well informed on the situation as it now exists as to the almond industry in California.

Thanking you in advance, I remain,
Yours truly,

W. E. SIMPSON.

TEMPLETON, SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY, CALIF., July 10, 1921.

Senators H. W. JOHNSON and S. M. SHORTRIDGE.

DEAR SIR: California wants at least a 5-cent tariff on unshelled almonds and a 15-cent tariff on the shelled product.

Yours faithfully,

B. W. CORDEAL.

BANNING, CALIF., July 10, 1921.

Senator SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Please use all your influence to secure 5-cent tariff on unshelled and 15 cents on shelled almonds. Tariff recommended by Ways and Means Committee of 8 cents on shelled almonds is pitifully inadequate and spells bankruptcy for every almond grower of California. Must have 15 cents tariff on shelled almonds to compete with Italy and Spain.

JOHN GREPLIER.

SAN JOSE, CALIF., July 10, 1921.

SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We the undersigned citizens and almond growers of California respectfully request that you use your influence toward the passage of the tariff on almonds as set forth by the California Almond Growers' Exchange, to wit, 5 cents per pound on unshelled and 15 cents per pound on shelled almonds.

Yours respectfully,

B. S. KEATON,
T. C. KEATON,
C. L. KEATON,
H. V. KEATON,
R. T. KEATON,
E. M. KEATON.

MARYSVILLE, CALIF., July 10, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.:

Owing to high prices of almond land, time required to raise orchards to commercial age, and high cost of harvesting and uncertainty of crop, excessive freight rate, large tonnage of unsold crop, financial distress of almond growers, we need tariff on almonds 5 cents on unshelled, 15 cents shelled nuts per pound.

S. W. MUDGETT.

GLENDALE, CALIF., July 10, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

California almond growers must have a tariff of 5 and 15 cents or stand another loss of thousands of dollars on crops and much more on acreage. We look to the California delegation to go to the bat for us.

RALPH W. BROWN.

MANTECA, CALIF., July 10, 1921.

Senator SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We beg respectfully to call your attention to the fact that as growers of almonds in California we need and earnestly desire a tariff that will save our industry from ruin by competition of the imports from the Mediterranean countries.

A tariff of 5 cents on unshelled almonds and 15 cents on shelled almonds is the least that would be considered at all adequate.

Very truly,

A. E. LACY,
R. F. D. Box 200.

ORLAND, CALIF., July 10, 1921.

HON. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As an almond grower I appeal to you to use your best efforts toward securing an adequate tariff on almonds and save the industry in California. The tariff as recommended by the Ways and Means Committee will not do this, and anything less than the tariff as sought by the California Almond Growers' Exchange will not let us operate at a profit.

Very truly yours,

C. E. CHRISTLEY.

LODI, CALIF., July 9, 1921.

Senator SAMUEL SHORTRIDGE.

DEAR SIR: We are asking you to help to protect the almond industry of our State. We want your aid in placing a tariff of 5 cents on almonds not shelled and 15 cents on shelled almonds.

Yours respectfully,

J. H. TECKLEBURG,
H. TECKLEBURG, Sr.,
Almond Growers.

MARYSVILLE, CALIF., July 9, 1921.

Senator SAMUEL SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.:

California wants at least a 5-cent tariff on unshelled almonds and a 15-cent tariff on the shelled product.

This means a great deal to the almond growers of California, if they stay in the business.

Yours truly,

GEO. M. GRAVES,
Owner Almond Orchard.

CORNING, July 9, 1921.

HON. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As we are trying to get part of our living raising almonds here in California, we request that the tariff on unshelled almonds be 5 cents per pound and 15 cents per pound on shelled almonds or meats. As the freight and taxes are so high, we don't like to work for nothing and board ourselves for the benefit of foreigners and middlemen. Hope you can get the tariff for us and help the growers of California.

Yours respectfully,

W. W. HANCHETT,
Member Tehama County Almond Growers.

CORNING, CALIF., July 9, 1921.

SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I understand that the Ways and Means Committee have recommended to Congress a tariff on almonds not shelled of 4 cents, and on shelled almonds 8 cents per pound. We almond growers feel that this tariff would not give us sufficient protection. It ought to be at least 5 cents on almonds not shelled and 15 cents on shelled almonds per pound. We are asking this that we may be able to compete with the almond growers of foreign countries where labor may be secured much cheaper than here. Please do what you can for the almond growers of your State.

Yours truly,

WALTER G. MAYNARD.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., July 9, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE.

DEAR SIR: Please help us. We must have a tariff on shelled almonds of 15 cents per pound—proposed 8 cents won't help.

European almonds shell out four to one; ours, three to one. We can't market our last year's crop and our almonds are better than the imported ones. I can't stand another year's loss and my savings of five years is gone unless you help by this tariff on shelled almonds of 15 cents pound.

Your friend always,

MRS. MARY M. JASON,
2806 Jackson Street.

Eighty per cent of the demand of the United States is for shelled almonds.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., July 9, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE.

DEAR SIR: Please help us get a tariff of 15 cents on shelled almonds. Recommended 8 cents is far too low, as European almonds shell out four to one and ours three to one. Must have three times as great as on almonds in the shell, for shelled almonds represent 80 per cent of the demand of the United States.

This big California industry will be lost unless we get 15 cents on shelled almonds; your State that you have worked for heart and soul. We can depend on you to help us, I know.

Very truly yours,

THOM. DOWD,
33 Java Street.

NELSON REALTY CO.,
Arbuckle, Calif., July 9, 1921.

HON. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Eleven years ago it dawned on the people in this locality that they had an ideal condition for producing almonds. At that time about 150 acres were under production. Since then the planting of almonds has increased until we now have over 10,000 acres planted and under cultivation, with our territory about one-half covered.

About two years ago the almond growers began to realize that although they could produce almonds it was another thing to market them. This fact has been most forcibly brought home to them by there still remaining unsold a portion of their 1919 and 1920 crops, all the while a large amount of almonds are still pouring in from the southern European countries.

California looked upon the almond, 10 to 15 years ago, as a side issue with farmers, but in recent years districts which are favored with frost protection, which the almond as an early bloomer requires, have capitalized their asset by specializing on almonds until to-day the State of

California, with a normal crop, will produce enough almonds to take care of the entire consumption of the United States.

This of course means that the industry has developed into one of immense magnitude. And now we are threatened with complete destruction unless, through your good offices and that of California's other honorable Members in the Congress, you can save us.

We feel that we should have a tariff of 5 cents on unshelled and 15 cents on shelled almonds. Our State Almond Growers' Exchange office has gone into this matter very thoroughly and has supplied you with all the data; therefore it is unnecessary to reiterate it here. But we do wish to impress upon you that these are serious times for us, and the destruction we see ahead of us causes us to burden you with our problems.

If you can succeed in securing us proper tariff protection, and we know you will if it is possible to do so, you will have earned your reward, and you will be blessed by 5,000 most serious and earnest almond producers of this State.

Very truly yours,

D. S. NELSON.

W. T. MCFIE SUPPLY CO.,
Arbuckle, Calif., July 9, 1921.

HON. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your cooperation is requested in adjusting the present tariff on almonds, viz:

Five cents on almonds in the shell.

Fifteen cents on almond meats.

As one of the 5,000 almond growers in the State of California I must draw your attention to the hazardous condition which we find our industry in, as we are unable to participate in the almond-meat business due to vast importations of the south European almonds produced under cheap labor conditions.

California almonds shell out 3 to 1. Therefore the above ratio is necessary to secure at least a portion of the almond-meat business.

Thanking you in anticipation of your hearty support in our behalf, I am,

Very respectfully yours,

L. M. BLOOM.

ARBUCKLE, CALIF., July 9, 1921.

HON. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As one of the 5,000 almond growers of the State of California I respectfully request your cooperation and support in the matter of adjusting present tariff on almonds, viz:

Five cents on unshelled almonds.

Fifteen cents on almond meats.

The above ratio of 3 to 1 is necessary on account of California almonds shelling out 3 pounds of almonds in the shell to 1 pound of meats.

Statistics show that the almond growers of California are now producing enough almonds under normal crop conditions to supply the needs of the entire United States, and since the bulk of consumption consists of almond meats, and the same are now being imported into the United States from the southern European countries at such low prices that the California producers are unable to shell out their almonds to compete with these foreign meats, in consequence of which they still have a portion of their 1919 and 1920 crops on hand unsold, your hearty support in our behalf will help save an industry that represents many millions of dollars invested, not to mention the great amount of study, labor, and risk involved in bringing an almond orchard up to bearing age.

Thanking you in anticipation, I am,

Yours very respectfully,

J. M. DRACK.

PASO ROBLES, CALIF., July 9, 1921.

Senator SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In the proposed new tariff the committee has recommended to Congress a rate of 4 cents per pound on unshelled almonds and 8 cents on shelled. This is too low in the first case and no protection in the second, as it would amount to only 2½ cents on almonds. We should have 5 cents and 15 cents, respectively.

It takes 3 pounds of California almonds to shell out 1 pound, and 80 per cent of the consumption of almonds in the United States is of those shelled, so at the proposed 8 cents it would in reality be only 2½ cents per pound, which, when you consider our higher labor charge, our more sanitary handling, and higher shipping charge, it amounts to so little that we can not live under this low rate.

The rate should be 5 and 15, respectively, but I urge you to do your best to get it, but, if impossible, stick until the last ditch for 12 cents, or at the consistent rate of 3 to 1.

Yours truly,

W. J. STONE.

OAKLEY, CALIF., July 9, 1921.

HON. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As an almond grower of California I most emphatically urge that you give your support to the increase of the tariff on almonds to at least 5 cents on the unshelled and 15 cents on the shelled product, for without such a tariff our orchards, which we have spent years in developing, are practically doomed in competition with the European almonds. I do not think that any right-minded American citizen, if he knew the facts, would desire that our splendid almond industry, with its superior product, should be allowed to wither in favor of the almond industry of Europe, with its cheap labor and inferior grade.

California almonds shell out at the ratio of 3 to 1, hence the common sense of a 3 to 1 tariff as compared with the shelled and unshelled product, and also the extreme necessity of such a tariff, for our future market lies mostly in the sale of shelled nuts. Hoping for your support of this matter, I am,

Very truly yours,

J. A. HOBBS.

OAKLEY, July 9, 1921.

Senator SAM. SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please do all in your power to get a readjustment of tariff on almonds. At least 5 cents on almonds not shelled and shelled almonds 15 cents.

If tariff can not be secured, the California almond industry is doomed, as we can not compete with foreign trade under present conditions. I remain,

Yours respectfully,
L. H. ELLIOTT,
Almond grower, Oakley, Contra Costa County, Calif.

GOODWIN & GOODWIN,
Ripon, Calif., July 9, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have been informed that the Ways and Means Committee of the House has recommended a tariff on almonds not shelled at 4 cents per pound and on shelled almonds 8 cents per pound. Our exchange has asked for a tariff of 5 cents on the former and 15 cents on the latter. As I am a practical grower, I know that the amount recommended by the committee is not enough, and the amount requested by our exchange is none too much. We all know the expense which almond growers and other farmers in this State are under for labor and supplies, and that our industry, which is a big one in this State, can not survive without adequate protection.

Shelled almonds should have a tariff of at least three times as much per pound as unshelled ones, for the simple reason that almonds shell out in the ratio of at least three to one. The ratio recommended by the committee is only two to one, and the shelled almond market is by far the more important of the two.

I know that you have the prosperity of the California farmer at heart and ask you to do what you can to save the almond growers from that complete ruin which the low tariff recommended would permit.

Yours very truly,
B. A. GOODWIN.

ORLAND, CALIF., July 9, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The House Ways and Means Committee have recommended a tariff of only 8 cents per pound on shelled almonds. This is only about half what we need to compete with European almonds. As an almond grower I hope you will do all you can to give us adequate protection.

I am also in favor of the adjusted compensation bill for ex-service men and hope you will boost it along.

Yours respectfully,
RALPH W. TROWBRIDGE.

OAKLAND, CALIF., July 9, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The tariff of 4 cents on almonds, not shelled, and 8 cents on shelled almonds is out of proportion and will not protect our shelled-almond industry. The almond-shelling plants in California will not open this season to compete with foreign-shelled almonds, and will be the cause of keeping hundreds of employees in that line of business out of work. They have petitioned you for a tariff of 5 cents on almonds not shelled and 15 cents on shelled almonds, which is in proportion and is as small a duty as will protect the industry.

In the interest of California we wish you would do your utmost to have the tariff placed on the above basis.

Yours very truly,
DIABLO STOCK FARM,
G. W. EMMONS, President.

WINTERS, CALIF., July 9, 1921.

Senator SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As an almond grower, will say it is absolutely necessary that we have a tariff of 5 cents on almonds in shell and 15 cents shelled to be able to meet running expenses of my almond orchard.

Sincerely yours,
W. H. UNDERWOOD.

OAKDALE, CALIF., July 9, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please give California at least a 5-cent tariff on unshelled almonds and a 15-cent tariff on the shelled almonds. If we don't get this much, the almond industry will fail.

Truly yours,
M. E. RINEHART.

Box 33, CORNING, CALIF., June 9, 1921.

SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

SIR: I recently purchased land in Corning, Calif., and put part of acreage in almond orchard, hoping that in a few years I would be able to make a comfortable living from the produce, but find that the almond grower is out of business unless he is protected by a strong tariff.

I am writing to you, hoping that you will use your influence to protect the orchardist in general (as a rule they are past middle age and do not want to become a burden to any State or person).

I am, dear sir,
Yours respectfully,
L. HACKER,

1660 LYON STREET,
San Francisco, July 9, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SHORTRIDGE: It has been called to my attention that the committee reporting the tariff bill has recommended, no doubt by oversight, a duty on almonds which would be absolutely ruinous to the almond industry of this State.

You are no doubt aware that the almond industry of this State has been laboriously built up in spite of drought, unseasonable frosts, grasshoppers, and other obstacles.

I know that you will make a great effort to protect this industry with a tariff commensurate with the needs of the almond growers.

We ask a tariff of 5 cents on unshelled and 15 cents on shelled almonds.

As you know, the almond growers of this State are well organized and will watch with vital interest your fight in Congress for the tariff we ask.

I am an owner of a small almond orchard in the Pennington district of Sutter County. I derive the major part of my livelihood from this source. The officials of the Almond Growers' Exchange have thoroughly convinced me that I shall be deprived of all income from this orchard should you fail in your efforts on our behalf.

Very truly yours,
Mrs. S. A. BEEBEE,
Member California Almond Growers' Exchange.

1907 LEAVENWORTH STREET,
San Francisco, July 9, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate of the United States, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: As an almond grower of Falf Oaks, Sacramento County, I wish to indorse Mr. T. C. Tucker, manager of the California Almond Growers' Exchange, in his effort to secure a tariff on imported almonds of 5 cents on the unshelled and 15 cents on the shelled almonds.

Most respectfully,
(Mrs. J. W.) ANNIE G. HOBSON.

DELANO, CALIF., July 9, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

A tariff of 5 cents on unshelled almonds and 15 cents on shelled product is absolutely necessary to save almond industry. This the almond growers must have.

JOHN E. LATHROP.

ASSEMBLY CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE,
FORTY-FOURTH SESSION, 1921,
Stockton, Calif., July 9, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I know that you are deluged with letters and petitions, but please permit one who has been through a similar mill recently to suggest a way whereby you will earn a great deal of popularity and do a great deal of good to the California farmers who are growing almonds.

I am informed that the committee of the House has recommended a 4-cent tariff on unshelled and 8 cents on shelled almonds. I have talked with certain practical almond growers of this vicinity, well known to me personally, and they assure me that the almond industry, on account of European competition and high expenses, is in a rocky condition even now, and that unless they get at least 15 cents per pound tariff on shelled almonds their crop won't bring them expenses. They also need 5 cents per pound on unshelled almonds, for which there is less market.

If you could possibly get an amendment on the floor to this effect, or secure a committee amendment, this agricultural community would certainly appreciate it. There is no question but what the farmers not only desire the change, but are earnestly insistent that it is absolutely necessary to preserve their industry. Please do what you can for them.

Yours very truly,
OSCAR C. PARKINSON.

STOCKTON, CALIF., July 9, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,

DEAR SIR: It is essential to the welfare of the almond growers to have a higher rate of duty on almonds than that proposed in the committee bill recently presented to the House. Please do all you can to have this increased, particularly on shelled almonds.

Very truly yours,
LEROY M. PHARIS,

E. D. 3, Box 155, Stockton, Calif.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., July 9, 1921.

SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Understanding the legislature has allowed a very small tariff on almonds, I want to plead with you to help us get more. I am a nurse and a widow, and for the past number of years have been putting every dollar of my earnings I could spare in our almond ranch of 10 acres, which is just beginning to bear, and of which I had hopes of realizing a little income from now on; but am afraid I will lose all if you do not help us. I say us, for I know of others in the same shape as myself who will lose all if we do not get help on this question. Hoping you will know how to help us, I am,

Yours respectfully,
KATE T. HENRY.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., July 9, 1921.

Senator SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As an almond grower of California, and one who is deeply interested in the prosperity of our State, I beg of you to use all influence possible in bringing about a tariff of at least 5 per cent on unshelled almonds and a 15 per cent tariff on the shelled product.

Unless we get a readjustment of tariff on shelled almonds of at least three to one it will mean the disintegration of the almond industry of California.

We entreat you to give this matter your serious consideration.

Very truly yours,
HORACE B. PECK.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., July 9, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Urge your utmost assistance readjustment of tariff on shelled almonds. At least three to one, or 5 cents in shell, 15 cents shelled. As grower, I know almond industry of California will fail unless you help this cause. Unable to make living on my almond holdings under present tariff. Forced to work in the city and let place go.

C. G. CHIPCHASE,
Burlingame, Calif.

WOODLAND, CALIF., July 9, 1921.

Mr. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
United States Senator of California, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In the interest of the California almond industry I protest against the tariff recommended by the Ways and Means Committee.

California requires at least a 5-cent tariff on unshelled almonds and a 15-cent tariff on the shelled product.

Hoping for a readjustment in this matter.

Yours truly,

JOHN C. KAUPKE.

LODI, CALIF., July 9, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As the tariff bill is before Congress at present I, as one of the growers of almonds, would like to impress upon you the absolute necessity of a tariff of 5 cents on unshelled and 15 cents on shelled almonds if we, as growers of almonds, are to remain in existence. Hoping you will help us win our fight, I am,

Respectfully yours,

BOYD JACOBS,
P. O. Box 47, Acampo, Calif.

HELP THE CALIFORNIA ALMOND GROWERS TO PROTECT INDUSTRY.

Millions of American dollars go annually to France, Spain, and Italy because Americans like almonds.

Fifty millions of American dollars are invested in California in almond orchards and almond-shelling machinery.

The California millions are unproductive as an investment because the Federal Government fails in giving adequate protection to this California and American industry.

The dollars that go to Mediterranean Europe should rightly come to California. They would if proper tariff protection were given the industry.

The almond growers are asking California's delegation in the Congress to insist upon reasonably high duties on imported almonds.

Every Californian interested in the welfare of this State should do his part, by telegram or letter, to bring home to our congressional delegation the importance of such action.

We must protect what is our own.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., July 9, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senator from California, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am an almond grower of this State, and I am writing you in the hope that you will do all in your power to have a tariff placed on almonds; otherwise the industry will be absolutely ruined, and quick action should be taken if anything is to be accomplished for the growers.

Thanking you in advance for your earnest attention, beg to remain,
Very truly yours,

E. N. CORNEAU.

BANNING, CALIF., July 9, 1921.

Senator SAM SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Am looking to you for help on tariff adjustment on almonds. We must have at least 5 cents a pound on unshelled and 15 cents on shelled almonds. This is very urgent.

R. H. COOMBS.

STOCKTON, CALIF., July 9, 1921.

SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

I grow almonds, but can not continue in business with tariff lower than 15 cents per pound on shelled and 5 cents on unshelled almonds. I ask you to help California growers get adequate tariff protection.

B. A. GOODWIN.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., July 9.

Senator SAMUEL SHORTRIDGE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

Authorities agree 5 cents correct tariff unshelled almonds. Shelled almonds one-third weight of unshelled. Fifteen cents on shelled necessary to protect growers. Eighty per cent demand American market is for shelled. Market for shelled now in hands Europeans. In three years California product 70,000,000 pounds. At present 9 per cent 1919 and 15 per cent 1920 crops unsold, because European almonds. California almond growing perishes if 3 to 1 tariff ratio on unshelled and shelled not provided. Your immediate assistance asked.

WESTERN CANNER AND PACKER.

BERKELEY, CALIF., July 8, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Save the almond growers of California by working for 5-cent tariff on unshelled and 15-cent tariff on shelled almonds.

We can not compete with European labor with tariff as recommended by Ways and Means Committee.

Save an important California industry.

Yours truly,

HORACE N. HENDERSON.

ESPARTO, CALIF., July 8, 1921.

Senator SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE:

We as one of the 4,000 almond growers in this State ask and plead of you to use your influence in getting a fair and just tariff on our product. The 4 cents on almonds in the shell and 8 cents on shelled almonds, as recommended by the Ways and Means Committee, is entirely too low if we are to exist as almond growers, as we can not compete with cheap foreign almonds. With the millions we have invested in almonds we feel we are entitled to fair chance with foreign almonds, and that we can only have by getting at least a 5-cent-a-pound on almonds in the shell and a 15-cent tariff in the shelled almonds.

Hoping you will give this a serious thought and a hard fight, we remain,

Yours royally,

LINDBERG BROS.
EDGAR LINDBERG,
M. A. LINDBERG.

BRENTWOOD, CALIF., July 8, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: If the almond industry in California is longer to exist, a tariff of at least 15 cents a pound on shelled almonds will be necessary to equalize cost of production and delivery to our markets in competition with Mediterranean growers.

Preservation being the first law of nature, is the American Government to allow the industry to pass to Europeans and lose hundreds of thousands of dollars and ruin farmers already suffering serious losses?

Yours respectfully,

ALEX MURDOCK.

FRESNO, CALIF., July 8, 1921.

SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Published reports of tariff of 4 cents on almonds and 8 cents on shelled almonds is ruinous to the California almond industry. Can you or would you use your best influence to give the California almond growers a 5-cent tariff on almonds and a 15-cent tariff on shelled almonds? Labor conditions make this a minimum upon which we can compete with the Mediterranean countries.

H. S. DUFF.

PASO ROBLES, CALIF., July 8, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I notice that it has been recommended that the tariff on almonds be 4 cents on unshelled and 8 cents on shelled. As California almonds sell out 3 to 1, it seems no more than fair that the tariff should be three times as great on the shelled as on the unshelled, and this is the branch of the trade that we must look to largely for our future trade. The California growers feel that they can not compete with European conditions on less than a 5-cent and 15-cent tariff, and ask that you kindly use your influence to this end, for if we can not get adequate protection it will mean ruin to a very large number of growers who have invested everything in this industry. Thanking you in advance for your efforts, I remain,

Yours respectfully,

J. W. HINMAN.

PASO ROBLES HOT SPRINGS,
Paso Robles, Calif., July 8, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I desire to put in my plea for your best endeavors toward procuring a protective tariff on shelled and unshelled almonds which will protect us almond growers of California, whose sales for last year's crop will not pay the cost of raising and harvesting.

I have all the savings of a lifetime invested in 33 acres of 7 and 8-year old almond trees and carrying a mortgage of \$7,500 at 7 per cent as well. For a man 68 years old, it is pretty tough to not even get the cost of labor back from a crop.

The United States markets were flooded last fall with shiploads of European raised almonds which were sold below the cost of nuts out here, as the growers across the water do not count the labor of their women and children as any additional expense, while out here we can not get competent labor for less than \$3.50 to \$4 or \$5 per day.

In future California growers must rely on shelled almonds very largely, which should have a tariff of at least 3 to 1 over unshelled nuts—say 5 cents on unshelled, and 15 cents on shelled nuts would give us the needed protection. Will you do your best for us? I heard you speak at a big meeting in Los Angeles last year during the campaign and feel sure you are for the good working people of your home State, so go to it strong, please.

Yours with respect,

CHAS. C. WILMOT,
P. O. Box 785.

PASO ROBLES, CALIF., July 8, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. SHORTRIDGE: We are heartily in favor of at least a tariff of 5 cents on unshelled almonds and a 15 cent tariff on the shelled product.

Respectfully,

A. P. BORKEY,
Almond Grower.

ELDRIDGE, CALIF., July 8, 1921.

SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

We, the undersigned California almond growers, respectfully urge that you do all in your power to have the duty on unshelled almonds fixed at 5 cents and all shelled almonds at 15 cents per pound. The salvation of the almond industry depends on this measure.

W. T. SUTTENFIELD,
C. S. BALDWIN,
C. F. GOSSIN,
M. SOLEY.

ORLANDI, CALIF., July 8, 1921.

SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senator, Washington, D. C.

Adequate protection for California almond industry demands 15 per cent tariff; lower tariff will not give adequate protection against foreign importations.

H. M. KINGWELL,
Horticultural Commissioner, Glenn County.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., July 8, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As an almond grower in California and a member of the Almond Growers' Exchange, I solicit your favorable action on the demand of the exchange for a tariff of 5 cents on almonds not shelled and 15 cents on shelled almonds. The reason for this demand by almond growers has been fully represented by the exchange, and I will not attempt to repeat.

California is the greatest almond-growing section in the United States. Millions are invested in the industry. We want only a reason-

able return for our product. Unless we are protected against cheap foreign labor we can not get it, and we must either uproot our almond trees or be reduced to the level and plane of our foreign competitor. God forbid! Many almond growers are already considering the advisability of planting other fruits than almonds. Help your own people. I know you will.

Yours truly,

O. G. HOPKINS,
Second District.

OAKLEY, CALIF., July 8, 1921.

SAM. M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senator from California, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Will you kindly give your support to a new tariff on almonds—5 cents for unshelled and 15 cents for shelled?

We have a 14-acre ranch of almonds and we are dependent on the same for a living. Should the present tariff remain we will have to turn to something else to make a living.

Hoping you will interest yourself in this matter, I am,

Yours truly,

PAUL STRINER.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., July 8, 1921.

HON. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
United States Senator from California,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The almond industry of California, representing an investment of over \$50,000,000, is at stake on the issue of the tariff legislation now before Congress, and to save the growers their means of a livelihood we must get a readjustment of tariff on shelled almonds of at least three to one. Our only future market is for shelled almonds, which represents 80 per cent of the demand of the United States. Only with proper protection on shelled almonds can the California growers market their product without a loss.

European almonds shell out four to one, and California almonds three to one. We are entitled therefore to a tariff on shelled almonds three times as great as on almonds in the shell, and we want a 5-cent tariff on unshelled almonds and a 15-cent tariff on the shelled product.

Please use your influence to obtain this adjustment in the present bill before Congress and save one of California's principal industries.

Yours very truly,

A. B. USHER,
1321 Twenty-third Street, Sacramento, Calif.

Orchard located in Arbuckle District.

DUNNIGAN, CALIF., July 8, 1921.

SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As an almond grower I am taking the liberty of writing you regarding tariff on almonds.

What the growers want is a tariff of 5 cents on unshelled almonds and 15 cents on shelled almonds. Any effort you may make to obtain this tariff will be appreciated by every almond grower.

Yours sincerely,

A. E. AMADEN,

CHICO, CALIF., July 8, 1921.

Senator SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: I beg that you will use all your influence to obtain a raise in the tariff rate on almonds recommended by the Ways and Means Committee.

Anything less than 5 cents per pound on unshelled or 15 cents on shelled would be ruinous to our orchards here. Please do everything possible to get this rate for us.

Very truly yours,

HARRIET LOSEE.

PALO ALTO, CALIF., July 8, 1921.

Senator S. M. SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.:

Being interested in almond raising in this State, I think it is necessary that the tariff on almonds should be 5 cents on unshelled and 15 cents on shelled ones.

Mrs. L. H. HAY,
744 Waverly Street.

MODESTO, CALIF., July 8, 1921.

Senator S. M. SHORTRIDGE.

MY DEAR SIR: As an almond grower I am very much interested in the tariff that we are very anxious should be put through. We can't possibly make ends meet if we don't get at least a 5-cent tariff on unshelled and a 15-cent tariff on shelled almonds. Will you kindly do all you can do for us, and we will surely appreciate it?

Yours very respectfully,

C. W. McEWEN,
Route A, Box 145.

CHICO, CALIF., July 8, 1921.

HON. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In the interests of almond growers of California, of which I am one, I would impress on your mind that we need better protection against foreign importations of almonds than we have at present, at least a tariff of 5 cents on unshelled almonds and a 15-cent tariff on the shelled product.

Respectfully,

D. K. CORNELL.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., July 7, 1921.

HON. SAMUEL SHORTRIDGE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

As a grower we insist on a minimum rate of 15 cents on shelled almonds. Industry facing ruin if not properly protected. United action of all California Representatives essential.

A. ANDRE,
T. BERTINSEN,
L. SEGELHORST,
239 California Street.

SAN JOSE, CALIF., July 8, 1921.

HON. SAMUEL SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR SHORTRIDGE: As an almond grower of California, I would call to your attention the tariff bill which the Ways and Means Committee has recommended to Congress. The bill is now on the floor of the House of Representatives. This bill provides a tariff of 4 cents on unshelled almonds and 8 cents on shelled almonds per pound.

It is indeed of vital importance to every almond grower of the State that a tariff be passed with at least 5 cents on unshelled nuts and 15 cents on the shelled. The California Almond Growers' Exchange petitioned for this rate.

It is inevitable that unless the American almond grower be protected with a higher tariff than is recommended by the Ways and Means Committee that his industry will absolutely fail. He can not compete with the Mediterranean, who can, with the tariff rates recommended by the Ways and Means Committee, harvest his crop, pay this low tariff, and make a gain. The American can not even harvest his crop at the prices thus made possible.

So you see, Senator SHORTRIDGE, it is imperative that the higher tariff as recommended by the growers themselves be passed.

I can assure you that any service you can render or any of your influence used to help the passage of this bill with a higher tariff will be greatly appreciated by each and every almond grower in the State of California.

Sincerely,

THOS. E. RAYNER.

Route C, Box 167, Monterey Road, San Jose, Calif.

SOLEDAD, CALIF., July 8, 1921.

SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As a California almond grower, I appeal to you to do all in your power to further the petition of the California Almond Growers' Exchange for a tariff of 5 cents on almonds not shelled and on shelled almonds 15 cents.

Without such protection from the European market, this great California industry will be practically ruined.

Yours very truly,

F. V. GILCHRIST.

MARTINEZ, CALIF., July 8, 1921.

HON. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: As an owner of 30 acres of almonds, I herewith appeal to you to use your power and influence to secure a 5-cent duty on unshelled almonds and a 15-cent duty (per pound) on shelled almonds entering this country.

Without this protection the investment of thousands of California almond growers is ruined. We raised our crop last season at a loss and the situation now appears desperate.

May we not have protection commensurate with the standards of American living and costs of production?

Very truly yours,

MAURICE H. ROWELL.

YUBA CITY, CALIF., July 8, 1921.

SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Since European almonds shell out four to one and California almonds three to one, our members are entitled to a tariff on shelled almonds at least three times as great as on almonds in the shell. Unless we get a readjustment of tariff on shelled almonds of at least three to one, it will mean the disintegration of the almond industry of California. Our only future market is for shelled almonds, which represents 80 per cent of the demand of the United States. This is a serious situation confronting the industry. Only by proper protection on shelled almonds can we bring to California the millions that are going to the shores of the Mediterranean. Now, we Californians want at least a 5-cent tariff on unshelled almonds and a 15-cent tariff on the shelled product.

Yours respectfully,

E. G. VAN ARSDALE.

JULY 8, 1921.

HON. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE.

DEAR SIR: In regard to the tariff on almonds, I would ask you to work for 5 cents on unshelled and 15 cents on shelled almonds.

Thanking you for what you can do for us, I remain,

Your friend,

J. C. OSBORN, Corning, Calif.

SAN FRANCISCO, July 9, 1921.

HON. SAM SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I take the liberty of writing to you in regard to a higher tariff on almonds. I am the owner of a 16-acre orchard near Esparto, Yolo County. Only a part of last year's crop sold, on account of cheap foreign almonds. I think a tariff of 5 cents on unshelled almonds and 15 cents on the shelled is necessary to save our orchards.

Thanking you for any interest taken in this matter, I remain,

Respectfully yours,

F. M. CORNELL, 1790 Larkin.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., July 8, 1921.

Senator SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: To assist in indicating to you the sentiment of the almond growers of California, the undersigned grower begs to add his indorsement to the petition presented by the growers to the Ways and Means Committee through the medium of the California Almond Growers' Exchange for a tariff of 5 cents on unshelled and 15 cents on shelled product.

Convinced that a lower tariff than that represented by the figures mentioned will result in the ultimate disintegration of this important California industry, we feel that we may justly solicit your hearty co-

operation and enthusiastic support to the end that the necessary protection may be obtained.

Your assistance will be appreciated.

Very respectfully,

LINTON HART,
252 Central Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., July 8, 1921.

MR. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

TO THE HONORABLE MR. SHORTRIDGE: The writer is engaged in growing almonds in the Atascadero district, San Luis Obispo County, Calif.

We have now nearly 400 acres in various stages of growth and development. The oldest are 6 years of age, just coming into commercial bearing. The returns last year on our almonds were barely enough to cover harvesting and marketing expenses, leaving the grower absolutely nothing for his labor and expenses. On the Mediterranean shores they pay 15 to 20 cents per day for labor, while we are paying \$4 to \$5 per day and other expenses in proportion.

If we are to continue in the almond industry in the United States, we should have at least a duty of 5 cents per pound on unshelled almonds and 15 cents per pound on shelled almonds.

Respectfully submitted.

WILLIAM BRIER,
711 Pacific Finance Building.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., July 8, 1921.

HON. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As a grower of almonds, I would respectfully ask that you do all in your power to secure an amendment to the proposed tariff on almonds, especially on shelled almonds.

As it takes 3 pounds of almonds in the shell in this country to make 1 pound of almond meats, I respectfully submit to you that the tariff on shelled almonds should be at least three times as great as on almonds in the shell, and unless we get adequate tariff, especially on shelled almonds, it will mean that we are prevented from participating in the benefits of the shelled almond market, which represents 80 per cent of the consumption of almonds in the United States.

Unless we do secure an adequate tariff from the Congress our industry, representing an investment of approximately \$50,000,000, is facing ruin, and I therefore respectfully ask you as a Californian to do everything in your power to secure a tariff on shelled almonds at least three times as great as on almonds in the shell in the protection of this California industry. Anything you may be able to do to assist the almond growers of California will be thoroughly appreciated not only by myself but by the 4,000 almond growers of the State of California.

Yours very truly,

C. LARSEN,
751 Tenth Avenue, San Francisco.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., July 8, 1921.

Senator SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I want to ask that you use your strongest efforts in the matter of the present tariff bill now pending before your House to secure proper and adequate protection for California almonds.

The California almond industry represents a livelihood to several thousand families and several thousand other people dependent upon its continuation.

It represents an investment of approximately \$50,000,000, and this industry is seriously jeopardized under the present competition with European almonds.

The California Almond Growers' Exchange, which represents the great majority of the California almond growers and which has been one of the pioneers in cooperative marketing of farm crops, has recommended a tariff of 5 cents a pound on unshelled almonds and 15 cents a pound on shelled almonds.

We are vitally interested in this tariff, as we individually represent the owners and growers of over 2,000 acres of almond orchards, and we trust that you will do everything in your power to secure the tariff represented by the exchange, to wit: Five cents per pound on almonds not shelled and 15 cents per pound on shelled almonds.

We feel that this tariff is necessary and absolutely essential for the continuation and protection of the \$50,000,000 almond industry in California.

As a Californian we feel that you have the best interest of this State at heart, and we shall appreciate whatever you can do in securing and fighting for the tariff protection requested.

Thanking you in advance,

Yours truly,

GEO. X. FLEMING.

RANCHO DE EL CAPITAN,
RIO LINDA, SACRAMENTO COUNTY, CALIF., July 8, 1921.

HON. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As the almond growers of California will surely be up against it with a tariff less than 5 cents on unshelled almonds and 15 cents on shelled almonds we would surely appreciate it if you would do all within your power to fight for the above tariff. If the 4 and 8 cent tariff goes through, I know that the California almond grower may as well grub out all of his trees and let the land lay idle, for he will be as far ahead as trying to grow almonds with an inadequate tariff.

Knowing that your past record has always been for the best interests of California I feel assured that you will do all within your power and see that the almond growers get a fair deal.

Thanking you, I remain,

Very truly yours,

CAPT. H. A. LEWALD,
Box 1203, Motor Route A.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., July 8, 1921.

Senator SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am the owner of 62 acres of producing California almond orchard land, which under normal conditions should have a valuation of \$21,500. Last year the crop income from this property was insufficient to pay for the care, much less give any return on the investment. This property was planted under conditions and has

since received the care such that I should expect now a reasonable interest on my investment. These are not normal times, and unless protection is afforded against the importation of almonds produced with underpaid labor under conditions with which we here are unable to compete I shall be obliged to uproot my almond trees and turn my attention to the production of other crops.

My position is the same as that of all the other almond growers of California, and I trust that we shall receive from you every assistance possible in securing protection for this California industry. The tax on shelled almonds should be at least three times that on unshelled almonds, and the rates proposed by the California Almond Growers' Exchange—i. e., at least 5 cents for the one and 15 cents for the other—are absolutely necessary to save the industry. We shall watch with interest and concern your activities in our behalf.

Very truly yours,

EVERETT N. BRYAN.

OAKDALE, CALIF., July 8, 1921.

SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I understand the Ways and Means Committee has recommended to Congress a tariff of 4 cents on unshelled almonds and 8 cents on shelled. This is entirely inadequate. We can not meet foreign competition unless we get 15 cents on shelled and 5 cents on nuts in the shell.

We will be driven out of business unless you can assist us in getting this protection to our industry in this State.

Yours truly,

WALTER J. STOLP.

TURLOCK, CALIF., July 8, 1921.

Senator SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Ways and Means Committee have recommended a tariff of 4 cents per pound on almonds in the shell and 8 cents per pound on shelled almonds. The almond growers of California, through the California Almond Growers' Exchange, have asked for a tariff of 5 cents unshelled and 15 cents shelled. This is not an unreasonable request, and much thought and time was consumed in arriving at these figures, and I believe that 5 cents and 15 cents is the minimum tariff required to protect the almond industry from the lower freight rates and the peasant competition of the south of Europe countries.

Kindly use your utmost endeavors to help secure the requested tariff.

Very truly yours,

R. K. SMITH.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., July 8, 1921.

HON. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I will not take up your valuable time with a long-winded letter, but will ask you to do all you can for us almond growers out here in the golden West.

We are not asking for a very lot, but just a living chance with our products.

We feel that we should have at least a tariff of 5 cents on unshelled almonds and 15 cents on shelled.

Many of us have our savings tied up in almond orchards that are bearing or just beginning to bear, and we trust you will do all in your power to help us out.

Thanking you for all you can do for us in this matter, and all of us trust you can do a great deal,

I remain,

Yours very truly,

A. VAN HOYT,
2221 California Street.

We represent an investment of \$50,000,000 in almond orchards and almond-shelling machinery.

ANTELOPE, CALIF., July 7, 1921.

Senator S. M. SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Kindly help us almond growers out and keep us from ruin by advocating tariff of 6 cents on unshelled and 15 cents on shelled nuts.

We are still holding part of 1919 and 1920 crop with 1921 crop on trees. You will appreciate our situation.

Protect us from cheap Spanish labor and oblige,

Sincerely, a grower,

I. E. EMERSON.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., July 7, 1921.

HON. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE.

DEAR SIR: I appeal to you to please help to give the almond growers of California better protection against foreign nuts imported. I bought 20 acres three years ago. They are just coming into bearing and hoped they would later help make a living, but under present proposed tariff my place will be a practical loss to me, as well as thousands who have invested their savings will lose also.

Respectfully,

Dr. C. E. FENNER.

LOS GATOS, SANTA CLARA COUNTY, CALIF., July 7, 1921.

HON. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am very much concerned about the almond industry of California. Our growers can not compete with the Mediterranean shores unless at least a 5-cent tariff on the unshelled product and a 15-cent tariff on the shelled product is secured. I hope we may have your active cooperation and assistance now for the good of our growers.

Very truly,

Dr. A. J. GERLACH,

Glenridge Heights, R. 1, Box 37.

VACAVILLE, CALIF., July 7, 1921.

HON. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR SHORTRIDGE: I planted an almond orchard 26 years ago. It has proved a bad investment, because of the great expense of harvesting the nuts which have to be sold in competition with Europe's cheap almonds. The only reason why I have not dug up my trees is because I have believed my Government would give the

almond industry in the United States an adequate protective tariff. We need a tariff on shelled nuts three times as great as on almonds in the shell.

Yours very truly,

HESTER X. HARRISON.

HAMILTON CITY, CALIF., July 7, 1921.

Mr. SAMUEL SHORTRIDGE.

DEAR SIR: Being an extensive almond grower, am asking you to give us a tariff of 5 cents on unshelled almonds and 15 cents on shelled almonds, as we can not compete with the foreign trade at the present rates.

Every cent I have in the world is invested in this orchard and on account of not realizing much of anything on the crops the last two years, am not able to keep up any part of my expenses, let alone pay off a mortgage and support an invalid son and an orphan child, which I have adopted. Under the circumstances, I am sure you do not want myself and hundreds of others to lose their homes to allow foreigners to prosper on our territory.

Thank you.

MRS. ADA WEST.

OAKLEY, CALIF., July 7, 1921.

Hon. Senator SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE.

DEAR SIR: I am very much interested in this tariff business. Please see to it that a 5-cent tariff is put on all unshelled almonds and 15-cent tariff on all shelled. If you don't it is going to work such a hardship on us.

Please give this your immediate attention and oblige.

M. E. CADWELL.

ARBUCKLE, CALIF., July 7, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As an almond grower of this State I am writing to ask that you favor at least a 5-cent tariff on unshelled almonds and at least a 15-cent tariff on the shelled product.

This is very vital to the industry in this State, as we will be unable to compete with the European market if a less duty is imposed.

Trusting that you will give this matter your favorable attention, I am,

Very truly yours,

C. F. HAMMER.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., July 7, 1921.

To the Hon. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senator, Washington, D. C.:

As a citizen of the United States and a resident of California, I humbly request you use your best efforts to obtain a tariff for the almond industry of California of at least 5 cents on unshelled almonds and 15 cents on shelled almonds.

I am only one of hundreds of wage earners in California who for the past several years have invested practically all our savings in a small piece of land, and planting same to almonds, with the expectation of deriving a reasonable income from same. And now, when our orchards are just on the verge of repaying us, we can not compete with the cheap European product, and unless we can secure the above tariff our years of hard work and saving have gone for naught. I am,

Respectfully yours,

OSCAR N. NELSON,
2110 L Street, Sacramen'to, Calif.

OAKLEY, CALIF., July 7, 1921.

SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As an almond grower I request your office to kindly use your utmost efforts in behalf of the almond growers of California in securing a 5 cents per pound protective tariff on almonds in the shell and a 15 cents per pound tariff on almonds that are shelled. I have a 25-acre farm of almonds, and as I derive a living for myself and family through the marketing of this product, I sincerely hope you will be able to help in getting this tariff through, as the almond growers of California have suffered badly in the last two years in not being able to market their almonds.

Respectfully,

F. P. MILET,
Oakley, Calif., R. F. D. Box 54.

CHICO, CALIF., July 6, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL SHORTRIDGE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As an almond grower of California I am appealing to you that you and the others representing California in Washington do your utmost to preserve the almond industry to our great State.

Sincerely,

ELMO ARCHER.

WINTERS, CALIF., July 5, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I don't know whether a Senator can help along any House actions or not, but if you can would like to have you work for a 5-cent unshelled and 15-cent shelled tariff on almonds.

Some of us here, and I suppose it is the same in other parts of the State, are having all we can do to hang on and save our places. With \$30,000 invested, I am continually running behind in spite of every economy I can use. When it comes to Senate know you will do your part.

Yours truly,

R. M. ROBERTS,
R. F. D. No. 1, Box A 55.

CHICO, CALIF., July 1, 1921.

Hon. SAMUEL SHORTRIDGE,
United States Senator from California, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: When you spoke here in Chico I had the pleasure of introducing you to your audience and in so doing laid particular emphasis on the fact that through the election of a Republican Senator we of this district would be more apt to be protected in our almond industry by having a tariff placed on the imported almond. This was the argument made throughout this district, but on reading the dis-

patches this morning I discover that the proposed tariff on almonds is limited to 4 cents a pound.

Such a figure is absolutely valueless, and almonds might just as well be put on the free list. I am an almond grower myself, and while I am not looking for any extortionate profit, I do believe that we are entitled to a reasonable return upon our investment.

In order to keep the industry alive in California we must have a tariff of 5 cents on unshelled almonds and 15 cents on shelled almonds.

Recently the growers, through their association, erected a factory in Sacramento for the purpose of shelling almonds. At present most of the shelled product comes from Spain, where the work is done by hand under conditions which I am given to understand are far from sanitary. We growers handling a food product decided to put up a clean product for consumption, but it is a foregone conclusion that if the present tariff rate goes through we might as well close our factory and stop further developments on work in connection with the almond in California.

I write this special letter to you, as this was a special argument raised by us in this last campaign against Phelan. The campaign promises of the Republican Party were for a higher tariff, but it appears to me that California products always seem to get it in the neck when it comes down to a matter of tariff.

If the Republican Party can not protect California products through a tariff, then that party might just as well expect to see California go Democratic again. There is a wave of feeling throughout this section of the country and through all the almond-growing districts against the proposed tariff. The growers have labored for years bringing the industry to a paying basis in developing their orchards and finding out what particular species thrive best in California. This can only be done after many years of patience, labor, and expenditure of money.

Now that the almond orchards are coming into bearing we are confronted with a situation which makes our work and expenditure absolutely futile.

In my campaign for the Republican Party I have been repeatedly opposed by nominal Republicans who make the declaration that the Republican high tariff policy is no good to California, because the Republican Party never applies it here. This proposed tariff gives truth to the claim, and frankly, I must say, it takes the heart out of us who are trying to keep the party alive in the State.

Please do not run away with the idea that this is a matter of a few growers protesting. The industry is a well established one and its loss will mean much to the wealth of the State of California.

I am writing to you with the request that you do your very best in protecting your constituents in this regard.

Very truly yours,

HARRY DAVIDS.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President, I must beg the pardon of the Senate for having consumed so much of its time.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will pardon me, but I would like to ask one or two questions about the California almond business.

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

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I yield.

Mr. SIMMONS. I would like to have the Senator inform us, because I think it is an important point in connection with the question, what per cent of the almond crop marketed in the United States is shelled and what per cent is unshelled.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I think that has been stated.

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not think it has been stated. If it has been stated by anyone I have not heard it.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I think it is in the Record. I do not recall accurately, but I know that up to a comparatively recent day there has been a very small output of shelled almonds from California.

Mr. SIMMONS. I think the Senator is correct about that.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Yes. I was going to add that it is perfectly well known that the imported shelled almonds are shelled in the most primitive way.

Mr. SIMMONS. They are shelled by hand.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Yes; they are shelled by hand and by those who work for just enough to enable them to breathe and exist.

In other words, I do not call it pauper labor, I call it poorly paid, unhappy labor; but be that as it may, the methods are primitive. In California we can no more engage in that method than the Senator could in his own great and good State. Wherefore we have built in Sacramento an expensive—I think fully \$300,000 it has cost—factory for the shelling of almonds. It can be done. Given, as we claim, the protection we ask, we can shell almonds and enter very greatly into the market of shelled almonds. Hitherto our output of shelled almonds has been limited. The great amount has been imported. We can shell almonds. We can enter into the market and we can give work and employment, and to that extent we will, of course, increase vastly our output not only of shelled almonds, but it will develop further the industry itself. I do not know that I have sufficiently answered the Senator.

Mr. SIMMONS. The fact is that up to this time, by reason of the fact that they have not been able to shell almonds by machinery, they have not put the shelled almonds upon the market to any considerable extent.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. That, I think, may be admitted.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator said they are providing a great plant for the purpose of shelling almonds by machinery. If that plant is successful—and I suppose that matter has been

investigated, and it has been conclusively determined that it will be a successful operating plant—

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mechanically, yes.

Mr. SIMMONS. When that happens, when California finds herself in the position where she can shell almonds by machinery probably the labor cost of shelling almonds in this country would be less than the labor cost of shelling them by hand anywhere else in the world, would it not?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I think not. Shelling by machinery here presumably would be much cheaper than shelling by hand here. However, that is but one element of the cost.

Mr. SIMMONS. Is there anything that can be done now, and is being done now successfully with machinery which can be done anywhere else as cheaply by hand labor? For instance, is there anywhere in the world that a shoe can be made by hand labor as cheaply as it can be made in this country by machinery? Is there anywhere in the world that a pair of stockings can be knit by hand as cheaply as by machinery in this country? Would the Senator contend that if we could provide suitable and efficient machinery for shelling almonds we could not, with that machinery, shell them at a less labor cost than they could be shelled for anywhere else in the world or even here by hand?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. May I answer in a word, having regard to the cost abroad and those engaged in the shelling of almonds abroad, that I can not imagine there could be any process, even by machinery, having regard to the cost of machinery and maintenance and labor employed, which would be as low or as little as is paid abroad.

Mr. SIMMONS. But those people have to live. They can not do it for nothing. It may take 100 people, shelling by hand, to shell as many almonds as one man could shell with a machine in a day. Those 100 people may be paid a very small wage each, but all the 100, if they live at all, would have to receive enough to equal the wages of the one man who operated the machine.

If the Senator will pardon me, in some sections of Europe, I think, even to this day they cut their wheat and their rye and their oats with the old hand scythe. In this country we cut those products by machinery. Would the Senator contend for a moment that the labor of Europe or anywhere in the world was so low as compared with American labor that they could cut wheat at a less labor cost with the old hand scythe than we could cut it here with our highly improved machinery?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I suppose the Senator is entirely familiar with conditions prevailing in practically all of the European States or the Asiatic countries, as well as conditions prevailing in our own country. In a little, limited area of wheat growing in a little, secluded valley in the Balkans it may be that a poorly fed and clothed Rumanian might cut the grain at a given 5 cents a day. It might be that upon a great wheat field in Montana they could cut the grain at a given price. But when we compare the style of living, the clothes, the food, the carpets on the floor, the pictures on the walls, the music, the schoolhouse, the church, the newspaper—when we compare American conditions with conditions prevailing abroad, I am sure the Senator does not wish to reduce us to the conditions prevailing there.

Mr. SIMMONS. No; I am simply trying to show to the Senator and to the country that where almonds are shelled by hand in one country and shelled by highly efficient machinery in another country the wage paid the laborer for the shelling by hand is not comparable to the wage paid the laborer for the shelling by machinery, and that the wage paid in the two cases is no index whatever of the ultimate cost of production. In other words, in cases of that sort we can not take the wage paid for the purpose of making a comparison of the cost of production, because we may have 100 hands engaged in shelling almonds for a whole day, but they would not shell as many almonds in a whole day as the one man operating a machine would shell in the same length of time. We can not compare, therefore, the wage paid to each one of those 100 men shelling by hand with the wage paid the one man shelling by machinery. I think that is about the way the Senator has reached his conclusion that the shelled almonds must have a duty about 300 per cent higher than the duty on unshelled almonds, because he has estimated that there will be an immense difference in the cost of shelling almonds in the foreign country and the cost of shelling almonds in this country when he begins to shell almonds in this country, which he has not begun to do yet.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Oh, yes; we have. It is conceded on all hands that the ratio abroad is as 4 to 1, but it is now proved that in America the ratio is as 3 to 1. The difference between shelled and unshelled was stated in the figures brought out. That is admitted on all hands. With respect to the other House, that was the mistake which the House made in taking the ratio as 1 to 4. The Senate committee puts it as 1 to 3.

Mr. SIMMONS. But let us keep to the concrete proposition. Does the Senator contend that the labor cost of shelling almonds by machinery will be as great as the labor cost of shelling them by hand?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. There are various elements to be taken into account—the capital invested, the amount of output, the number of employees, and so forth—and it is very difficult to compare the cost abroad with a given cost in California. There are many elements that enter into it, but it seems to me—not only seems, but I am very sure—that the calculations of those familiar with the whole subject are correct, namely, that if it be necessary, as claimed, to have a 5-cent duty on the unshelled almond as it is picked from the tree and cured or made ready for market, there is a necessity for three times that rate for the shelled almond.

Mr. SIMMONS. Is that because of the higher cost of shelling here as against the cost abroad?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. It is one of the elements that enters into it, naturally.

Mr. SIMMONS. And the Senator thinks after they get their machinery at work out in California the difference in the labor cost will be so great as to justify this high differential?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Unquestionably. I do so contend.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator does admit, however, that up to this time there has been a very limited quantity of shelled almonds placed upon the American market?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Yes; though, of course, "limited" is a relative term.

Mr. SIMMONS. I want to ask the Senator now if at this time there are any domestic shelled almonds held for the market in this country?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I think there are.

Mr. SIMMONS. I find in one of the telegrams which I put into the RECORD the other day, to which the Senator from California has referred, a statement to the effect that the association in California which controls the sale of almonds have no goods for delivery. The telegram asks the question:

Why should Representatives vote for such an increase when the California Almond Growers' Exchange can not even deliver goods?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. The almonds may now be in the hands of brokers or local houses here in the East.

Mr. SIMMONS. Then I find a statement made in another one of these telegrams to the effect that a very small proportion of shelled almonds which are produced in this country are used by the manufacturers of candies, and for the reason that they are not so desirable, that the public does not like the almonds which grow in California, that the imported almond is much preferable. I find this in a statement from the New England Confectionery Co.:

We are speaking now of shelled almonds and walnuts, and not nuts in the shell. Why should we manufacturers be forced to pay such an increase when the total amount of almonds shelled in California yearly would not supply two of our manufacturers in this country for one and one-half days?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Just a word.

Mr. SIMMONS. The statement which I have just read is from the New England Confectionery Co., and is to the effect that the total amount of California shelled almonds at the present time would not supply two of the great candy manufacturing concerns in this country for two days.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I may in a word reply to the last thought suggested by the Senator from North Carolina. There are always two arguments advanced in opposition to the almond industry—first, that we can not produce almonds in quantity; second, that we can not produce in quality. Our position is that, given adequate protection, we can produce in quantity sufficient and, beyond all controversy, that we can produce in quality. If there were an embargo to-day, established by law or created by war, we should find the New England candy men crying out for almonds from California, and there would be no objection whatever to them on the score of quality.

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not desire to discuss that question with the Senator from California, because I know nothing about it. I simply know what the manufacturers of confections have stated in their telegrams. If we should impose this duty of 15 cents a pound on shelled almonds which are imported into this country, we should have this situation—and I want to hold the Senator to it and to get his answer to it—with no shelled almonds of American production on the market and none for delivery, all the shelled almonds would have to come from abroad and would have to pay the 15 cents duty until the almond growers in California were prepared to supply shelled almonds.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. We shall get them in California very speedily.

Mr. SIMMONS. If they get them at all they will probably get them rather slowly; they have not the mills yet erected to shell the almonds.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Oh, yes; there is a magnificent mill there for that purpose.

Mr. SIMMONS. Is the mill in operation?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. There is not a wheel turning. Why? Because there is no market.

Mr. SIMMONS. There is no market and there are no almonds.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. We shall have the almonds there to turn the wheels.

Mr. SIMMONS. And yet the Senators from California are asking Congress immediately to impose a duty of 15 cents upon every pound of almonds which is used in this country, when in California they have no almonds ready to be marketed to be protected against the foreign imports.

The Senator from California says that they will have some in the future, but we have got to take that for granted. Would it not be time enough for the Senator to come and ask that this 15 cents duty be imposed upon the almonds after the California producers have some shelled almonds to sell or at least until after they have a reasonable quantity of shelled almonds to put upon the American market?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President, to make an end of my remarks, I answer the Senator from North Carolina by saying that if we should wait until those who believe, as the distinguished Senator from North Carolina believes, we never should have any shelled almonds; we should cease to have any unshelled almonds. Almond growing is in a sense what might be called a new industry with great possibilities. We seek to keep what we have and to increase it. The theories of the Senator from North Carolina and myself differ radically. I hold to the notion expressed here again and again that in California we can produce almonds in quantities which are ample and in quality unexcelled.

Mr. SIMMONS. But the Senator—

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Just let me finish the thought. As to the theory, whether it be that of Cobden or Hamilton, Washington or Calhoun, we may differ, but we are not discussing that question now. We simply come here and say that under present conditions we can not compete with the cheaply produced unshelled or shelled almonds of Europe, and it is for us legislators to determine whether we shall maintain an American industry which will serve to bring about competition with the imported article, and at the same time add to the prosperity of State and Nation, or whether we shall abandon an American industry and again become dependent upon the foreign industry, which will speedily become a monopoly over which we shall have no control. Let us as to this and all our industries stand up for America.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I think the almond industry in the Senator's State has been prospering pretty well up to this time. I do not think any money has been lost in California in the almond business. The lands cultivated in almonds are, as I understand, valued at about \$500 an acre. There is no evidence that the almond industry up to this time has not been prosperous, at least as well as any other industry, certainly any other agricultural industry. The almond growers have been selling in considerable quantities shelled almonds, but have been finding a ready market for their unshelled almonds. I have heard no complaint on that ground. They do not seem to have a large quantity of either shelled or unshelled almonds on hand. The truth is there is not and never has been any considerable demand in the markets of this country for the California shelled almonds, partly for the reason that the California shelled almonds do not seem to keep so well as the shelled almonds grown abroad, partly for the reason that it is said to contain more pulp and therefore not so desirable for the purpose of making confections as is the foreign almond. There has been no market for the domestic shelled almond, and, because there has been no market for them, they have not been shelled.

Senators need not tell me that in America, with all of our initiative and with all of our energy, if the almond growers of California could have found a market for their shelled almonds they would not have long ago provided ample up-to-date machinery and put it in operation for the purpose of shelling their almonds. In this situation, if we should adopt the Senate committee amendment and impose the duty proposed, it would be the first time in my knowledge of tariff making that we imposed a high duty such as this—for this is a very high duty, being 275 per cent higher than the rate in the present law and 150 per cent higher than the Payne-Aldrich rate—for the purpose of protecting an American product, when it was disclosed in the argument there was not any of the product sought to be protected on sale in the American market. We

are asked to provide this rate of duty simply upon the theory that if we will impose it possibly in the future they will be produced.

Mr. President, if we impose this duty under such circumstances we can not do it for the purpose of protection, because there is nothing to protect. Almonds have been raised in California, I presume, for 25 or 30 years, and yet the industry has no shelled almonds on the market to-day, according to the telegram from which I have quoted, and there is no American product to be protected. Therefore, Mr. President, if we impose it, for the present, at any rate, it will be a pure revenue duty and not a protective duty, and I think not only for the present but for a long time in the future. Even if the almond growers of California are successful in their shelling processes and in the expansion of their business, it will be a long time before they will be able to supply even a small part of the demand of the country for the unshelled almonds.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me, it is not necessary for our argument or for our position for me to add that, speaking for myself, I hold to the theory that if it is possible to develop an American industry in the State of the Senator from North Carolina or in the State of my friend from Mississippi, if it is possible to develop an industry whereby the people of the several States may have profitable employment I would impose a tariff duty on the imported product. Why? In order that an industry might be developed so that we would not become dependent upon the foreigner. In the end the prices would be no greater. I challenge the learning of my friend from North Carolina to point out in this country where, after we have developed an American industry, the cost of the product is more than when we were formerly dependent upon the imported article.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I am not going to enter upon a discussion of the rudimentary principles of the tariff as understood and enunciated by the other side. I am discussing this case upon the facts, and I am attempting to show that, according to the facts, even from the standpoint of the Republican theory, there is no present ground for a duty, especially a duty of the proportions proposed. In the telegrams of which the Senator has spoken and in connection with which he has taken occasion to say some very delightful things about me for which I wish to thank him, the statement is made that the 15-cent duty upon shelled almonds will be practically prohibitory; that the consuming public will not stand the prices that the confectioners will have to charge for this class of sweets if they shall have to pay the proposed high rates of duty for the foreign product, there being no domestic product which they can buy, and therefore they are compelled to buy the foreign product.

Under the theory which the Senator has just invoked I do not recall any instance where any industry has come and asked us to give it in the very beginning, in the very initiation, a prohibitive duty to protect an industry that does not exist in the United States; and practically the industry of shelled almonds does not exist in the United States. Although you have been in the almond business for 25 or 30 years, multiplying each year your acreage, the shelled-almond industry does not exist. You have no goods to-day which you could deliver to these candy producers if they demanded them of you, so that they must necessarily pay these high rates of duty while you are developing your industry—an industry that practically does not now exist—and you can not give us any reasonable information as to how long it is going to take you to supply a reasonable percentage of the demand of the American consumers of shelled almonds. You do not know yourselves. It depends upon the growth of your trees; it depends upon the success of your newly installed shelling machines; it depends upon a great many contingencies, all in the future.

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

Mr. SIMMONS. Therefore—if the Senator will pardon me one minute—I say that if this duty be imposed at this time it can not be for the purpose of protection, because there is nothing to protect. It must be for the purpose of revenue; and does the Senator want to impose for revenue purposes a duty that the consumers of the product say will be prohibitive?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. In the first place, it would be justified as a revenue measure.

Mr. SIMMONS. If it is prohibitive?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. In the second place, it would not be prohibitive; and in the third place, according to the Senator's argument, this industry never would grow, never would develop, and we would forever be dependent upon the foreigner.

Mr. SIMMONS. I did not say that. What I have said is that when an industry in contemplation, in anticipation, comes

and asks for protection before it becomes a reality, before it is brought into being, it at least ought not to ask for a prohibitive duty. It ought to be satisfied with a very moderate duty until it does get into existence. That is the point I am making. The point I am making is that you have no unshelled-almond industry, and you are asking us to give you a duty to foster an industry that if it exists at all is in swaddling clothes, and you want a prohibitive duty to begin with. Out of those many telegrams that you speak about, presented by me, I think nearly a fourth of them say that the duty will be absolutely prohibitive.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. The trees are in existence, the factory is in existence, the men and women are in existence, the soil is in existence, the sunlight of heaven is in existence, and the moon showers down her silver; so that this industry is in existence—in esse and not in futuro.

Mr. SIMMONS. The industry exists, but the marketable usufruct of the industry is wanting. There is no usufruct on the market or in existence to supply in whole or part the daily demand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the committee.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I ask for the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered, and the reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FERNALD (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES] to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. SWANSON (when Mr. GLASS'S name was called). I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. GLASS] is detained from the Senate on account of sickness. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. HARRISON (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before, I vote "nay."

Mr. NEW (when his name was called). Making the same announcement of the transfer of my pair as on a previous roll call, I vote "yea."

Mr. POMERENE (when his name was called). Again announcing my pair for the day with my colleague [Mr. WILLIS] I find that I can transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK], which I do, and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as on the last vote as to my pair and its transfer, I vote "yea."

Mr. UNDERWOOD (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. WARREN (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] to the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. NEWBERRY], and will let that transfer stand for the day. I vote "yea."

Mr. WATSON of Indiana (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before, I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.
Mr. BALL. Transferring my pair with the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], I vote "yea."

Mr. TRAMMELL. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] to the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce that the Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] is detained on official business.

I have been requested to announce the following pairs:
The Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS];

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN]; and

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. ERNST] with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY].

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 17, as follows:

YEAS—39.

Ashurst	Frelinghuysen	McCormick	Poindexter
Ball	Gooding	McCumber	Rawson
Borah	Hale	McKinley	Shortridge
Broussard	Harreld	McLean	Smoot
Bursum	Johnson	McNary	Spencer
Cameron	Jones, Wash.	New	Sterling
Capper	Kellogg	Nicholson	Sutherland
Curtis	Kendrick	Norbeck	Warren
Fernald	Keyes	Oddie	Watson, Ind.
France	Ladd	Phipps	

NAYS—17.

Caraway	King	Shields	Walsh, Mass.
Dial	La Follette	Simmons	Walsh, Mont.
Harris	Lenroot	Swanson	
Harrison	Pomerene	Trammell	
Hedra	Sheppard	Underwood	

NOT VOTING—40.

Brandegee	Ernst	Nelson	Robinson
Calder	Fletcher	Newberry	Smith
Colt	Gerry	Norris	Stanfield
Crow	Glass	Overman	Stanley
Culberson	Hitchcock	Owen	Townsend
Cummins	Jones, N. Mex.	Page	Wadsworth
Dillingham	Lodge	Pepper	Watson, Ga.
du Pont	McKellar	Pittman	Weller
Edge	Moses	Ransdell	Williams
Elkins	Myers	Reed	Willis

So the amendment of the committee was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that paragraph 758 be now taken up for consideration.

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

The READING CLERK. On page 111, paragraph 758, on line 1, it is proposed to strike out "2½" and insert "4," so as to read: Walnuts of all kinds, not shelled, 4 cents per pound.

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

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I should prefer, of course, that we might have immediately a vote upon these amendments; but the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] tells me that he desires to present certain facts, and he has suggested that I present the reasons which actuate us in asking these rates. I am very glad, indeed, therefore, to provide him and the other Members of the Senate with a demonstration of the necessity for the rates upon walnuts which have been given in the bill by the Finance Committee.

Walnuts are somewhat unlike almonds. While, of course, it is important that upon both the shelled and the unshelled almonds a tariff should be levied, and while, of course, it is important that upon both shelled and unshelled walnuts a tariff shall be levied, the importance in the two instances perhaps is in inverse order. The essential rate in the almond tariff was the rate upon the shelled almonds, the very important rate upon the unshelled. The essential rate concerning walnuts is upon the unshelled, the very important upon the shelled.

The walnut tariff and the history of the walnut industry illustrate the wisdom and the beneficence of the protective tariff policy. Walnuts are not only a luxury, if you choose to call them such, but walnuts are a food product, and a food product of the very highest value. I think the analyses of walnuts demonstrate that there are more vitamins in the walnut than in almost any other food product. So when we are dealing with the walnut we are dealing not only in what may have been termed, in dealing with the almond, a luxury, but we are dealing with something that we ought to be able to produce in quantity and that we ought to foster and encourage in production because of its very high food value.

The rates which have been accorded to walnuts in the past are as follows: Under the Payne-Aldrich law, 3 cents upon the unshelled walnuts and 5 cents upon the shelled. In the Underwood bill it was 2 cents and 4 cents. In the bill which passed the House it was 2½ cents and 7½ cents; and in the amendment now before the Senate the rates are fixed at 4 cents and 12 cents.

Ninety per cent of the domestic output of walnuts are unshelled. The domestic production now is about 56,000,000 pounds, and that constitutes 70 per cent of the American consumption of unshelled walnuts. The present investment in the walnut industry is greater than \$110,000,000. The wholesale value annually at the point of production is over \$12,000,000.

There are to-day 89,000 acres of walnuts on the Pacific coast; 64,000 of these are bearing, 25,000 are nonbearing. There is, I may add in passing, enough acreage in the State of California to supply all the world, and the production is increasing on the Pacific coast now at the rate of 100 per cent in every four years.

The walnut is one of the slow bearing of our fruit trees. It does not reach its maturity with the rapidity with which other trees do, and consequently the investment in a walnut grove is greater than in other trees and a longer time elapses before there can be any return upon it.

The walnut grower must spend the best portion of his life in bringing his grove into a profitable bearing state. The tree grows to a very large size, and indeed, from my point of view, it is one of the most beautiful of all the trees we have. To my mind there is no picture quite so charming as is presented by the walnut groves in southern California and in parts of Oregon, groves where the trees are planted symmetrically and where they have grown to full age, with an appearance somewhat like the umbrella tree, but really more beautiful. The spread of a full-bearing tree is fully 50 feet, and there are only 12 to 17 trees planted to the acre.

The walnut, of course, differs very much from annual crops, where the grower can rotate his crop from year to year and abandon his business without loss of any capital investment.

The walnut grower can do nothing of the sort. He of necessity makes a heavy capital investment in the first place, then a heavier capital investment in constantly caring for his grove during the period between planting and profitable bearing. He can not rotate his crop and can only abandon his business at absolute ruin to himself.

As I stated a moment ago, the output of American walnuts for the past 12 years has been doubling on an average every four years, and there is every indication that this ratio of increased production will continue for the next 10 or 12 years. The rapid increase proves that the point of market saturation will be reached within a very brief period, probably the next year or two. The American-grown product will not only be available in sufficient quantities to supply the entire normal consumption of the United States but there will be a large surplus, which will make for competition in the markets so keen as to force prices down to lower levels, regardless even of foreign competition.

Mr. President, these trees are bearing in about 10 years. They reach full bearing in 15 to 25 years. It will be obvious, therefore, that while under the provisions of the Payne-Aldrich law planting began in the State of California and that planting has continued under the provisions of that law, it is only now that the trees bear sufficiently to make the product really an article of commerce.

Exclusive of interest on investment, it costs in this country 15 cents a pound to raise walnuts. The labor cost is 65 per cent of that, or about 10 cents. The labor cost in America in raising walnuts is 10 cents a pound. We come in contact with and we have to meet in competition France and Italy, and in the last two years, perhaps greater than either, or more dangerous and perilous than either, China and the Orient. While our labor cost is 10 cents a pound, the labor cost in France is 2½ cents a pound, the labor cost in Italy is 1 cent a pound, and, from the best available data, the labor cost in China is one-half of 1 cent a pound.

It will be observed, therefore, that the difference in labor costs between America and foreign countries is 7 to 9 cents a pound. The duty that is asked upon the unshelled walnut is less than one-half the difference in the labor cost here and abroad. I want to impress that upon my brethren, because if a tariff should be determined in the fashion the Senator from Massachusetts has stated it ought to be fixed, then there could be no complaint upon his part, or on the part of any of his Democratic colleagues, against the duty that is asked upon this particular product.

In transportation, again we are at a disadvantage. Since 1915 freight has increased 1 cent a pound upon our products. One cent a pound added to what the Payne-Aldrich law gave us, 3 cents a pound, would make the duty now 4 cents a pound, and without considering the additional labor cost, without considering all of the changed conditions which have come in the metamorphosis of the world from the war, thinking only of the increase of 1 cent a pound which has occurred in transportation alone, by the bill under which the orchards were planted, in the main, in California, we would, were it to be enacted again to-day, be given as the very minimum of protection 4 cents per pound, which is all that is here sought.

The foreign freight rate is 80 cents per hundred pounds. The American rate is \$2.40 per hundred pounds. The foreign rate to New York, Boston, Philadelphia, and New Orleans is only 40 cents per hundred pounds from the countries of Europe with which we have to compete with our California raised walnuts. That rate of transportation is only one-sixth of the rate of transportation we are compelled to pay upon our transcontinental roads.

First, therefore, they may raise their walnuts for from 7 to 9 cents a pound more cheaply than we because of labor conditions abroad and at home. Next, they may ship them to the greatest markets there are in this country for one-sixth the sum it costs us to transport our walnuts upon our railroads; and when these things are shown, and they can not be gained, we believe we present a case not only justified and demonstrated but a case which requires and demands imperatively the protection we ask.

It needs no statement of mine to make perfectly apparent that conditions were vastly different when the original rates were fixed under former tariff bills, and those changed conditions, if we acted upon the same theory as was acted upon when former bills were enacted, would give us higher rates than those contained in this bill.

Do you realize, sir, that in 1864 there was a 3-cent duty—a 3-cent duty that was reestablished in 1883, and that that 3-cent duty continued until the Underwood law was passed? So what we are seeking to-day is really nothing new, and is not at all out of proportion; indeed, is less, considering changed condi-

tions, than would have been accorded under the older bills and under the system which was in vogue in the past.

The United States is the largest consuming market of walnuts in the world. Here we consume 80,000,000 pounds annually, and because the United States is the largest consuming market for walnuts we have become the dumping ground of walnuts raised in every country in Europe where there is culture at all, and in the last two years we have become the dumping ground of the Orient, and from China and Manchuria we are being flooded at present with walnuts.

That the walnuts produced in this country are infinitely superior to those produced abroad, I do not think admits of question at all. They are produced in different fashion. We maintain our regular groves in the manner in which I have detailed. They must be irrigated a number of times yearly. The nuts are graded with extraordinary care after they are picked from the trees, and every sanitary condition prevails in the culture of this product in the West, while there is no such care in the production of the walnuts which come from abroad.

The walnut industry found it essential, like most industries of this sort, to market by cooperation, and formed its nonprofit cooperating society in order that it might obtain the very best prices that could be obtained for those who produce the walnut in the first instance.

The Walnut Growers' Association presents indeed as fine a business acumen as any association in the country. It sells at the lowest possible price that it can and it endeavors to bring, of course, some return to its members. There is the slightest spread in this business between the consumer and the producer that there is in any business with which I am familiar. It speaks volumes for the mode of doing business with the walnut growers and the Walnut Growers' Association that they have maintained this slight spread between the producer on the soil and the ultimate consumer throughout the land.

The sales policy of the domestic walnut growers is built up entirely on the theory that quality pays. It has long been recognized by the American walnut producers that domestic consumption can only be increased by furnishing the American consumer with an article that is as near perfect as American ingenuity and skill can make it. For this reason nothing but the very best selected stock is packed under first grades. Domestic shippers are given positive guaranties to the trade that their deliveries will crack 90 per cent perfect. The average of all American-grown shipments for the past several years have cracked 95 per cent perfect.

American producers, in order to avert financial disaster, have made almost superhuman efforts along merchandising lines. For many years prior to the enactment of the Payne-Aldrich bill the American walnut growers were operating at an actual and considerable net loss. During this period many full bearing groves were uprooted and other crops substituted. It was found that the producer was only receiving about one-third of the price charged the consumer for his product. Finally a cooperative, noncapital, nonprofit sales organization was developed, which now markets over 75 per cent of the walnut production of America. Through the efforts of this organization all speculation in the product handled has been eliminated. The number of dealers through whose hands the product formerly passed has been cut in two. The product has been so thoroughly standardized and merchandising methods so highly perfected that the ratio between consumers' cost and producers' selling price has finally been reversed. So to-day the consumer receives an almost perfect product at but 35 per cent advance over what the producer receives, or conversely the producer receives 65 per cent of the consumers' price. The 35 per cent spread between the consumers and producers' price includes all freight charges and both wholesalers and retailers' profits. We believe this margin between producers and consumers' price to be less than that on any other nonperishable product of the soil. This is but one example of the many economies which market conditions have forced upon American producers and no further perceptible savings either along producing or marketing lines can be expected.

The 4 cents per pound duty would make it unprofitable for foreign importers to ship to this country the poorest grades and qualities of walnuts. Therefore the quality of importations would be improved, which, in the long run, would prove of benefit to both the American and foreign producer as well as a source of great satisfaction to the American consumer.

The duty proposed by us would add to the revenue of the United States Treasury approximately \$1,750,000 annually above that yielded by the present rate.

In America the producing of walnuts is a highly specialized business. It is in no way a roadside crop or by-product of the soil as in foreign countries. Over 85 per cent of the American

walnut growers depend exclusively on the production of walnuts for their livelihood and produce no other crop. The cultural methods are as highly developed as those of any fruit-producing industry. To obtain the best results it is necessary for the growers to fertilize annually, irrigate at least three times a year, and cultivate the ground from five to six times each season. It is only the richest land that will satisfactorily produce walnuts. Added to this, peculiarly adapted climatic conditions must prevail. Interior sections are usually too hot in summer and many other localities are too susceptible to frost in the early spring or late fall. Consequently the available area for producing walnuts is somewhat limited, for out of nearly 100,000,000 acres in California only about 300,000 acres are suitable for walnut growing. The land suitable for the production of this crop is also suitable for producing beans, many kinds of vegetables, and in some cases citrus and deciduous fruits. Consequently, in order that the industry may survive and prosper, the profits per acre must be kept in harmony with the average income that can be derived from the land used for producing any of the other crops referred to. There are at least 200,000 acres of land in California alone still producing only annual crops which are very properly suited for the production of walnuts. With fair protection it is only reasonable to suppose that enough of this acreage will shortly be planted to keep the American production well ahead of the domestic consumption.

In all European countries walnut culture is principally a by-product. Walnut trees are set out in a rather haphazard manner in pastures, as roadside borders, and on otherwise rather worthless hill slopes. Irrigation is unheard of. Little or no cultivation is practiced and about the only cost is the harvesting cost. The report of Mr. Thomas W. Murton, for many years American vice consul at Grenoble, France, the center of the French walnut production, and who is perhaps the best posted authority on European walnut culture, shows the mode of cultivation abroad, and this report I desire to have printed in the RECORD as an appendix to my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, permission is granted.

(See Appendix A.)

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I ask leave to annex as a part of my remarks various exhibits, as follows:

Exhibit A: Amount invested in the walnut industry in California alone.

Exhibit B: Number of acres, bearing and nonbearing, devoted exclusively to walnut culture in California and Oregon.

Exhibit C: Out-of-pocket cost of producing walnuts in the United States compared with European costs, also labor costs in the United States compared with that in Europe, particularly Italy and France, and cost of farm labor in China.

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

(See Appendix B.)

Mr. JOHNSON. Now, Mr. President, considering the extraordinary investment in walnut groves, considering how the walnut tree represents a generation, really two generations, before it can become profitable to the owner, considering the fact that there has been a rate of duty of 3 cents in the past, considering also the changed conditions, and that it would not be inappropriate to make the rate 6 or 8 cents now, while but 4 cents is asked in this instance, it would seem that without further argument even Senators on the other side of the Chamber ought to agree that this duty be given to us.

APPENDIX A.

STATEMENT ON THE COST OF PRODUCTION OF THE WALNUT IN FRANCE BY THOMAS W. MURTON, GRENOBLE, FRANCE, DECEMBER 30, 1920.

The walnut is a tree that in France grows freely all over the country, mostly in its natural state, and without any particular care or attention. Only in one or two places is it really cultivated, which consists mainly in grafting, namely, in the department of Dordogne, which produces a fairly good quality known as Cornes, and in the department of Isere, where along both sides of the river of that name, known as the valley of the Greswandan, the fine so-called English walnuts, otherwise Mayettes, are grown.

Formerly farmers and peasants attached but little importance to the walnut, which was planted principally for its wood. It is only in recent years that it has become interesting for its fruit by reason of the high value it has attained. Thus scientifically planned and laid out orchards like those of California are practically unknown here. There are plantations, of course, and plenty of them; but mostly all with a double purpose; that is to say, the production of other field crops at the same time, walnut crops being generally considered as a side issue.

Under these conditions it is difficult to estimate the cost of production of walnuts alone, for in nine cases out of ten the trees benefit from the care given to other crops growing around them and which otherwise they would not get. When trees stand on ground unutilizable for other crops, they generally perish from sheer negligence because the earth around the roots is rarely, if ever, loosened and no manure used. And as for pruning, this is a luxury rarely resorted to as being too costly or from want of time, so the trees carry deadwood from year to year until it finally drops or is blown off by a stiff wind.

Of all the proprietors of medium sized plantations that I have consulted as to their annual expense of maintaining them not one in his reply has stated the honest truth. All have exaggerated the cost, either because they are afraid of compromising themselves or of giving away something—what they do not know.

Of all the figures submitted by the different parties those of M. A. Buisson, of Sorges, Dordogne, appear to me to be the most sincere, as he frankly states that he cultivates other crops at the same time. For 120 trees he gives a rendering of 3 tons and a cost of maintenance of 2,400 francs (\$138, or 2½ cents per pound). Admitting that he sold his nuts at 240 francs (\$13.80) the hundred kilos (220 pounds, or 6½ cents per pound), which is the lowest price quoted, the cost of production would be about 33 per cent of the value. But as two crops were tended at the same time, I consider the figure 33 should be cut in half. In my opinion the maintaining of an orchard dedicated solely to the production of walnuts and receiving every care and attention should not exceed 40 per cent of their value. I regret exceedingly that I am not able to give you more precise information, but with the best wish such is not possible, seeing that conditions of production in France differ so greatly with those in vogue in the United States.

It is convenient to call to mind here that in France the land is cut up mostly into small parcels, and many are the families that contrive to live comfortably and save money on the production of a few acres. Most peasant farmers possess a few walnut trees scattered over their property, which receive no special attention and profit only from the care given to other crops, and as this class forms the vast majority of agriculturists, it will be readily understood how difficult it is to establish even an approximate idea of the cost of production of walnuts. As a matter of fact it is exceedingly small, and by many is considered negligible.

Not a quarter of the persons to whom I addressed a questionnaire have responded to it. I inclose herewith what answers are at hand, untranslated, as the time is too short to undertake this work.

COST OF PRODUCTION OF WALNUT MEATS.

The obtaining of data on this subject has been a much more simple operation than is the case with walnuts in the shell. Crackers pretend that there is practically no saving by the employment of a machine, although the cost is only 2 francs per 100 kilos as against 12 and 15 francs by hand, because the shell being only broken the meat has to be picked out and separated the same as by hand. In general, the cost of cracking and putting up 100 kilos of walnuts ready for shipment, without taking into account the cost of the merchandise, averages about 45 francs. This figure may vary a little, accordingly as the nuts cracked are large or small. This sum, decomposed, would be about as follows, according to M. Eugene Ferrieux, of Romans, Drome, who has favored me with a very complete summary of the situation. I transmit his letter, which, however, I have not had time to translate.

	Per 100 kilos (220 lbs.) rendering 55 pounds good meats.	Equivalent in United States exchange.	Cost per pound United States exchange.
Transportation of merchandise from seller's to buyer's premises and brokerage.....	10.00	\$0.58	\$0.01
Cracking by hand.....	12.00	.67	.012
Sorting.....	6.60	.40	.008
Case and packing.....	5.00	.29	.005
Manipulation, etc.....	10.00	.58	.01
	43.60	2.52
Contingencies.....	1.40	.08
	45.00	2.60	.035

This is certainly not an extravagant price and must compare very unfavorably with that paid for the same work in the United States. It would seem then only just and equitable that an increased tariff should compensate for such difference.

THOS. W. MURTON.

The following is a copy of a questionnaire sent by Mr. Murton to a number of the principal growers of walnuts in the various producing districts of France:

"To complete a study on 'The Walnut and its Propagation,' which I am in the act of preparing in a spirit of propaganda, I desire to know approximately what is the cost of production per annum and per hundred kilos.

"As I believe you will not find any objection to favor me with this information, I should be greatly obliged if you would kindly fill out and return to me as soon as possible the inclosed questionnaire.

"With my anticipated thanks, I am,

"Yours truly,

"T. W. MURTON."

QUESTIONNAIRE.

1. How many producing walnut trees do you possess?
 2. What is about the quantity of nuts they render annually?
 3. What are your expenses for maintaining these trees, viz:
 - For labor?
 - For fertilizer?
 - For gathering, sorting, washing, sulphuring, etc.?
- The following replies are typical in averages of all received:
- From M. Minet, N. Quentin, December 22, 1920:
- "Owns 150 trees, thickly planted. Average production, 1,500 to 2,000 kilos (4,000 pounds); manual labor, 400 francs; fertilizing, 500 francs; gathering, etc., 300 francs; total, 1,200 francs. (Equivalent, United States exchange, \$68.40; 4,000 pounds at cost of production of \$68.40; average cost of production per pound, 1.71 cents.)"
- From Joseph Marchand, Polinas, France, December 26, 1920:
- "Owns 500 walnut trees. Average production, 3,000 kilos (6,600 pounds). Cost: Manual labor, 3,500 francs; fertilizer, 1,200 francs; gathering, etc., 2,000 francs; total, 6,700 francs. (Equivalent, United States exchange, \$381.90; 6,600 pounds at cost of production of \$381.90; average cost of production per pound, 5.8 cents.)"
- From L. Maire, Dordogne, France, December 23, 1920:
- "Answers: The only expense is in connection with picking them."
- From A. Buisson, Sorges, France, December 22, 1920:
- "Owns 120 trees. Produces 3 tons (6,000 pounds). Cost of labor, 1,200 francs; fertilizer, 600 francs; gathering, etc., 500 francs; total

cost, 2,300 francs. (Equivalent, United States exchange, \$131.10; 6,000 pounds at a cost of production of \$131.10; average cost of production per pound, 2.2 cents.)

From Marc Bussiere, Brantome, Dordogne, France, December 22, 1920:

"I have not forgotten your pleasant visit, and I shall be delighted to be useful to you in giving you what information I can on the cultivation of our walnut trees.

"In Perigard generally and at Brantome the walnut is raised along borders or in the middle of fields where chance has planted it or it is planted in rows, where it receives no particular care and benefits only from the labor and fertilization given to the grain. They are not always even grafted, but they are trimmed, so that the animals when plowing can pass under them.

"The trees are also allowed to grow in amongst the vines. They are planted as a border in lines. Certainly the tree grows to a great size, and is bad for the vine, but it develops very well amongst the vine.

"Under these conditions the trees are of no expense whatever. The nuts are merely gathered when they fall, and their fall is hastened by beating the trees with poles.

"This rudimentary cultivation is not worthy of praise, and the trees do not yield all that they might, but it costs nothing and reduces expenses to a minimum.

"In our district there are to-day trees which have been carefully grafted with good species, but they receive hardly any other care than that given the crops in the middle of which they grow. That is the farmer's usual method of cultivation.

"I have trees of every age, but most of them are young, all the old trees having been renewed or needing renewal.

"This year my walnut trees on the hill and on the plateau were the only ones that had a normal quantity. The greater part of the fruit buds in the lower sections were frost bitten, which hurt all the trees this year.

"I hope that this information will be of some utility to you.

"Believe me, etc."

Of a total of 18 answers received to the questionnaire the average cost of all those growers who replied giving costs was a total of production cost of 3.67 cents per pound.

THE FRENCH WALNUT-MEAT INDUSTRY.

A similar questionnaire to that sent the walnut growers was sent by Mr. Murton to all the principal walnut-cracking plants in France.

A total of seven replies were received, that of M. Ferrieux being the most complete. However, the French cost, exclusive of the price of the unshelled walnuts purchased taken from the seven replies, shows a cost of cracking, packing cases, sorting, manipulating, commission, etc., to be 2.84 cents per pound when translated to United States weights and exchange.

(NOTE.—The original letters of reply and original translations are on file with the United States Tariff Commission, Washington, D. C.)

APPENDIX B.

EXHIBIT A.

Amount invested in the walnut industry in California alone.

Average value of bearing walnut acreage ----- per acre----- \$1,477.05

(Determined by taking an average of the appraised valuation per acre, exclusive of buildings, but including irrigating system, compiled from answers to questionnaires received from 231 walnut growers of 15 various walnut-producing districts, owning 5,030 acres.)

Total value of 60,800 acres bearing walnuts----- \$89, 804, 640.00

Average value of nonbearing walnut acreage ----- per acre----- \$826.65

(Determined by taking an average of the appraised valuation per acre, exclusive of buildings, but including irrigating system, compiled from answers to questionnaires received from 15 walnut growers of 10 various walnut-producing districts.)

Total value of 23,900 acres nonbearing walnuts----- 19, 756, 935.00

Total investment in land----- 109, 561, 575.00

There are in California 42 walnut packing houses where walnuts delivered by the grower are culled, graded, cleaned, and packed.

Answers to questionnaires received from 21 of these packing houses show a total investment of \$511,217.49, or an average per house of \$24,343.69.

Total value of 42 packing houses----- \$1, 022, 434.98

Total investment in walnut land----- 109, 561, 575.00

Total investment in walnut industry----- 110, 584, 009.98

The assessed valuation of bare land in Ventura, Los Angeles, and Orange Counties—the three largest walnut producing sections of California—in the districts where walnuts are grown and where land is under irrigation, ranges from \$350 to \$440 per acre, depending upon quality, location, etc. This assessed valuation is generally considered to be one-third the actual cash value.

(Copy of questionnaires, from which this information was obtained, on file with and approved by the United States Tariff Commission.)

EXHIBIT B.

Number of acres, bearing and nonbearing, devoted exclusively to walnut culture in California and Oregon.

CALIFORNIA.

Figures as shown by monthly bulletin of State commissioner of horticulture, April, 1919, except where marked.¹ (See footnote.)

County.	Acres bearing.	Acres nonbearing.	Total acreage.
Alameda.....	112	220	332
Butte.....	53	53	106
Contra Costa.....	180	496	676
Los Angeles ¹	19,845	4,332	24,177

Number of acres, bearing and nonbearing, devoted exclusively to walnut culture in California and Oregon—Continued.

County.	Acres bearing.	Acres nonbearing.	Total acreage.
Orange.....	13,753	3,090	16,843
Riverside ¹	505	1,884	2,389
San Benito.....	73	73	146
San Bernardino ¹	671	403	1,074
San Diego.....	483	46	529
San Joaquin ¹	700	1,125	1,825
San Luis Obispo.....	520	180	700
Santa Barbara ¹	4,500	150	4,650
Santa Clara.....	880	922	1,802
Sonoma.....	250	105	355
Stanislaus.....	135	133	268
Tulare.....	161	550	711
Ventura ¹	11,531	3,243	14,774
Yolo.....	46	46	92
Yuba.....	50	50	100
	54,448	16,746	71,194

¹ Figures taken from individual report from county horticultural commissioner, July, 1919.

The statement above gives the latest official figures available, but as these are some two years old now they do not include the last two seasons' plantings, estimated at 13,500 acres. Therefore the present walnut acreage in California may be said to be 60,800 acres bearing, 23,900 acres nonbearing, 84,700 acres total.

OREGON.

Figures as shown by statement compiled by Oregon State tax commissioner for the year 1920: 2,675 acres bearing, 1,614 acres nonbearing, 4,289 acres total.

EXHIBIT C.

Out-of-pocket cost of producing walnuts in United States compared with European cost, also labor cost in United States compared with that in Europe.

PRODUCTION COST IN THE UNITED STATES.

The out-of-pocket cost of production of merchantable walnuts compiled from answers to questionnaires from 231 walnut growers of 15 various walnut-producing districts covering 5,030 acres of bearing walnuts, with a production of 4,020,224 pounds in 1920, or an average of 799 pounds per acre, is as follows:

Cultural cost, per acre, \$79.27.....	Pounds.	\$0.0992
(Exclusive of harvesting, but including cost of water for irrigation; 10 per cent depreciation on pumping plant, pipe lines, live stock; 20 per cent depreciation on tools, implements, tractors, etc.; 1 per cent depreciation on value of above, all taxes, insurance, labor, fertilizer, and a reasonable charge for owner's labor and supervision.)		
Harvesting cost.....		0.0256
(Includes yard work, picking, and drying.)		
Packing cost; per ton, \$27.54.....		.0137
(The cost of packing includes insurance, taxes, labor, bleaching materials, bags, twine, repairs and replacements, 5 per cent depreciation on buildings, 20 per cent depreciation on machinery, and other costs, such as stationery, power, etc., and is compiled from answers to questionnaires received from 18 packing plants located in the 15 districts above referred to.)		
Marketing cost.....		.0112
(This is the average selling expense of California Walnut Growers' Association, including advertising, commission to brokers, 1 per cent trade discount, maintenance of field department, inspection department, rent, salaries, overhead, etc.)		
Total American cost of production.....		0.1497*
Cost of farm labor in walnut industry in Italy compared with the United States. ¹		

[Per 8-hour day in the lemon industry.]

	Lira per day.	Converted into United States exchange.	Figures originally submitted by Walnut Protective League in brief to Ways and Means Committee.
Male laborers.....	11½	\$0.48	
As American male farm labor is costing \$4.61 ² per day, the labor cost in Italy is 10.4 per cent of the American cost.			
American labor cost to produce a pound of walnuts.....		.0973	\$0.0973
Italian labor cost to produce a pound of walnuts, 10.4 per cent of 9.73 cents.....		.0101	.0108
Saving in labor cost between Italy and America.....		.0872	.0865

¹ See pp. 34 and 36, Ways and Means Committee bulletin "Wages in the United States and Foreign Countries."

² P. 36—Either same rate as "male workers in lemon industry" or average of other comparable workers in agriculture specified in table.

Cost of farm labor in walnut industry in France compared with United States.¹

[Compiled from bulletin published by Ways and Means Committee entitled "Wages in the United States and Foreign Countries."²]

	Francs per day.	Converted into United States exchange.	Figures originally submitted by Walnut Protective League in brief to Ways and Means Committee.
Male farm laborers.....	17	\$1.19
As American male farm labor is costing \$4.61 ² per day, the labor cost in France is 25 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent of the American cost.			
American labor cost to produce a pound of walnuts.....		.0973	\$0.0973
French labor cost to produce a pound of walnuts, 25 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent of 9.73 cents.....		.0250	.0243
Saving in labor cost between France and America.....		.0723	.0730

¹ See p. 35, Ways and Means Committee bulletin "Wages in the United States and Foreign Countries."

² F. 34, "Average Wages of American Farm Labor, Far West, by the Day, Without Board."

COST OF FARM LABOR IN CHINA.

The United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Far East Division, labor and wages, in digest of material in files as of January 1, 1921, are authority for the fact that in the Tientsin Province, where most of the oriental walnuts are produced and packed, the April, 1920, average wage of coolie labor was from 28 cents to 40 cents per day, Mexican money, and they state that agricultural laborers were available at \$20 per year, Mexican money, and board.

We have used the higher rate of 30 cents per day, Mexican money, or 22 cents per day, American money, in making our calculations.

	Mexican cents per day.	Converted into United States exchange.
Male farm laborers.....	30	\$0.22
Male coolie laborers.....	28	.21

As American male farm labor is costing \$4 per day, the labor cost in China is 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent of the American cost.

	Cents.
American labor cost to produce a pound of walnut.....per pound.....	9.73
Chinese labor cost to produce a pound of walnuts, 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent of 9.73 cents.....per pound.....	0.53

Savings in labor cost between China and America.....do..... 9.20

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, the facts in connection with the tariff rate upon walnuts are very similar to those with reference to almonds. I do not know of any better argument to make in answer to the one the Senator from California has just made than to quote one statement made by him. "This industry," he said, "has doubled every four years." That means that during the eight years of the protective duty levied under the Underwood law the industry has grown over 400 per cent. How can he justify such a tremendous increase in duty over the Payne-Aldrich law as is provided by the committee amendment, in view of the record of growth of this industry?

The walnut industry is a very prosperous one. I am not going to ask the Senate to accept my personal information about it. I am going to give the Senate the information about the industry which the Walnut Growers' Association itself furnishes to the public. I am going to read from an article written for the Western Canner and Packer, by Mr. Carlyle Thorpe, general manager of the California Walnut Growers' Association. The article was published in the Western Canner and Packer for February, 1922:

The opening prices, 22 $\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound for No. 1's, 17 cents per pound for No. 2's, and 28 cents per pound for fancy budded, were so well received by the trade that the California Walnut Growers' Association was completely swamped with orders by the end of the first week in October.

Referring to the trade of the previous year, the year 1921, the prices were so satisfactory that the Walnut Growers' Association "was completely swamped with orders by the end of the first week of October."

Early demands for walnuts at opening prices brought in orders for about four times as many walnuts as could be supplied. The association sold about 90 per cent of its unshelled walnuts at the opening prices in taking care of the requirements of old customers.

The market continued to show strength and advanced to a point 4 cents above the opening figures, by which time the California crop was entirely exhausted, not a single bag of walnuts remaining in the warehouses at the end of November.

This is the industry for which we are asked to increase the protective tariff duty 200 per cent, and not a bag of walnuts in late November was available. What industry in the country can show such a record? Yet protection, high protection, is demanded.

In recent months the association has found it necessary to decline orders for hundreds of tons of unshelled walnuts, and has only been able to offer the trade its shelled walnuts, which are vacuum packed in tins and glass jars.

The shelled-walnut business promises to become the big end of the California walnut industry. During the past season the association has handled four times as many meats as it shelled and packed during any former season.

In standardizing the 1921 pack it screened out and eliminated by hand sorting 10,000,000 pounds of undersized, shriveled, and light-weight walnuts from a 40,000,000-pound harvest, putting these off-sizes through the cracking machines and reducing them to hand-selected, bright, and toothsome walnut meats, ready for the can opener and the dinner table.

The associated growers have hit a popular note with the housewife in offering her walnut meats. When she wants to finish a cake in a hurry or top a salad for dinner or luncheon she hasn't time to stop and crack and pick out nut meats, but she does have time to open a jar of selected meats.

In the same article, referring again to the prosperous character and nature of the walnut business, I call attention to the following:

The year's outstanding accomplishments, which include quick sale of the crop, reduction of railroad freight rates, erection of a magnificent association building, and a successful campaign for protective tariff, are all convincing evidence of the benefits derived from cooperation.

By presenting a solid front when matters of great importance present themselves, the California walnut industry has succeeded in protecting its own interests, and in so doing it has protected to a considerable degree the interests of the wholesaler, the jobber, the retailer, and the ultimate consumer.

So prosperous is the industry that the entire production was sold in a few weeks. So prosperous is the industry that the price of land suitable for the cultivation of walnut trees is said to be \$1,200 per acre. Does this show need of such prohibitive rates?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I am glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator is attempting to make much of the statement that the California Walnut Growers' Association disposed of the entire crop. From that does he deduce that the producer made a large profit?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Yes. It is my opinion that an association such as the Walnut Growers' Association would not at the outset fix a price that did not give the grower a profit; and the very fact that in a very few weeks the whole output was sold is evidence to me of a very successful season.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator is usually accurate, but he is terribly mistaken in this instance. At the very time the crop was sold the average gross return to the growers in California was \$16 an acre.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Then I am to understand from the Senator that the growers' association opened up this season by offering walnuts at a price which brought no profit to the grower. Is that the fact?

Mr. McNARY. They are not offering in a monopolized market. They do not fix the price at any figure that may suit them. There are very many elements that control the price the consumer pays the grower for his product. This is merely a co-operative selling agency, that gets the best price possible. I want to say to the Senator, because it is related to the subject under discussion, that the cost to the producer is 14 cents a pound and the walnuts are sold for 16 cents a pound. I want further to say that that is a margin of 2 cents a pound, and the average production per acre in all the Pacific Coast States, in the matured orchards over 12 years old, is 800 pounds to the acre. So that it may be said that the net sum of money which the growers received for their crop was \$16 an acre. I shall have something more to say in reference to that matter in a few moments, but I simply wanted to get the state of mind of the Senator at this time.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I will read to the Senator from the Tariff Commission report and give him the information that it contains about the activities of the growers' association. I can not conceive—it seems incredible—that a growers' association would give the public information which is contained in what I have just read—that they have had a successful season; that as soon as the prices were named they had a tremendous demand; that the prices shortly jumped 4 cents per pound; that the whole crop was sold out in a few weeks—and then presented evidence that it was all done at a loss. I repeat, it is incredible. What must we think of an association

that handles the product of the growers in the fashion and manner described by the Senator from Oregon and then boasts about what a successful season they had, the rapidity with which orders came in to the growers' association, and what a short period of time elapsed before the whole output was purchased?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President—

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Let me read what the Tariff Commission says:

The growers organized in 1912 as the California Walnut Growers' Association. Its prime object is to market the product advantageously for the growers and to standardize and stabilize the industry. The association, which includes between 75 and 85 per cent of the growers, annually establishes opening prices for different grades. The actual prices realized may be higher or lower, according to the demand. To improve and make uniform the product, the association early adopted a trade-mark and brand name, and first-quality nuts are now sold under the Diamond Brand trade-mark. This brand is applied to the three top grades, which constitute 60 per cent of the crop. No. 2 nuts, which constitute 30 per cent, are sold as "California walnuts." The remaining 10 per cent, consisting of culls, is sold as walnut meats. Nearly the whole of the crop is marketed in the shell, except the so-called culls, which consist of walnuts that are partially filled, blighted, or have a poor appearance.

Further on in the same report, speaking of the crop of 1919 and confirming what I quoted from the article which I have just read, the Tariff Commission says:

The average return for the 1919 crop was 24 cents per pound, and for 1918 slightly less. The best grades of French and Italian nuts sold during 1920 at 18 and 19 cents. But a large part of the imports auctioned off at around 8 cents per pound. (Table 8.) Commercial advices indicate that virtually all of the domestic walnut crop of 1920 has been sold.

This report was published in the early part of 1921.

It is noteworthy that the growers were able successfully to dispose of their crop at prices far higher than were received for the foreign product and in the midst of the prevailing business depression. They were able to do this by a prompt price reduction of around 28 per cent. Such wide differences in price seem to indicate that the tariff problem is not a vital one, and that the higher domestic costs are to a very large degree offset by the higher prices received for the better California product.

Mr. President, there is further evidence from the Tariff Commission itself that the crop was disposed of and that very shortly after the harvest season there were no walnuts upon the markets which were available for the American demand.

I now quote from a publication which is known as the Confectionery Market, as follows:

The value of the domestic walnut crop (97 per cent being produced in California) increased between 1909 and 1919 from two and a quarter million dollars to over fourteen millions—

And that during the time when there was a very much lower duty imposed than is contemplated in this amendment—

It did not need a high protective tariff to bring about this phenomenal result. During the first half of this period the rate of duty was 5 cents; the last half, 4 cents.

The labor cost of production of California walnuts is approximately 65 per cent of the total. Nobody wants workers in California to have to compete with European labor nor to live under European conditions. A glance at the development of the California industry noted above would seem to indicate that it is not necessary they should. The development was due to progress in cultural and marketing practices. The United States Tariff Commission, referring to the walnut crop, says:

"It is also to be noted that the great bulk of the crop is marketed by a growers' association, which annually establishes opening prices, but it is apparent that the control it exercises over the great bulk of the domestic crop enables it to profit in prices from a tariff more readily than is the case of an industry where competition among individual producers is general."

In a letter from one of the leading candy manufacturers of Boston I note the following comment in reference to California walnuts:

During the war when walnuts were scarce, we used some California walnuts. They came in very much discolored, due to the thin shells on them. In fact, most of them showed up very black. While they are white when they are cut open, they are very far from being attractive and are not desirable for confectioners.

Were it not possible to get French nuts, we believe there are many confectioners who would not use these nuts at all, unless it were for inside work.

The price of walnuts and almonds is now so high that we are not using anywhere near the quantity we would use if prices were nearer normal. The normal price on walnuts is 30 cents; the price to-day is about 60 cents.

Many similar letters have come to me—some of them are printed in the RECORD of July 3. I can not believe the candy manufacturers would intentionally and willfully assert that the California walnut was not suitable for their purposes unless their experience justified it.

Let me read further from this letter of April 27, 1922:

In our small business here we thought nothing of buying 100 cases of walnuts when the price was around 30 cents; to-day we buy them in 5 and 10 case lots.

If this bill passes, it will work a great hardship on all the confectioners, and will be the means of taking away some of the attractiveness from our package goods, which make up a large part of our business.

We are willing to do anything we can to help, and of course understand it is necessary for the Government to obtain revenue through such sources, but if our business is injured we can not make money to pay taxes. In other words, "If they kill the hen, they lose the eggs." If we should write you every time we were asked to do so, you would receive about three letters a week from us.

Mr. President, the question is very simple. The walnut industry is a very prosperous one. It has grown rapidly by leaps and bounds, but it does not and can not produce a sufficient quantity of walnuts to meet the American demand. The domestic production is about 50 per cent of the consumption and the imports are 50 per cent, chiefly shelled walnuts. The confectioners say the foreign shelled walnut is superior to the domestic shelled walnut; that its color is better for their purposes, and that its flavor is better, but they frankly admit that the California unshelled walnut is one of the best in the world and does not compete with the foreign unshelled walnut; that it is superior and commands a better price in the market. However, when shelled and exposed to the air it discolors, so the confectioners say, and is not suitable for their purposes. In any event, the California walnut growers have not shelled their walnuts, because the demand for their unshelled walnuts is more than their supply.

Mr. President, it does not seem to me that these high rates can be justified or can be successfully defended in view of the disclosures in this case, and the evidence, which is overwhelming, to the effect that walnut growing has been a prosperous and successful industry and has grown tremendously under a very much lower tariff duty than that proposed by the amendment, which amounts to an increase of 200 per cent over the rates of the existing law. If the rate reported by the committee is sound, if it is defensible, then every agricultural industry which can show the prosperity that the walnut industry shows and which can show a production equal to one-half of the consumption ought to have similar high protective tariff rates imposed. Of course, the proposed duty can not be defended and the amendment ought not to prevail.

I desire to say in conclusion that we are establishing some very bad precedents in this bill. It is easy enough to levy duties now, but when the time comes to revise this tariff bill, as it will have to be revised in the future by either the Democratic or the Republican Party, precedents like this will be at hand which will make much trouble for future revisionists. I tell the Senate that it is a very serious matter to levy high duties upon these products without having sufficient evidence to warrant this action and facts to justify an increase of this proportion.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a memorandum prepared by me showing the rates of duty under previous laws, the extent of production, and cost to the consumers if the increased duty shall be imposed.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN SENATE BILL AND PREVIOUS LAWS.

In the Underwood Act walnuts unshelled were dutiable at 2 cents and shelled at 4 cents per pound.

In the Payne-Aldrich Act walnuts unshelled were dutiable at 3 cents and shelled at 5 cents per pound.

The pending bill is an increase over the rate in the Underwood Act of 100 per cent on unshelled and 200 per cent on shelled walnuts, and an increase over the rate in the Payne-Aldrich Act of 33 1/3 per cent on unshelled and 140 per cent on shelled walnuts.

PRODUCTION, IMPORTS, AND EXPORTS.

The United States produces about 59,000,000 pounds of walnuts per year. Imports of unshelled walnuts range about 16,000,000 pounds, and imports of shelled walnuts range about 12,000,000 pounds (54,000,000 pounds in terms of unshelled walnuts); a total consumption of 129,000,000 pounds.

The domestic product is marketed as unshelled walnuts, and adding to 59,000,000 pounds of the domestic product 16,000,000 pounds of unshelled walnuts imported we have a total of 75,000,000 pounds of unshelled walnuts consumed yearly. With a tax of 4 cents per pound, the total tax would be \$3,000,000.

Practically the total consumption of shelled walnuts are imported—12,000,000 pounds at a tariff rate of 12 cents will impose a total tax of \$1,440,000 on the consumers.

The tax on the shelled and unshelled products will amount to \$4,440,000—4 cents per capita—\$160,000 for the 4,000,000 people of Massachusetts.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I want to speak briefly in reply to the able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

I find myself in total disagreement with the Senator from Massachusetts. That is regrettable, but nevertheless it is a fact. I think the Senator approaches this argument from the standpoint of a confectioner. In no place do his argument or his facts furnished or his statistics supplied show any profits being made by the producers of walnuts. That is an important element, and must be considered in making up our decision in this matter. I am speaking now more or less as one who is familiar with this industry.

There is no horticultural industry that pays so little profit upon the investment or for the labor employed as the culture

of walnuts. There is no one on the Pacific coast who has made a considerable sum of money in the development of the walnut industry. I know this from having studied the industry. I went through the groves of California some years ago and carefully surveyed the industry.

It takes 15 years for a tree to produce a profitable crop. There is twelve or fourteen hundred dollars invested in each acre by the time the trees arrive at a proper bearing period. Only a few trees can be put out to an acre. If they are 60 feet apart, you have only 12 trees to an acre working for you. You must cultivate the tree, you must fertilize it, you must prune and spray it year after year, without getting a single cent of return upon your investment; and when the tree is 15 years old, and producing fruit profitably, it takes 10 or 15 years from that time on to catch up with your investment.

Mr. President, I do not know a single rate in this whole bill that has more merit than this one protecting walnuts. The expected competition from Manchuria is so serious that the Department of Agriculture within the year will send an expert to study the subject in Manchuria. The annual agricultural appropriation bill which we voted for in the Senate a few months ago—and I have no doubt that the Senator from Massachusetts voted for it—carried an appropriation to send a nut expert to Manchuria to determine whether it would be profitable to go ahead and plant walnuts in this country in competition with Manchuria. If the great Department of Agriculture and both branches of the Congress know the great menace in the future from that country, and Congress voted for it, then it must exist, and is not an idle dream.

Mr. President, the growers of the Pacific coast can not possibly compete with the growers of walnuts in Manchuria, in China. There are no cultural methods adopted there. They are grown haphazardly on the roadside or as a by-product where wheat, vegetables, or rice are raised. The labor costs patically nothing, and it costs a whole lot less to bring a pound of walnuts into New York from China than it does to bring it from the Pacific States to New York.

Again, Mr. President, one of the great injuries that is being done is not only the fierce and ruinous competition, but the foreign nuts are inferior. They are small and rancid, the pellicle is dark, and people buy them and find they are not tasty, and they get out of the habit of buying walnuts and go to buying other nuts; and that in itself is ruinous competition.

In the State of Oregon about 5,000 acres have been planted to walnuts in the last 10 years. Very few of the orchards are old enough to bear profitably. If this tariff is left at the present rate, with the increased planting in Manchuria, and also in Europe, and the low labor cost, the nut producers will be compelled to take up their trees and plant other crops, after wasting perhaps \$1,000 an acre and waiting 8 or 10 or 12 years. This duty is an absolute necessity. We do not produce all of the walnuts that we need, and this duty will protect these growers from having foreigners put inferior nuts on the market in competition with them at a price at which they can not live.

I would not want to vote to see harm come to an industry so large as this in California, where there is \$100,000,000 invested, and \$8,000,000 or \$10,000,000 in Oregon, and about half as much in the State of Washington. It is an industry which ought to be protected, and which employs hundreds, and I might say thousands, of men and women. A walnut orchard is a grove that is beautiful, as the Senator from California so aptly described. It is a healthful industry. It bears through a time of the year when the other crops have been harvested. People who have been working in the wheat fields or the corn fields or the hay fields can go to the walnut groves, because that crop comes along and is harvested along in October. It extends the time of employment to those people who are living on the farms and the industry must be protected in order to endure; and I certainly hope that the Senators present will not vote to accept the theory of the Senator from Massachusetts.

There has been no profit made, Mr. President. The Senator argues, and ably argues, that because this association has sold its entire crop there was a profit. I want to say to the Senator from Massachusetts, from the actual figures that I have here, and from what I know personally, that the average production of an acre of trees after 12 years is about 800 pounds to the acre. If I may use the figures the Senator quoted, the highest he quoted, as I recall, was 24 cents a pound, and the lowest 18 cents. It is indisputably true that it costs 14 cents a pound in America to produce walnuts.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield a moment, this statement says that the opening

prices were 22½ cents per pound for No. 1, 17 cents per pound for No. 2, and 28 cents per pound for fancy budded.

Mr. McNARY. That is true; but it must be remembered that you are not taking into consideration orchard run. That is the average price for all of them. You may have a budded nut, a first-class nut that is fancy, put up in a nice way and sold, that brings 24 cents, but your culls and your orchard runs and your seconds will perhaps only bring 12 cents; so, in discussing this matter, you must keep in mind what we call orchard runs, or the general average price.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator answer this question? Will he state whether this statement in this article that I have read is a fact or not?

Mr. McNARY. I do not recall the statement. I shall be glad if the Senator will let me know what it is.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts (reading)—

Early demands for walnuts at opening prices brought in orders for about four times as many walnuts as could be supplied. The association sold about 90 per cent of its unshelled walnuts at the opening prices in taking care of the requirements of old customers.

Mr. McNARY. Will the Senator state what the price was?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The article does not state the price, but I want to know if it is true that the harvest of walnuts was sold out almost upon the opening of prices.

Mr. McNARY. I have no doubt of it.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Does the Senator seriously argue to us that these prices were fixed at a sum which caused a loss to the growers?

Mr. McNARY. I have said to the Senator—perhaps he does not appreciate it because he comes from a part of the country where the manufacturers do fix their prices—that they do not fix the prices of agricultural products. The law of supply and demand to a large extent controls. The association markets the nuts, and they do try to get the best price obtainable; and if the buyers in the East or the commission men or brokers say, "We will give you 22 cents," they report it back to the growers, who come in and tell them whether or not they will sell. They do not fix prices. If they were going to fix prices, they would perhaps put them at a dollar a pound, but they are controlled all the time by and amenable to the consumption power of the country and the law of supply and demand.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. May I read another line from this same article?

Mr. McNARY. I shall be very glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts (reading):

In recent months the association has found it necessary to decline orders for hundreds of tons of unshelled walnuts.

And yet we are told that that walnut supply was sold at a loss.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the Senator is arguing from a simple statement that means nothing. I want him to tell me what they sold for.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I have quoted the prices.

Mr. McNARY. What are the prices?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. This article is written by the general manager of the California Walnut Growers' Association. It is written to let the public know how successful, how prosperous, the business is, what a great demand there was for walnuts, how quickly the output was sold, and what good prices they received. He says:

The opening prices—22½ cents per pound for No. 1, 17 cents per pound for No. 2, and 28 cents per pound for fancy budded—were so well received by the trade that the California Walnut Growers' Association was completely swamped with orders by the end of the first week in October.

What does that mean except that the business was prosperous, that there was more of a demand than they could supply, and that the prices they fixed at the outset were so satisfactory that the harvest was cleaned right out?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, that is no argument at all. It is a mere baseless assumption. I take the Senator's own figures. On the highest grade of nuts there was a gross profit of 12 cents a pound; on the low grade there was a gross profit of 3 cents a pound, so we will say the average was a gross profit of 10 cents a pound. With 800 pounds to an acre, and a profit of 10 cents, you make \$80 gross per acre. Does the Senator say that is profiteering, when you have \$1,400 invested in an acre?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I make no such claim; but the Senator has to take either one of two positions: Either that the prices were fair and that the output was sold immediately at those prices, or that at the very outset the growers' association fixed a price that meant a loss.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, that is not unusual. Very many times the Prune Growers' Association or the Almond

Growers' Association, or like organizations, fail to obtain a profitable price. They do not go out and fix a price. If they should do that, they would be prosecuted. They are amenable to the general economic laws of the country. They get the best price they can. In 1920—I have the figures here—the crop was sold, orchard run, which, I explained, was the general average, at 16.97 cents a pound. That left a gross profit of 2 cents per pound, which would give the grower a gross profit of \$16 an acre, with perhaps \$1,500 an acre investment.

You can not live on that. You can not pay your taxes on that. You can not pay your insurance on your buildings or the interest on the money which you borrowed at the bank. It can not be done. A grower ought to have at least 10 to 15 cents a pound gross profit in order to make any sort of return upon his investment; and there are no figures the Senator from Massachusetts has given that dispute the fact that I am relating now, that they do not produce at a great profit, and that it is one of the poorest paying crops in all the horticultural activities of the country.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, an assertion that rates have been raised 100 per cent or 200 per cent or 300 per cent may be somewhat startling to the uninitiated, but it ought not to affect those who are capable of understanding just what it means. If we give a duty of a quarter of a cent per pound on any commodity under the present law and we increase that to 1 cent per pound, we have increased the rate 300 per cent, and yet the 1 cent per pound may mean very little. So a specific duty ordinarily does not mean much to those who are not at all times thoroughly acquainted with prices. What the public wants to know is to what extent, by percentage, it raises the price of a given commodity, and that becomes important in the discussion of this matter. Therefore I want to put into the Record a few figures that will bear upon that particular point.

The production of walnuts in 1921 was about 36,000,000 pounds. In 1921 we had a short crop, because in 1919 our production, in round numbers, was 59,000,000 pounds; so it must be that an average crop will give us something over 50,000,000 pounds.

Now, let us take the imports for the purpose of determining what the ad valorem rate is.

In 1921 we imported 31,821,639 pounds of walnuts not shelled. The value per pound of the imports was 13 cents. Therefore with the Senate rate the equivalent ad valorem duty is 31 per cent; certainly not a high rate of duty. In the same year we imported 13,264,089 pounds of shelled walnuts at an importing value of 38 cents a pound. With the Senate rate of duty the ad valorem upon the shelled walnuts is 32 per cent, also a very moderate tariff.

In 1921 we had 63,474 acres of land in trees bearing walnuts. We had also young trees covering an acreage of 25,513—trees which had not yet reached the bearing stage. Therefore, in 1921, we had 88,980 trees, which will soon become bearing, and with that number of trees bearing in an ordinarily good year we could produce nearly all the walnuts which would be required for the consumptive demand in the United States. I say nearly; I do not think it would be quite sufficient.

This is an important industry, and if America can produce the walnuts necessary to supply the demand, I certainly am in favor not of our supplying one-third or one-fourth, but I think we ought to supply at least nine-tenths of the demand, and the other tenth will be enough to take care of the prices.

So I think that with 31 and 32 per cent ad valorem we can justify these rates. Certainly we can justify them when we compare them with the rates which are given upon other commodities.

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

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I ask for the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Assistant Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARRISON (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before, I vote "nay."

Mr. NEW (when his name was called). Again transferring my pair with the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] to the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. Page], I vote "yea."

Mr. POMERENE (when his name was called). Again announcing my pair for the day with my colleague [Mr. Willis], I beg to transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hitchcock], and vote "nay."

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as to my pair and its transfer as on the last vote, I vote "yea."

Mr. TRAMMELL (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Colt] to the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. Myers] and vote "nay."

Mr. WARREN (when his name was called). Again announcing my pair and its transfer, which I ask to stand for the day, I vote "yea."

Mr. WATSON of Indiana (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before, I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. SWANSON. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. Glass] is detained from the Senate on account of illness. He is paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Dillingham]. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. Ball] with the Senator from Florida [Mr. Fletcher]; and

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Edge] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Owen].

Mr. FERNALD (after having voted in the affirmative). I transfer my pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Jones] to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Townsend] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. ERNST. Making the same announcement as before, I vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 21, as follows:

YEAS—38.

Ashurst	Fernald	Lodge	Rawson
Borah	France	McCumber	Shortridge
Broussard	Frelinghuysen	McKinley	Smoot
Bursum	Gooding	McLean	Spencer
Calder	Hale	McNary	Sterling
Cameron	Johnson	New	Sutherland
Capper	Jones, Wash.	Nicholson	Warren
Curtis	Kellogg	Oddie	Watson, Ind.
du Pont	Kendrick	Phipps	
Ernst	Ladd	Poindexter	

NAYS—21.

Caraway	King	Robinson	Underwood
Culberson	La Follette	Sheppard	Walsh, Mass.
Dial	Lenroot	Shields	Walsh, Mont.
Harris	Nelson	Simmons	
Harrison	Pittman	Swanson	
Hedlin	Pomerene	Trammell	

NOT VOTING—37.

Ball	Glass	Norbeck	Stanley
Brandege	Harrell	Norris	Townsend
Colt	Hitchcock	Overman	Wadsworth
Crow	Jones, N. Mex.	Owen	Watson, Ga.
Cummins	Keyes	Page	Weller
Dillingham	McCormick	Pepper	Williams
Edge	McKellar	Ransdell	Willis
Elkins	Moses	Reed	
Fletcher	Myers	Smith	
Gerry	Newberry	Stanfield	

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate closes its session on this calendar day it recess until to-morrow at 11 o'clock.

Mr. HARRISON. Reserving the right to object, is there any intention of offering a cloture rule and taking a vote on it to-morrow?

Mr. McCUMBER. We could not vote on it to-morrow.

Mr. HARRISON. If it is offered to-day it will go over until day after to-morrow?

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes; it could not be voted on before day after to-morrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Dakota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The next amendment of the committee was, in paragraph 758, on page 111, line 2, to strike out "7½" and insert "12," so as to read:

Shelled, 12 cents per pound.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I do not want to interrupt the consideration of this amendment, but I ask the Senator from North Dakota, in charge of the bill, as to tomatoes, to be found provided for on page 113, in line 16, where a rate of 1 cent per pound is imposed on tomatoes in their natural state. If I am correct in my opinion, that would not be subject to amendment until we dispose of the committee amendments.

Mr. McCUMBER. The amendments in that paragraph have been agreed to.

Mr. ASHURST. There is no amendment as to tomatoes in their natural state?

Mr. McCUMBER. No; there has been no amendment to the rate on tomatoes in their natural state.

Mr. ASHURST. And it would not be in order for me at this time to offer an amendment?

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ASHURST. As to line 17—

Mr. McCUMBER. That amendment has been agreed to.

Mr. ASHURST. I see that the rate on tomato paste has been increased from 28 to 45 per cent ad valorem. That was done on Saturday. I am not especially interested in that, but I want to be sure that I am not waiving any of the rights I might possess with reference to the amendment of the rate on tomatoes in their natural state.

Mr. McCUMBER. That can come up after we have disposed of the committee amendment.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, returning to the amendment about to be voted on, all that has been said about shelled almonds can be applied to shelled walnuts. There is practically no production at all in this country of shelled walnuts. The unshelled walnut is the domestic product.

The "Confectionery Market" says:

Nearly the whole of the domestic crop is marketed in the shell. There are probably several candy factories any one of which could use all the shelled walnuts produced in California and sold out of shell.

California produces about 1 per cent of the various shelled nuts consumed in the United States. The size of the kernel and the count per weight are both in favor of the imported walnuts.

The same objection is made to walnuts that is made to almonds by the confectioners, namely, that the California product is not suitable for their uses. So we have a situation where it is absolutely necessary to import shelled walnuts, and the duty will be effective in raising the price of shelled walnuts. The amendment increases the rate of duty over the Underwood law and over the Payne-Aldrich law. The rate on shelled walnuts in the Underwood law was 4 cents per pound. The rate in the Payne-Aldrich law was 5 cents. The rate suggested by the House was 7½ cents. The rate suggested by the Senate committee amendment is 12 cents per pound. It can not be justified. It is notice to the consumers of America that the price of shelled walnuts is immediately to be raised 8 cents per pound. There is no justification whatever for it. If there were a shelled walnut industry in this country or an industry engaged in selling shelled walnuts, something could be said for a small protective duty, but there can not be anything said, in my opinion, in view of the fact for such a high duty upon shelled walnuts.

Mr. President, on the committee amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered and the Assistant Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARRISON (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before, I vote "nay."

Mr. NEW (when his name was called). Repeating the announcement made upon the previous vote, I vote "yea." I ask that this announcement of my pair and transfer may stand for the day.

Mr. POMERENE (when his name was called). Announcing my pair as heretofore with my colleague [Mr. WILLIS], I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and vote "nay."

Mr. TRAMMELL (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] to the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS] and vote "nay."

Mr. WARREN (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before, I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BALL. Making the same announcement as before as to my pair and transfer, I vote "yea."

Mr. ERNST. Making the same announcement as before, I vote "yea."

Mr. STERLING. Making the same announcement as on the last roll call, I vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 18, as follows:

YEAS—36.

Ashurst	France	Ladd	Oddie
Ball	Frelinghuysen	Lodge	Phipps
Broussard	Gooding	McCumber	Polindexter
Bursum	Hale	McKinley	Shortridge
Cameron	Johnson	McLean	Smoot
Capper	Jones, Wash.	McNary	Spencer
Curtis	Kellogg	Nelson	Sterling
du Pont	Kendrick	New	Sutherland
Ernst	Keyes	Nicholson	Warren

NAYS—18.

Dial	La Follette	Sheppard	Underwood
Harris	Lenroot	Shields	Walsh, Mass.
Harrison	Pittman	Simmons	Walsh, Mont.
Heflin	Pomerene	Swanson	
King	Robinson	Trammell	

NOT VOTING—42.

Borah	Colt	Dillingham	Fletcher
Brandege	Crow	Edge	Gerry
Calder	Culberson	Elkins	Glass
Caraway	Cummins	Fernald	Harreid

Hitchcock	Norbeck	Rawson	Watson, Ga.
Jones, N. Mex.	Norris	Reed	Watson, Ind.
McCormick	Overman	Smith	Weller
McKellar	Owen	Stanfield	Williams
Moses	Page	Stanley	Willis
Myers	Pepper	Townsend	
Newberry	Ransdell	Wadsworth	

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, I send to the desk a circular which is universally being sent to all the dye manufacturers and dye users in New Jersey by the German importers. I ask that it be read for the information of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the communication will be read.

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

NEW YORK, July 1, 1922.

DEAR SIRS: We beg to offer you our services for the importation of coal-tar dyes, including indanthrene and other vat dyes, manufactured by the Badische Anilin & Soda Fabrik and by other makers. We have the assurance of the manufacturers that they will give prompt attention to our orders. The prices will be as low as can be made, and, we have every reason to believe, will be found satisfactory by you.

It is to be hoped that the embargo and license provisions which were eliminated from the tariff bill by the House of Representatives will not be put back. It is also to be hoped that these same provisions now in force under the terms of the emergency tariff bill will be repealed. The removal of these restrictions on importations of coal-tar dyes would enable us to carry in stock all the dyes needed and to fill your orders promptly at current prices. It would permit us to bring in samples of new products as soon as they are put on the market, as well as to provide quantities sufficient for your practical trials. Thus you would be in a position to adopt improvements as quickly as the foreign dye consumer.

Soliciting your favors, we remain,

Yours truly,

KUTTROFF, PICKHARDT & Co. (INC.).

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

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. In paragraph 759, page 111, line 5, the committee proposes to strike out the word "pound" and insert the same word, with a semicolon and the following words thereafter: "pickled, or otherwise prepared or preserved, and not specially provided for, 35 per cent ad valorem," so as to make the paragraph read:

PAR. 759. Edible nuts, shelled or unshelled, not specially provided for, 1 cent per pound; pickled, or otherwise prepared or preserved, and not specially provided for, 35 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That no allowance shall be made for dirt or other impurities in nuts of any kind, shelled or unshelled.

Mr. McCUMBER. Just for the record, I desire to state that during the calendar year 1921 the imports of these nuts under the basket clause were 3,880,676 pounds, valued at \$805,303, or 21 cents a pound. On the basis of 21 cents per pound, the 1 cent per pound rate is equal to about 5 per cent ad valorem. Upon the pickled or otherwise prepared and preserved nuts, it will be noted that we have given a rate of 35 per cent ad valorem.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCUMBER. I ask now that we return to page 107, paragraph 741, figs. The committee authorizes me to make the following modification: On page 107, line 14, strike out "35" and insert in lieu thereof "40," so as to read:

PAR. 741. Figs, fresh or dried, 2 cents per pound; prepared or preserved in any manner, 40 per cent ad valorem.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the committee amendment as modified.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, the same situation exists in regard to this amendment as with reference to the amendments which we have just considered. Figs are a California product. There is not sufficient production for our consumption. The committee have seen fit to impose excessively high rates of duty upon all of the citrus fruits and nuts produced in southern California.

The Senate committee amendment on figs as modified increases the duty from 20 per cent ad valorem, as proposed by the House, to 40 per cent ad valorem.

Under the Underwood law prepared figs were dutiable at 20 per cent ad valorem, and under the Payne-Aldrich law at 1 cent per pound plus 35 per cent ad valorem. Fresh figs or dried figs were dutiable at 2 cents per pound under the Underwood law and 2½ cents in the act of 1909, while 2 cents is the rate proposed in the pending bill. The domestic production for the year 1919 was 21,801,000 pounds, valued at \$2,180,000. The imports for 1920 were about 20,000,000 pounds, valued at about \$5,000,000. The imports, therefore, were about one-half of our consumption.

It is to be noted that we imported about one-half of our consumption and that the imports were valued at \$5,000,000; that the domestic production was valued at only \$2,000,000, showing

that the imported fig sells at a much higher price than does the domestic fig; in fact, there is no very serious competition between the foreign fig and the domestic fig. The foreign fig is so superior that it does not compete with the fig which is produced in southern California and in some of the Gulf States.

Mr. President, I do not care to consume any more of the time of the Senate in discussing this item. It involves the same principles that were discussed when we considered the duties upon almonds and walnuts. Our people demand the importation of figs. That this duty will be effective there can be no question, and consequently our people will have to pay an increased price for this product equivalent to the rate of duty provided in the bill. The California industry does not need this protection. It is excessive, unwarranted, and indefensible. It is a very great injustice to the consumers of America to impose this very heavy burden upon them.

I ask, Mr. President, to attach to my remarks a statement and table showing a comparison of rates of duty, the percentage of production to consumption, the increased burden which will result to the consumer on all the citrus fruits and nuts produced in California.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEAVY TAXES LEVIED ON CONSUMERS FOR CITRUS FRUITS AND NUTS.

Table showing increased duties on citrus fruits and other products raised or produced chiefly, and in some instances exclusively, but which constitute only a small percentage of our consumption, in southern California:

Article.	House bill	Senate bill.	Per cent of increase Senate bill over House.	Senate bill over act of 1913 (per cent).
Almonds, unshelled...	4 cents per pound.	5 cents per pound.	25	66½
Almonds, shelled.....	12 cents per pound.	15 cents per pound.	25	27½
Walnuts, unshelled....	2½ cents per pound.	4 cents per pound.	60	100
Walnuts, shelled.....	7½ cents per pound.	12 cents per pound.	60	200
Raisins.....	2 cents per pound.	2½ cents per pound.	25	25
Figs, prepared or preserved.	20 per cent ad valorem.	35 per cent ad valorem.	75	75
Dates, prepared or preserved.do.....do.....	75	75
Beans, dried.....	1½ cents per pound.	2 cents per pound.	14½	380
Beans in brine, prepared or preserved.	2 cents per pound.	2½ cents per pound.	12½	125
Lemons.....do.....	2 cents per pound.	300
Olives.....	20 cents per gallon.	20 cents per gallon.	33½
Average per cent increase.	41	150

To what extent this industry in southern California is subsidized at the expense of the American people can best be appreciated by comparing the percentage of production in California with our total consumption.

California produces only 15 per cent of our consumption of almonds; 3 per cent of our consumption of olives; one-half of 1 per cent of our consumption of dates; 50 per cent of our consumption of figs; 46 per cent of our consumption of walnuts; and 77 per cent of our consumption of lemons.

As we must import in large quantities most of these products in order to supply the demand of our people, how can we justify an average increase in tariff duties on these products of 150 per cent over existing law?

The pending bill will continue the increased tariff duty of 2 cents per pound named in the emergency law of 1921 on lemons amounting to \$1.12½ per box, or 4½ cents per dozen, an increased duty of 300 per cent over the rate in the Underwood tariff law, the tax under that law amounting to 1½ cents per dozen.

The Underwood rate was the law from 1913 to 1921, and during that period the production of lemons in California increased 200 per cent. If this industry could prosper under a tariff protection of one-half cent per pound, equivalent to 1½ cents per dozen, how can an increase of 300 per cent in the duty be justified except as a governmental subsidy to the lemon industry of California controlled by relatively few growers' organizations. The tax in this bill will increase the cost of lemons \$1.12½ per box over the cost of lemons under the Underwood tariff law, making the total increased price which the public will have to pay about \$9,300,000 if these duties become effective.

Practically all of the walnuts and almonds produced in California are sold unshelled. The imports of walnuts and almonds are almost entirely shelled and are used in very large quantities by confectioners and bakers.

The high duty upon shelled walnuts the confectionery trade estimates will increase the price of the 12,000,000 pounds imported annually to the amount of \$900,000, all of which increased price will, of course, be passed on to the consumers.

The high duty upon shelled almonds will increase the price of the 20,000,000 pounds imported annually for the use of the confectioners and bakers to the amount of \$2,200,000, which will also be passed on to the consumers. As 85 per cent of the consumption of almonds must be imported, how can an increased cost through increased tariff duties, amounting to \$2,200,000, be justified?

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, the California production of figs for the year 1919, which is the last year of which I have a record, amounted to 26,460 pounds, while the importations in 1921 were 38,794,431 pounds. At 2 cents a pound, the proposed duty would be equivalent to an ad valorem rate of 22 per cent. So we have a 22 per cent duty upon fresh figs, and upon preserved and other figs a duty of 40 per cent under the bill as reported.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, on page 107, paragraph 741, line 15, after the words "ad valorem," to strike out:

Dates, 1 cent per pound.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, on page 107, after line 15, to insert:

PAR. 741a. Dates, fresh or dried, 1 cent per pound; prepared or preserved in any manner, 35 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. McCUMBER. On behalf of the Committee on Finance, I ask to modify the amendment which has just been stated, in line 17, before the words "per centum," by striking out the numerals "35" and inserting in lieu thereof the numerals "40."

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, this is another amendment which can not be successfully defended. The rate proposed by the committee is unwarranted and most excessive. The California production of dates amounts practically to 145,000 pounds, valued at only \$29,000. The imports in 1920 amounted to 36,000,000 pounds, valued at \$2,224,000. The California production is less than 1 per cent of the consumption.

This is not an infant industry. Dates are not produced in any large quantities in this country; they are imported. Here again the exceedingly high rate proposed of 40 per cent ad valorem means that for preserved dates costing 10 cents a pound the American people will have to pay instantly, tomorrow—if this bill should become a law to-morrow—about 15 cents a pound; if dates were selling for 20 cents a pound, this amendment means that the people would be charged about 30 cents a pound for dates; if dates are selling for 30 cents a pound, this amendment means that the people will be charged almost 50 cents a pound. There ought to be some limit upon these rates.

Evidently what the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOF] said this morning is becoming more and more apparent, that any Senator on either side of the Chamber who promises to vote for this bill may get whatever he wants in the way of duties upon the products in which he is interested. It is a give-and-take proposition. This is a duty of 40 per cent ad valorem on something that the American people must buy abroad; a food supply for which they have to go into a foreign market to secure what they want.

I am surprised that the Committee on Finance would, day after day, in the face of the opposition throughout the country to the pending bill, come here proposing to increase these rates. I do not know where the pressure is coming from or what the influence is, but the fact is that there has not been, to my recollection, a single amendment offered by the Committee on Finance to the agricultural schedule proposing to reduce a rate; there has not been a single amendment of the committee rejected; and I honestly believe that if the Senator from North Dakota had proposed to make this rate 200 per cent ad valorem he would get a majority in this Chamber in favor of it and that it would be adopted. The committee may come in with any rates they see fit and get favorable action.

There is no longer independent judgment here. We might just as well end the discussion. When the chemical schedule was under discussion and the metal schedule was being considered the committee came to the conclusion, after hearing the opposition, that many of the rates proposed were too high,

and in a few instances they reported amendments reducing the rates on metals, but on food every single amendment proposed here has been designed to increase the rates. I venture to say that the Senator from North Dakota, representing the Finance Committee, has proposed at least 25 amendments to the agricultural schedule in this bill increasing the rates since this schedule has been under consideration, and that those amendments have all been adopted. What is the justification for these increases? There is a day of reckoning coming.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

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

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. McCUMBER. Does the Senator want to have the duty on fresh or dried dates reduced to the Underwood rate?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I would reduce this rate to 20 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. McCUMBER. But I ask the Senator in regard to dates, fresh or dried. Most of the dates come in either fresh or dried, although some come in in candied or glacéd form. Now, does the Senator desire the Underwood rate to govern in this instance?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I think the Underwood rate on fresh dates was about the same as the rate provided in this bill, and, perhaps even a little bit more. But that rate was for revenue purposes.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator thinks the Underwood rate is too high, does he?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I am discussing the only amendment before the Senate, and that is the amendment in relation to prepared or preserved dates and not fresh or dried dates, which I do not desire to discuss now, because there is no committee amendment pending to that bracket.

Mr. McCUMBER. The whole paragraph 741a is an amendment, and therefore the Senator can discuss the entire paragraph.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I ask the Senator's pardon. The entire paragraph 741a is in the nature of an amendment, but the rate has not been changed in the Senate committee amendment so far as fresh or dried dates are concerned. The only change in the rate originally proposed in the bill is from 35 per cent ad valorem to 40 per cent ad valorem.

I am informed that the acreage in both figs and dates is relatively insignificant. In broad terms, the proposed duty will mean virtually nothing to the industry except in the case of a few scattered producers.

To show the inconsistency of the position of the committee in levying any duty at all upon dates, fresh or dried, prepared or preserved, the committee placed upon the free list bananas, which are imported in large quantities and are very insignificantly produced in this country; but on dates, which are also imported in very large quantities and practically are not produced at all in the United States, the committee imposed a duty of 1 cent per pound upon fresh or dried and 40 per cent ad valorem upon prepared or preserved.

Mr. President, I have nothing further to say upon this amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is upon the committee amendment as modified.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, the imports of dates, fresh or dried, in the year 1921 were 45,827,320 pounds. The import price was about 5 cents per pound, and therefore a duty of 1 cent per pound is equivalent to 20 per cent ad valorem. I am rather surprised that my good friend from Massachusetts can find such serious objection to this rate, when it is exactly the same as that fixed in the Democratic tariff law of 1913. We have not raised the rate a penny; and yet the importation of dates continues and we are still importing many times the quantity raised in the United States. I have not noticed that the duty on dates has enormously added to the cost of living in the United States.

When we come to glacéd or candied fruits, which are luxuries, and in which there is a great deal of waste and an enormous expense, with our high standard of wages it was necessary to increase the protective principle, or, if we say that it is not for protection, then we are entitled to have the benefit of the duties; but inasmuch as these glacéd fruits are produced in this country to a considerable extent by the higher cost of labor we of necessity are required to give a higher protective duty than under the Payne-Aldrich law.

The quantity produced in California does not amount to a great deal. In 1919 California produced 144,992 pounds; Arizona, 42,812 pounds. The total produced in those two States was 187,804 pounds. The imports of this 45,000,000 pounds, the Senator must remember, were not imports which will now take a duty of 40 per cent ad valorem. They are imports which

will take a duty of 1 cent per pound, or 20 per cent ad valorem on the present basis of importing values.

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

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. In paragraph 742, page 107, line 20, it is proposed to strike out "2" and insert "2½," so as to read:

Grapes in barrels or other packages, 25 cents per cubic foot of the capacity of the packages; raisins, 2½ cents per pound.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, this item illustrates once more the want of an underlying principle in the fixing of rates in this bill.

Raisins are exported in large volume. Dates are imported in large volume. Walnuts are imported in large volume. Almonds are imported in large volume; but whether the volume of imports be large or small, whether the industry be on an export basis or not, under this bill all have been given increased protective duties.

In 1919 the production of raisins amounted to 336,000,000 pounds, valued at \$50,000,000. The imports amounted to only 14,000,000 pounds, valued at \$2,653,000, about 4 per cent of our production. The exports were six times as large as our imports, amounting to 86,000,000 pounds, valued at \$12,000,000.

Here, then, is an industry where our production is beyond the requirements of the consumers of our country—an industry that is so profitable that we are exporting six times as much as we import of raisins. Clearly these facts do not justify the imposition of an increased tariff duty. There is nothing to protect when there are no importations.

Attention ought to be called to the fact that this is an industry that the Federal Trade Commission recently cited and called attention to the trade and price practices of the Raisin Growers' Association as not being entirely legal. The result of the action of the Federal Trade Commission against the Raisin Growers' Association was a modification of their marketing practices in trying to fix prices.

This industry can not claim that it is going to be injured by foreign exploitation. It is a very prosperous industry. Its prosperity has increased since the coming of prohibition. There is a greater demand for raisins in America to-day than ever before. The prohibition amendment has done more for this industry than tariff duties will ever do.

Mr. McCUMBER. How does the Senator explain that?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I did not think the Senator was so innocent.

Mr. President, how can we explain to the American people the need of a protective-tariff duty upon an industry that is not meeting with any competition from foreign sources? How can we justify a protective-tariff duty on an industry that is so prosperous that it can successfully compete with the world and export in large volume its products to all parts of the world?

Protection usually implies the necessity of preventing something of an injurious nature being inflicted upon an industry. Protection usually suggests that an industry needs to be safeguarded against foreign importations that may undersell the domestic product in the home markets. This claim can not be made of raisins. The facts do not warrant the levying of any duty whatever upon raisins, except for revenue purposes; and this amendment, as I said at the outset, is further evidence that no principle of tariff protection heretofore approved and supported by the majority party has been invoked in the preparation of the rates and schedules in this bill.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, in 1921 we imported \$1,136,947 worth of grapes in barrels and other packages. That gives us \$300,000 duty for revenue purposes, and we shall need that many times over. The raisins also give us a fair return in duties.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 107, line 21, it is proposed to strike out the words "dried currants and."

The amendment was agreed to.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On line 22 it is proposed to strike out the word "pound" and to insert the same word with a semicolon and the words "currants, Zante or other, 2 cents per pound," so as to read:

Other dried grapes, 2½ cents per pound; currants, Zante or other, 2 cents per pound.

The amendment was agreed to.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. In paragraph 743, page 107, lines 24 and 25, it is proposed to strike out "oranges, and grapefruit,

1 cent per pound," and to insert "and oranges, 1 cent per pound; grapefruit, one-half of 1 cent per pound."

So as to make the paragraph read:

PAR. 743. Lemons, 2 cents per pound; limes and oranges, 1 cent per pound; grapefruit, one-half of 1 cent per pound.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, on behalf of the committee, I offer the following amendment: On page 107, line 25, before the word "and," insert the words "in their natural state or in brine."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the committee as amended.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, the item of lemons in this paragraph is not now under consideration, there being no amendment offered to that part of the paragraph by the Senate Finance Committee; so I shall not take up the time of the Senate in discussing the high rate upon lemons named in this paragraph. The committee does, however, propose an amendment on oranges and on grapefruit, and I should like to have inserted in the RECORD some information which I have in regard to these products.

First of all, let me call attention to the fact that the House rate of 1 cent per pound is higher than the rate in the Underwood law, which was one-half cent per pound, and the rate named by the Senate committee restores the Payne-Aldrich duties.

The California orange crop is around 20,000,000 boxes, and that of Florida about 8,000,000 boxes. The imports are negligible, rarely exceeding \$100,000 worth, while our exports have been around three to seven million dollars worth. This industry, therefore, has reached a stage where it can maintain itself against foreign competition without the aid of a tariff, and this has been achieved not by the tariff but by production through the development and improvement of orange-grove cultivation.

The exports of oranges are relatively small, since it requires nearly a generation to create a citrus industry. Oranges come chiefly from Spain and the Mediterranean countries, but this supply is dwarfed by the demand for the domestic product. Here we have an illustration of why a tariff is continued upon an established industry in spite of the fact that it no longer requires such support. It affects relatively insignificant quantities of oranges from the West Indies, and assists the growers' association in maintaining their prices through the feeding out of the orange supply to the different markets. The increased uses of oranges, such as for drinks and as a table fruit, have tremendously expanded the demand.

As to grapefruit, Florida produces the great bulk of the domestic grapefruit, production in 1919 being 3,000,000 boxes, valued at \$6,000,000. Porto Rico produced in 1919, 345,340 boxes. California produced 465,000 boxes. The imports have been relatively small, amounting to about half a million dollars.

Mr. President, with these facts before us, I want to call attention to the fact that the orange industry does not need any protective tariff duty. One cent per pound will not bring any revenue, because there are no imports; and the only purpose is that it will give the growers' association a chance to increase the price. Oranges are produced in sufficient amount to take care of the domestic demand, and there is not any justification, in my opinion, for this duty. Oranges, like raisins, are produced in such quantities that they can not possibly be considered infant industries.

I have nothing further to add, Mr. President.

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

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

Mr. McCUMBER. That completes paragraph 743?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It does.

Mr. McCUMBER. I ask, then, that we take up paragraph 718, providing for duties on fish.

The next amendment of the committee was, in paragraph 718, page 102, line 18, to strike out the word "all" and insert the words "fish, fresh, frozen, or packed in ice; halibut, salmon, and swordfish, 2 cents per pound."

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] is interested in these paragraphs. He ought to be sent for, or a quorum call had.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I move to amend the amendment by adding, after the word "salmon," in line 19, the word "mackerel" and a comma.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, fish is a product that differs from all others in the very nature of the industry, and therefore it must be considered upon somewhat different principles. First, I want to call attention to a strik-

ing inconsistency in this paragraph. Halibut is the fish most extensively found in the eastern markets. Salmon and swordfish are found more extensively in the Pacific coast markets.

The imports of salmon and of swordfish are insignificant, so that the salmon and swordfish market, largely on the Pacific coast, has practically no competition, while halibut, a fish caught in the Atlantic Ocean waters, and marketed in the Atlantic coast markets, meets with very serious competition from Canadian fish importations, yet the committee amendment, drawn so unscientifically, only gives the same protection to the halibut fisherman of the East that it gives to the salmon fisherman of the West, although the halibut fisherman must compete with an importation from foreign markets of 17 per cent of the amount of our consumption.

I think this is a very grave and serious injustice to the halibut fisherman, and that the rate upon halibut ought to be more than the rate upon salmon and swordfish, in view of the statistics upon the imports and the production and consumption of these various kinds of fish, or the rates on salmon and swordfish reduced.

I do not know that there is anything more I care to say, but I ask that some letters which I have received and information which I have summarized about the imports and domestic production of these fish be incorporated with my remarks.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE SENATE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT AND PREVIOUS LAWS.

Under the Underwood Act fresh fish, frozen or packed in ice, were free. Under the Payne-Aldrich Act fresh fish were dutiable at three-fourths cent per pound, with a special provision of one-fourth cent per pound for fresh herring, eels, smelts, and fresh-water fish, and a special provision of 1 cent per pound for fresh mackerel, halibut, and salmon.

PRODUCTION, IMPORTS, AND EXPORTS.

The present annual catch of fresh fish amounts to about 2,500,000,000 pounds. Our imports average about 100,000,000 pounds, of which fresh-water fish constitutes about 4 per cent. Exports are relatively small; ordinarily they amount to around 10,000,000 pounds.

Imports are almost exclusively from Canada and are received at North Atlantic ports. The great bulk of salt-water fish consists of halibut, cod, haddock, hake, pollock, herring, smelts, salmon, and mackerel.

Of the total catch of fresh fish 35,000,000 pounds are halibut and 613,910,000 pounds are salmon. I have not been able to obtain any accurate figures as to swordfish. The figures on halibut and salmon, however, are sufficient to indicate that a large percentage of the total catch is of these varieties, and that therefore the proposed increase from 1 cent to 2 cents per pound on halibut, salmon, and swordfish will be applicable to at least 30 per cent of our domestic catch.

About 17,000,000 pounds of halibut and about 6,000,000 pounds of salmon are imported per year. Imports of halibut amount to about 17 per cent of our total consumption; imports of salmon amount to less than 1 per cent of our consumption.

It is clear from these figures that halibut fish should bear a higher duty than salmon.

—
GLOUCESTER FISH EXCHANGE,
Gloucester, Mass., June 5, 1922.

Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: At a meeting of the Gloucester Fish Exchange, held this morning, I was instructed to communicate with you and to ask your kindly influence in having the provision in the proposed tariff relating to fresh mackerel raised from 1 cent to 2 cents per pound.

The suggestion offered is that the word "mackerel" be inserted in Senate Document No. 187, Schedule 7, agricultural products and provisions, paragraph 718, page 42, so as to read:

"Par. 718. Fish, fresh, frozen, or packed in ice: Halibut, mackerel, salmon, and swordfish, 2 cents per pound," etc.

Briefly, and as a reason for making the foregoing request, it might be added that the American fresh-mackerel market is flooded with fish imported from Nova Scotia, with the result that the product is selling at figures unprofitable to the American industry.

During the past two weeks, as an illustration, thousands of barrels of fresh mackerel have been shipped in from Nova Scotia and dumped on the New England market, with the result that the American fisherman finds his usual and regular market destroyed and unprofitable.

Trusting that the suggestion herein contained will meet with your approbation and thanking you in advance for a kindly consideration of the matter at your convenience.

I am, sir, with great respect, sincerely yours,
WILMOT A. REED, Secretary.

—
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Gloucester, Mass., June 6, 1922.

Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: The board of directors of the chamber of commerce has asked me to bring the following matter to your attention, with the request that, in so far as may be possible, you lend your influence in support of the proposed change.

The matter relates to the proposed tariff, and especially to that portion which concerns fresh mackerel. It is found in Senate Document No. 187, schedule 7, "Agricultural products and provisions," paragraph 718, page 42, and reads as follows:

"Fish, fresh, frozen, or packed in ice, n. s. p. f., halibut, salmon, and swordfish, 2 cents per pound; all other fish, n. s. p. f., 1 cent per pound," etc.

The board of directors is convinced from the facts presented to it by its committee and its affiliated organizations that the tariff on fresh mackerel as herein provided for would result in great injury to the

extensive mackerel fisheries existing in Gloucester and elsewhere in New England. It is apparent that at present Canadian fresh mackerel are being imported via Boston at a cost far below the cost of production to our own fishermen. The board of directors therefore begs to suggest that this particular paragraph be so amended as to include along with the three other fresh fish mentioned mackerel. The paragraph would then read as follows:

"PAR. 718. Fish, fresh, frozen, or packed in ice, n. s. p. f., halibut, mackerel, salmon, swordfish, 2 cents per pound; all other fish, n. s. p. f., 1 cent per pound," etc.

We trust that this suggestion will meet with your approval and that there is still time and opportunity in which to make the desired change. We fully appreciate all your past efforts in our favor and know that you have our interests at heart, for all of which we are truly thankful.

Sincerely yours,

HERMAN F. LION, *Manager.*

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I was called out for a moment. What is the pending amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment relative to fish.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The first amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The first amendment.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I desire to offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will report the amendment.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 102, line 19, the Senator from Washington moves to amend by inserting after the word "pound" the following proviso:

Provided, That from and after 90 days after the enactment of this act no fresh or frozen halibut, salmon, or swordfish from the North Pacific Ocean or its tributary waters shall be admitted into the United States through any foreign country, except when the same shall be in bond from an American port.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, this amendment to the amendment does not affect the duty on fish as proposed by the committee. I will say frankly that it is intended to meet rather a local situation which has been brought about by special orders in council and regulations by the Canadian Government.

I do not know whether the committee will oppose the amendment or not. I will take just a few moments to explain the situation, and I hope there will be no opposition to it. I can not see how there can be, from the American standpoint.

This amendment was put in the tariff bill of 1913 in the Senate. It was very carefully considered by the committee and there was a very extended debate on the floor of the Senate. Senator Chamberlain, of Oregon, on the Democratic side, made a very strong speech in behalf of it. As I said, it was put in the bill in the Senate; but it went out in conference.

The situation which we seek to meet by this amendment is about this: The halibut fishing grounds are 600 or 700 miles north of Seattle, extending a distance of about 1,500 miles. They are fished very largely by American fishermen and American vessels; at least, that used to be the case.

In 1915 the Grand Trunk Railway was completed to Prince Rupert, which is about thirty-odd miles from the Alaskan coast. It is the terminus of this railroad. Immediately upon the completion of the railroad, or when it was near completion, the Canadians, with characteristic energy and characteristic devotion to the interests of Canadians, took steps to concentrate business at Prince Rupert and provide freight for the Grand Trunk Railway.

One of the inviting fields in this direction was the fishing industry, and especially the halibut fishing industry. If this product could be diverted over the Grand Trunk Railway it would furnish a very large freight tonnage coming to eastern cities and eastern markets.

Canada has a very effective legislative system, one that can be used very promptly, and it was put into operation at once. Certain regulations were made and certain orders in council were passed, with the avowed purpose of concentrating the fishing fleet and the fishing industry at Prince Rupert.

I made an address myself in connection with the tariff bill of 1913 and quoted from some of these orders in council, and I desire to quote from those orders now, because they are just as pertinent at this time as they were in 1913. I desire to quote from a statement I made, because it summarizes the action of the Canadian Government. It is as follows:

In December, 1914, the Canadian Government passed an order in council permitting the Minister of Customs to make such regulations and conditions as he found necessary to induce foreign corporations and American vessels to bring their business to Canadian ports.

That was the distinct purpose of these regulations and orders in council. I read further:

This order in council provided that during the year 1915 foreigners and foreign corporations bringing fresh fish in vessels registered in the United States could land such fish at any Canadian port without the payment of duty and transship the same in bond to any port in the United States. This order in council also provided that foreigners and foreign corporations bringing fish into Canada would be permitted to purchase supplies at any port in British Columbia; all of these things to be done, however, under such regulations and conditions as the Minister of Customs should determine.

After making inducements which would lead the fishing fleet to go into Canadian ports for the purpose of acquiring provisions and for the purpose of disposing of their fish, and so on, one of the provisions was that these fish should be shipped out of Canada only by railroad. In other words, it was the avowed purpose of these orders in council to have the fish shipped over the Canadian railroad. That was the only railroad there, and the only way to get those fish out was to ship them over the Canadian railroad. It was also provided, I think in the 1914 order in council, that the fish could be brought into Canada and transshipped in bond. That precluded many of the smaller catches from being disposed of.

In order to encourage the fisherman to come into Prince Rupert a subsequent order in council was made, modifying the original order in council, and permitting these fish brought by American ships and American seamen into Canada to be sold to Canadians for the purpose of shipment in bond into Canada. It was provided also by these orders in council that fish brought by Americans into those ports could not be sold for consumption in Canada at all.

One of the principal objections made by some of the fishermen and seamen out in that country seems to be based upon the idea that if an amendment like this should be adopted, the price would be lowered. As a matter of fact, in my judgment, they would get a much better price in American ports and American territory than under the present conditions. They seem to have overlooked the fact that under the Canadian orders in council they can not sell their fish to Canadians for consumption in Canada; in other words, the market is very decidedly limited.

Briefly, that is the situation we strive to meet by this amendment. The Canadian Government has used its legislative power to concentrate the fishing industry at Prince Rupert. We think this industry should have an opportunity, at least, and an encouragement, to concentrate at American ports.

I believe the effect of the amendment I have offered will be to induce American fishermen to bring their fish to Ketchikan, Alaska. Some think this is aimed to promote the welfare of the city of Seattle. That is not the purpose. Ketchikan is about 600 miles north of Seattle, less than a hundred miles from Prince Rupert, and the only disadvantage to which it is put, aside from these orders in council, is the fact that it has not railroad connection with the land. In other words, Prince Rupert, as I said, is the terminus of this railroad.

I have here a petition in the form of a guaranty from business men and business interests at Ketchikan, in which they guarantee that a ferry service would be maintained between Ketchikan and Prince Rupert if legislation of this character should be enacted so that the Canadian railway may not lose the business. One objection heretofore urged has been that this was intended to confine the shipment of the fish to American railroads. I believe that a great deal of it will come over the American railroads. I believe a great deal of the fish will come to Seattle with legislation of this character, but it may not do so. Even though a great deal of it may come to Seattle, a great part of it will still go to Prince Rupert under this legislation and go over the Canadian railroad, but the business involved in the handling of the fish, in taking care of it and storing it and preparing it, and all that sort of thing, will be done in American territory by American capital and American interests. That is done pretty largely, I think, in Ketchikan and elsewhere; in other words, this will result in encouraging American industry and employment and capital, and so forth, in Alaska. That is another consideration that commends it to me.

The guaranty that I have is dated Ketchikan, May 8, and reads as follows:

We are informed that your objection to the legislation now pending before Congress, relative to the Alaska fresh-fish business, is due to the lack of facilities and transportation between Alaska and the rail terminal at Prince Rupert, British Columbia.

In order, therefore, that this objection may be overcome and Alaska receive its full share of the benefits accruing from the fisheries operations along the North Pacific coast and to conserve this industry to the American instead of Canadian people, we, the undersigned, whom you know to be financially responsible, agree to provide upon the passage of the suggested legislation satisfactory transportation facilities for all shipments of fresh and frozen fish between Ketchikan, Alaska, and the western terminal of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railroad, at a rate which shall not exceed the present cost of delivery, and we offer for your consideration the hereto-attached statement of the facilities now available at Ketchikan for the economical and expeditious handling of the product of these fisheries as compared with those at Prince Rupert, British Columbia.

This is signed by some 30 or 40 leading business men, including bankers, merchants, and so on, of Ketchikan. Then they point out the facilities for handling the fish at Ketchikan. I desire to say that because of the tendency of this legislation and the proposals which they knew were going to be urged from time to time and in the belief that Congress would respond

to this desire and this need of encouraging American industry the people in Ketchikan have gone on to provide the facilities that may be necessary to handle the fish. They have, according to their statement—and I have no reason to doubt it—much more extensive facilities than have been created even at Prince Rupert.

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

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield.

Mr. KELLOGG. I was not in the Chamber when the Senator commenced his remarks, and I would like to ask a question. Is it proposed to prohibit the importation of fish into the United States except through an American port of entry?

Mr. JONES of Washington. They can not come into the United States except through an American port of entry. The amendment provides that they can not come through a foreign country, except in bond from an American port.

Mr. KELLOGG. The Senator means that they could not come on any of the Canadian railroads into the United States?

Mr. JONES of Washington. They could not come in on any Canadian railroad, unless shipped from an American port in bond. In other words, they could come from Ketchikan in bond over the Grand Trunk Railway.

Mr. KELLOGG. But they could not come from any Canadian port into the United States?

Mr. JONES of Washington. No.

Mr. KELLOGG. In bond?

Mr. JONES of Washington. This prohibits their coming from any Canadian port in bond.

Mr. KELLOGG. The Senator is aware, I suppose, of the great amount of Canadian products to be exported which come through the United States. Is not this rather radical discrimination against Canadian interests when we take a large amount of their products, even for export, through United States ports?

Mr. JONES of Washington. This deals only with particular products—with halibut and salmon and swordfish.

Mr. KELLOGG. But products from Canadian farms—wheat, flour, live stock, and meats—are shipped through the United States and through the United States ports to foreign countries.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do not try to deal with those.

Mr. KELLOGG. I know the Senator does not, but it seems to me that they could with equal justice prohibit any of their exports coming through the United States.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Does the Senator think they will do it?

Mr. KELLOGG. I do not know whether they will or not.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Did the Senator hear what I stated with reference to what they have done to us to center this trade at Prince Rupert? What I propose to do is to meet the very discrimination they have made against us. That is all in the world it is. They provide that our people can not bring fish to Canada and sell them there for Canadian consumption.

Mr. KELLOGG. Do they place an absolute embargo on American fish in Canada? Is that what the Senator means?

Mr. JONES of Washington. No; they encourage it to come in there to be shipped over the Grand Trunk Railroad, but they say that it can not be sold for local consumption.

Mr. KELLOGG. Then it is an embargo against the local consumption of American fish?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes. They have done that by their orders in council. They have used their legislative power, as I said awhile ago, to build up Prince Rupert.

Mr. KELLOGG. Do we sell much American fish in Canada locally?

Mr. JONES of Washington. They prohibit it.

Mr. KELLOGG. Would we sell much if they did not prohibit it?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I expect we would.

Mr. KELLOGG. Does the Senator know whether we would or not?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I can not tell what we would do absolutely. I think that we probably would, because our fishing fleets gather in most of the halibut and the salmon, especially the halibut from the halibut bank. They are American fishermen and American ships, and they take them to Prince Rupert, and have been doing it. I have not any doubt that if they could be sold locally many of them would be sold there, but they especially prohibit that by their order in council. I have here a copy of that order. Here is what they say. This is an amendment of the order in council of 1914:

Said order in council of December 10, 1914, is hereby amended to provide: During the present calendar year (1915) foreigners or foreign corporations—

This is aimed directly at the United States, and I want the Senator from Minnesota to notice it—

During the present calendar year (1915) foreigners or foreign corporations bringing fresh fish in vessels registered in the United States of America to any port in British Columbia shall be permitted

to land such fresh fish at such port without payment of duties and transship the same in bond to any port in the United States, or to sell such fish in bond to such local dealer or dealers as may be properly and duly licensed therefor, under the regulations and conditions therein-after mentioned, which dealer or dealers shall export the same in compliance with the bonding requirement (without the right, however, in either instance, to sell in Canada for consumption therein, or otherwise except in bond, any of such fresh fish so landed); and such foreigners and foreign corporations bringing fresh fish in vessels registered in the United States of America to any port in British Columbia shall be permitted to purchase supplies and ship crews for such vessels at any port in said Province of British Columbia, the whole under such regulations and conditions as the minister of customs may determine.

As I called attention a while ago, by this order in council the fish brought in there could not be sent out of Canada except by railroad. In other words, if an American fishing vessel went into Prince Rupert with fish and landed them there and could not dispose of them or could not sell all of them, they could not take them by boat to Seattle; they could only get them out of there by railroad. What Canada may do by way of retaliation I do not know. We are trying to meet retaliation that Canada has already practiced against us. In dealing with many of these questions where we are trying to meet discrimination, an act aimed directly at us and against us, I can not understand why we should be urged not to do something for fear that we may offend or for fear they may retaliate against us. We did not begin this. They commenced it. They began it upon the completion of the Grand Trunk Railway for the specific and avowed purpose of building up the business of Prince Rupert, and for the further purpose, as stated in one of these orders in council, of securing the transfer of registry of American ships to Canadian registry. Here is what they said in one of the whereas to this order in council of 1915—I shall not take the time to read it all:

And whereas the minister of the naval service is informed that, in view of the fact that Prince Rupert is several hundred miles nearer the fishing grounds than is Seattle, and as the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway is now operating, so that fish can as readily be shipped to the eastern United States markets from Prince Rupert as from Seattle, if such boats and smaller vessels were permitted to go to Prince Rupert and sell their catches to some person or corporation which would in turn ship them in bond to the United States, and if such vessels or boats were then permitted to purchase supplies for their fishing operations, a considerable number of them would transfer their base of operations from Seattle to Prince Rupert, and would probably later transfer their vessels or boats to the Canadian registry and permanently operate from Prince Rupert.

That is another method that our friends across the line take to build up their merchant marine. I commend it upon their part. If I were a Canadian, I would be very proud of the action which they took in order to promote and build up their interests, especially their shipping interests. I would like to see us do the same thing to look after our shipping interests.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. I only interrupt the Senator because I really desire information, and I want to understand the situation fully. As I understand it, the fish comes in at Ketchikan, which is an American port. It is shipped from there to Prince Rupert.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Not now. By reason of the encouragement and the special inducements offered the fishing vessels do not go to Ketchikan, but to Prince Rupert.

Mr. LODGE. They go direct to Prince Rupert?

Mr. JONES of Washington. They go direct to Prince Rupert.

Mr. LODGE. American vessels?

Mr. JONES of Washington. American vessels, and they turn their fish over to some dealer, who will ship them in bond into the United States; in other words, they have the business transaction there.

Mr. LODGE. They are relieved from the Canadian duty?

Mr. JONES of Washington. That is true.

Mr. LODGE. The reason why I ask is that I have received a telegram from the New England Fish Co., referring to another communication, which I have not been able to find, asking me to oppose the amendment placing an embargo on fish other than packed in American ports. Then I also have a letter from the Fishing Vessel Owners' Association of Seattle, and they speak in it of a pamphlet which they prepared for the Senate Finance Committee, which I have not received. They say:

If you can see your way clear to oppose this amendment when it is proposed, you will materially assist in the preservation of a great American industry in which our members, who own over 100 sea halibut schooners, have invested their all and on which their living depends.

That is from Seattle; it is not from New England.

Mr. NELSON. Will the Senators yield to me?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. LODGE. I was merely asking a question for information.

Mr. NELSON. What the Senator from Washington contends for may be of some benefit to American shipowners, but it will

be very disastrous to the Alaskan fishermen. They contend, and I have numerous letters from them to that effect, that they are cut off and are unable to sell their fish for the prices for which they could otherwise sell them. The amendment proposed, if adopted, would be a curse to the Alaskan fishermen.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I desire to say that the mere statement of the Senator from Minnesota does not make it a fact. I should like to have some one point out how it would be a curse to the Alaskan fishermen. It does not take away in any degree their market; it really expands their market. The Alaskan fishermen now take their fish into Prince Rupert, but they can not sell them there for local consumption. The only way they can sell them in Prince Rupert is in such a manner that they may be shipped in bond to ports into the United States to be sold.

Mr. NELSON. At present all of the fish which are caught there have to go through Seattle to be shipped to the eastern market.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Oh, no.

Mr. NELSON. Oh, yes.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Oh, no.

Mr. NELSON. The Alaskan fishermen can not now sell their fish at Prince Rupert; if they wish to ship any fish eastward anywhere in the United States they have all got to go through the port of Seattle and nowhere else. The Alaskan fishermen bitterly complain of that; I have had them come to see me about it here within the last three months.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Of course, the only way that fish from Alaska may be shipped to the eastern market, unless they go around by vessel, is over American railroads or over Canadian railroads; and the American railroads, of course, connect at Seattle. That is all true; but the amendment which I have proposed does not prohibit the Alaskan fishermen from shipping their fish to the eastern markets over Canadian railroads; it does not deprive them of that market at all.

Mr. NELSON. I will call the attention of the Senator from Washington to the fact that the Legislature of Alaska was so interested in this question that it directed the attorney general of Alaska to bring suit in the Supreme Court of the United States in order to get rid of this hamstringing legislation that is ruining the Alaskan fishermen. The case was argued here in the Supreme Court—and I saw the attorney general of Alaska at that time—but the Supreme Court held that inasmuch as the law complained of related to a Territory, Congress had the power to enact it. If Alaska had been a State, that legislation never could have been enacted.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, the legislation to which the Senator from Minnesota has referred does not relate to fisheries at all. That was a provision of the merchant marine act with reference to the coastwise laws of the country and to shipping, and has no bearing whatever upon this proposition. Why the Senator from Minnesota should bring that law in, I do not understand.

The Senator from Minnesota states that the Legislature of Alaska and the attorney general of Alaska are objecting to this proposal. I have here a resolution which was passed by the Alaska Territorial Fish Commission with reference to this very matter. The Senator from Minnesota thinks, and I think, that we should pay some attention to the local sentiment and the views of the people of Alaska.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, ever since I visited Alaska in 1903, with a committee of the Senate, I have been a warm friend of Alaska. A great deal of the legislation which has been obtained in behalf of Alaska in the past I formulated and secured its passage here. Alaska has had such very hard times that the Territory now has not as large a white population as it had 10 years ago. If it is desired to build up Alaska, its industries should be encouraged, and one of its leading industries is that of fishing, which should not be frozen out in the interest of Seattle.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I do not think the Senator from Minnesota means what he says or he does not appreciate what he is saying. I am not trying to freeze out the fishing industry in Alaska in the interest of Seattle. As a matter of fact, as I stated a while ago, this amendment is in the interest of Alaska; it is in the interest of Ketchikan, Alaska. There is where, if this amendment is adopted, the fishing business will be concentrated.

I appreciate what the Senator from Minnesota has said regarding his friendship for Alaska and as to what he has done for Alaska. Too much can not be said as to his interest

in Alaska and his friendship for that Territory; and I am sorry to see that because of a few people who, in my judgment, have been very largely inspired by Canadian influences, the Senator will unwittingly join in defeating a proposition that is for the benefit of Alaska, and is especially for the benefit of one of the principal towns in Alaska.

I know that some of the fishermen oppose this proposition; but I want to say to the Senator that I am very reliably informed that a prominent Canadian attended the meetings of some of the fishermen on Puget Sound and used his influence there in opposition to this proposed legislation. Canadians know how to look after their own interests, and they do it; they know how to use their business connections in this country to look after their interests, and they use them.

Mr. NELSON. There is this difference, I wish to say to the Senator, namely, that when these poor fishermen take their fish to Prince Rupert they get a better price in cash than they do at Seattle.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do not want them to have to come to Seattle.

Mr. NELSON. And they make more money; it is more profitable to them. If the fishermen are compelled to go to Seattle, as under existing arrangements and under the proposed arrangement, they will be the losers.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Why does the Senator say that this proposed amendment is in the interest of Seattle? I wish he would tell us.

Mr. NELSON. Because it will compel them to take all their fish and ship them eastward through the port of Seattle.

Mr. JONES of Washington. How will the amendment compel them to ship their fish through Seattle?

Mr. NELSON. That is provided under the law already existing, and the Senator's proposal is supplementary to that law.

Mr. JONES of Washington. No; the Senator is mistaken.

Mr. NELSON. No.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Senator is not usually mistaken, but sometimes, like the rest of us, he does make a mistake, and he is mistaken in this instance. There is not any law which requires them to ship their fish through Seattle; they are not doing it now; they are selling their fish at Prince Rupert, and this amendment will not take away their markets, but will expressly permit them to send their fish in bond from Ketchikan over the Canadian railroads to the eastern markets.

So, Mr. President, this amendment does not take away from the American fishermen any market that he has, but, as a matter of fact, it expands his market.

I am just as much interested in the Alaskan fishermen as is the Senator from Minnesota; I am just as much interested in the fishermen of Puget Sound as is the Senator from Minnesota, although I may not have done as much as has the Senator from Minnesota; I am just as much interested in the welfare of Alaska as is the Senator from Minnesota, and, with all due respect to him, I believe I know about as much about it as does the Senator from Minnesota, and if I thought that this amendment would be an injury to Alaska I would not propose it, but, instead of thinking that it is a benefit to Seattle, I believe it is of special benefit to Ketchikan.

Now, here is a resolution passed by the Alaskan Territorial Fish Commission at the session held in Juneau January 14, 1921:

Whereas it is the sense of the commission that the fresh-fish industry of the Territory is one of its greatest and most important resources; that said industry should be encouraged as a means of developing and building up the said Territory; and that if proper protection is given this industry to prevent the fish caught in the waters of and adjacent thereto from being packed and prepared in foreign countries for shipment to the markets of the United States, a permanent fishing population will settle in Alaska, improve its lands, and aid in the settlement and development of the Territory: Therefore be it

Resolved, That all fresh or frozen halibut or salmon, or the products thereof, arriving at an American port from or through any foreign country, which have been packed or prepared for shipment in other than American territory, shall be subject to a duty of 3 cents per pound, and all other deep-sea fish or the products thereof arriving at an American port from or through any foreign country, which have been packed or prepared for shipment in other than American territory, shall be subject to a duty of 1 cent per pound; and

Resolved, That no fresh or frozen fish taken from the North Pacific Ocean or tributary waters shall be admitted into the United States through any foreign country except when the same shall be in bond from an American port; and

That is the amendment which I have proposed.

Further resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the Secretary of Commerce through the Governor of Alaska as chairman of this committee.

I have before me another resolution which was adopted setting out the reasons for all the position taken, but I will not take the time to read it now.

The Governor of Alaska came down here, and I understand, though I was not present, that he appeared before the com-

mittee and urged this same proposition. I know that he is for it; he is looking after the interests of Alaska; he is devoted to her interests; he wants done that which will benefit Alaska.

Mr. President, I know there are some who oppose this amendment. Some of our fish vessel owners' associations have sent telegrams and resolutions opposing it, but let me call attention to the fact that when the Simmons-Underwood tariff law was pending in this body the same organizations urged the same amendment. I have copies of their letters and telegrams here urging the adoption of the amendment. I am told—and the information comes from reliable authority—that some of the representatives of Canadian interests and Canadian companies have appeared in the meetings of the vessel owners' associations at Seattle opposing this amendment, and they sent me resolutions or telegrams protesting against its adoption.

I have here a copy of a letter signed by O. O. Hvatum, dated Ketchikan, May 22. It is addressed to "Fellow members of Fishing Vessel Owners' Association," the writer of the letter being a member of the association. He says:

GENTLEMEN: I have had considerable discussion with Mr. Strong about the proposed legislation which will move the market and port of discharge for our fish from Prince Rupert, British Columbia, to Alaska—

Not as the Senator from Minnesota says to Seattle, but to Alaska, and I believe if the business men stand back of their agreement, namely, to put a ferry on the run between Ketchikan and the Grand Trunk Railway, to be run on train schedule, regardless if there is a load or not, that our main objection is removed.

I do not know whether the Senator was present when I read from the guaranty signed by nearly all the business men of Ketchikan—not signed by any business men of Seattle, but by nearly all the business men of Ketchikan—banks and business houses, merchants, and so forth, saying that they will guarantee the establishment of a ferry service, not from Seattle but from Ketchikan to Prince Rupert. They certainly know, or at least they ought to know, what is of interest to them and what will benefit them. The writer of the letter goes on to say:

I do not know if you are aware of the fact that at the present time American fish is barred from Canadian markets when discharged at their ports by American fishing vessels. However, such is the case. Consequently Canadian boats often receive—

I hope the Senator will note this—

Consequently Canadian boats often receive from 1 to 3 cents a pound more for their fish than we do, which I consider unfair to American boats. I was under the impression that American fish could be used in Canada by paying the duty. Had conditions been generally known, I believe the most of us would have taken a different view and action at our meetings held in Seattle last winter.

It is impossible for us to meet together at this time of year, and I would suggest that each of you give the legislation which has been proposed by the citizens of Ketchikan careful consideration. I believe it should have our support.

Respectfully,

O. O. HVATUM.

Mr. President, I do not feel like taking more of the time of the Senate in the discussion of this matter. The sole purpose of this amendment is to encourage American interests, American industry, American capital, and it is in the interest of the American fisherman, the American fleet.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Certainly.

Mr. NELSON. Take the Ketchikan case: Most of the fisheries in Alaska are immediately west of Prince Rupert, the terminus of the Canadian railroad. What the Senator asks and what the Ketchikan people ask is that instead of bringing that fish to Prince Rupert, which is close by, it shall be brought 100 or 200 miles farther south to a little mining town, Ketchikan, and there shipped back to Prince Rupert. That is what they are after.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, the Senator was professing his love and his interest and friendship for Alaska a few moments ago.

Mr. NELSON. My interest is in the poor fishermen of Alaska. Theirs is the most permanent industry. The gold mining, the placer mining, is only transient. The timber supply of Alaska is limited. It is the fishing industry of Alaska that is the most permanent industry there, and I am in favor of the poor fishermen who catch the fish.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Senator overlooks the fact that Ketchikan is many miles nearer to the fishing grounds than Prince Rupert, and that the fishing boats must largely go by Ketchikan to get to Prince Rupert with their cargoes. That would be another saving to the fishermen and to the fishing vessels.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. KING. For information, may I ask a few questions of the Senator? This is rather terra incognita to me, although it is in the water.

As I understand, the fishermen have no general restrictions imposed upon them, and may invade the waters of the Pacific coast and fish as and when and where they please.

Mr. JONES of Washington. These fisheries, of course, are outside the 3-mile limit.

Mr. KING. Yes. The only competition they have is among themselves. The product of their catch they bring either to Canadian ports or to American ports. I am speaking now of Canadian fishermen and American fishermen, too, and I am confining these interrogatories to the Pacific coast. Why should a tariff be levied at all, unless it is for revenue, when the people need fish, when meat prices are high, when fish is so important an article in the diet and in the food supply of the people? The ocean is free. They do not have to plant, they do not have to sow, they do not have to reap. They go there and catch the fish. They bring them into our markets. If we put on a tariff, obviously it is to enable them to get just that much more per pound for their fish than otherwise they might get.

Mr. JONES of Washington. My amendment does not deal with the matter of the tariff, and I am not discussing that phase of it as yet. I am in favor of a tariff myself. As a matter of fact, the rate proposed by the committee is not as high as a good many would like to see. Our people on Puget Sound meet the Japanese fishermen, and their markets have been very seriously invaded under the free-fish legislation that we now have on the statute books. Our people believe that if this is continued our fishermen are going to be driven out of business by the Japanese fishermen.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me just on that point?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. Japan gives a very heavy subsidy to her fishermen, and it is impossible for our people to contend at all with them for our markets unless we have a duty. They ask a higher duty than is in this bill, and I have no doubt they are justified in asking it; but we are presented in these fisheries with a contest with subsidies everywhere. Other powers have more intelligence about their fisheries than we have shown of late. We used to be very intelligent about it at the beginning of the Government. The Japanese competition I happen to know about, and I know—if the Senator will pardon me for interrupting him—

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; I am glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. LODGE. I know that they subsidize all their fisheries, and they have an advantage which no unsubsidized fishery can possibly meet.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator, if that statement is true—and, of course, I accept it—

Mr. LODGE. Oh, there is no doubt about it. It is all in testimony here.

Mr. KING. May I inquire if it is not based upon the fact that the Japanese live almost entirely upon fish and rice, and therefore it is important that they shall have fish brought to their shores, and in order to get quantities adequate for the wants of their people they are compelled to subsidize their fishermen, as the Senator says?

Mr. LODGE. All nations do it. The Japanese are not the only ones. Canada subsidizes very extensively. Great Britain used to subsidize, and I think is returning to it; but almost all the countries that have any fisheries, like Holland and the others, give subsidies. I have it all here. I did not want to take the time of the Senate to go over them all, but Japan substantially subsidizes all branches of the fishing industry and has done so for several years past.

Canada for years has offered bounties to resident Canadian fishermen employed in deep-sea fishing, and has also subsidized cold-storage plants at fishing ports up to 30 per cent of their cost, and has given substantial transportation aid in absorbing up to two-thirds of transportation charges on certain products shipped from the Pacific coast to interior points in order that the production of these goods may be encouraged and the product made available in the interior areas not otherwise served with ocean fish.

That is, they pay two-thirds of the charges of the railroads. We give them nothing.

The United Kingdom, in recognizing the importance and need of fostering and promoting this industry, has now established a department of marine and fisheries. Very recently a similar department has been established in Canada.

The Senator will find, if he will look into it, that those bounties are given by practically all nations that have fisheries.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, just a word and then I will conclude.

I hope the Senator from Minnesota will not allow himself to be controlled in opposition to this measure by some opposition coming from fishermen. As I say, I know some of them oppose it, but they do not all oppose it. I have received letters and petitions from fishermen out there favoring this legislation, and since the situation has been explained to them more fully they are in favor of it. As I say, I do not claim that they are all for it, but the Senator from Minnesota might do a very great injustice to many other fishermen by taking the statements of a few fishermen who may, of course, voice their opposition, and it may be very sincere opposition. I do not question that.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me—

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. NELSON. I got the most of my information from the attorney general of Alaska, who was here during the winter. He came down to argue that case. Under existing law they have to ship all the fish caught in Alaska to Seattle. This amendment modifies it and would put Ketchikan in place of Seattle. The fishermen were so insistent upon it that they succeeded in getting a resolution passed through the Legislature of Alaska instructing the attorney general to bring this suit in the Supreme Court; and, as I understood from the attorney general, but for this legislation the fishermen could bring their fish into Prince Rupert and get a far better price for them than they could at Seattle. Under existing law they can not ship any of the fish eastward, no matter where they are caught in Alaska, without sending them to Seattle, and Seattle in that way had a complete monopoly of the business. That was my understanding. That was why the legislature instructed the attorney general to bring the suit.

I have sent my clerk down to get the opinion of the Supreme Court in the case. The discrimination was of such a character that if it had been a discrimination between two States it could not for a moment have been tolerated. If Alaska had been a State instead of a Territory, it would not have been tolerated, but the Supreme Court held—and the case was ably argued on both sides—that inasmuch as Alaska was a Territory, Congress had a right to pass any kind of legislation that it saw fit to pass.

I have no interest in the railroads. I do not care a bit about the Canadian railroads. My heart goes out for those poor men who are on the water catching the fish. Those men ought to get the best possible return for their work, and they can only get it by leaving them free to take their fish to any of these places—Prince Rupert, Victoria, Seattle, or Ketchikan.

I know what Ketchikan is. It may be a little more of a town now than it was when I was there. It is at the end of a very narrow channel that leads up to Skagway on the inner passage. When I was there it was a little bit of a mining town, and the mining industry was at work there. A gentleman sent me a paper, and I think I referred it to the Finance Committee, in favor of this amendment that the Senator from Washington advocates. He had a brother who lived at Ketchikan, and Ketchikan was aching to get the monopoly of this fish trade.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, the Senator is a good lawyer. The Senator understands the coastwise laws of this country, and he knows that there is nothing in our law that prevents an American ship catching fish out in the ocean from going to any foreign port to which it desires to go. He knows that the trade between one American port and another American port is confined to coastwise American ships. That is true, and that was the question that was involved in the suit to which the Senator refers.

The attorney general of Alaska contended that Congress had no right to confine the trade between areas in the United States and points in Alaska to American ships, but, Mr. President, that does not require the American fishermen to bring their fish to Seattle. It does require trade between Ketchikan and Seattle to be by an American ship, that is all. These fishermen and these vessel owners got the very idea that the Senator from Minnesota urges here now, that if this legislation were passed, under the decision of the Supreme Court their vessels could not go from Ketchikan to Prince Rupert.

Mr. President, that is foreign trade, and there is no question whatever about the right of any American ship to go from one American port to a foreign port; so that the Senator from Minnesota is basing his opposition to this legislation upon an entire misapprehension of the facts and of the law as it is sought to be applied.

Mr. President, I was going to read the statement of the facilities at Ketchikan. I shall not take the time to read it.

I will ask, however, that the letter which I have here from the president of the Commercial Club of Ketchikan, together with the petition and the statement regarding these facilities, may be printed in the RECORD. I do this to save time. I have also a memorandum prepared by a very reliable man, one whom I can vouch for, with reference to the conditions, which sets this matter out very concisely and very fully, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

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

KETCHIKAN COMMERCIAL CLUB,
Ketchikan, Alaska, May 16, 1922.

HON. WESLEY L. JONES,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JONES: About a week ago the Commercial Club of Ketchikan mailed you some data in support of the halibut legislation which we furnished the Hon. DAN A. SUTHERLAND.

Since that data was compiled, the writer has been able to make a thorough check on the equipment of the Canadian Fish & Cold Storage Co. at Prince Rupert, and find that in addition to the 150 tons of refrigerating capacity, they have also an absorption plant of an additional 75 tons. Our statement, therefore, should read 225 tons for the Canadian Fish & Cold Storage Co. as against 410 tons of refrigerating capacity contained in the two plants at Ketchikan.

We trust the above will arrive in time so that we will not be charged with any misrepresentation of the facts.

Yours very truly,

J. C. BARBER,
President Ketchikan Commercial Club.

KETCHIKAN, ALASKA, May 8, 1922.

HON. DAN A. SUTHERLAND,
Delegate to Congress from Alaska,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are informed that your objection to the legislation now pending before Congress relative to the Alaska fresh-fish business is due to the lack of facilities and transportation between Alaska and the rail terminal at Prince Rupert, British Columbia.

In order, therefore, that this objection may be overcome and Alaska receive its full share of the benefits accruing from the fisheries operations along the north Pacific coast and to conserve this industry to the American instead of Canadian people, we, the undersigned, whom you know to be financially responsible, agree to provide, upon the passage of the suggested legislation, satisfactory transportation facilities for all shipments of fresh and frozen fish between Ketchikan, Alaska, and the western terminal of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railroad at a rate which shall not exceed the present cost of delivery, and we offer for your consideration the hereto attached statement of the facilities now available at Ketchikan for the economical and expeditious handling of the product of these fisheries as compared with those at Prince Rupert, British Columbia.

H. C. Strong, president Northland Dock Co.; W. A. Bryant, manager J. R. Heckman & Co.; Alfred Howe, manager Tongass Trading Co.; I. Y. Pruett, jeweler; M. J. Heneghan, merchant; P. J. Gilmore, merchant; Thomas Torry, mayor; Jno. R. Beegle, insurance; Forest J. Hunt, merchant; L. H. Kubler, merchant; F. E. Ryus, manager Ryus Drug Co.; Frank Mullally, American Meat Co.; G. E. Lingerfelt, manager Ketchikan Iron Works; A. C. Kreedlee, contractor; W. F. Schlotman, Beegle Packing Co.; W. A. Williams, Northern Machine Works; T. A. Thatcher, hardware; W. H. Patching, grocery; W. K. Spaulding, coal and explosives; J. H. Mustard, physician; H. R. Thompson, merchant; Chas. H. Cosgrove, lawyer; Dean C. Cannon, merchant; H. M. Sawyer, logging business; Albert Reinert, dry goods; Jas. Neuman, sign writer; Edward Morrissey, editor Chronicle; C. H. Field, clothier; F. H. Bold, electric laundry; E. A. Howard, furrier; John Kall, real estate owner; W. E. Peterson, dentist; R. V. Ellis, physician; N. R. Walker, druggist; A. R. Larson, cashier Miners & Merchants' Bank.

STATEMENT OF FACT SUBMITTED TO DAN A. SUTHERLAND, DELEGATE FROM ALASKA.

For the purpose of giving you positive assurance that there is now at Ketchikan, Alaska, adequate facilities for icing, freezing, and packing for shipment the entire amount of halibut, salmon, and sable fish that is now being handled at both the Canadian port of Prince Rupert and the American port of Ketchikan, Alaska, we beg to give you the following figures, showing the capacity of the refrigerating plants at Prince Rupert and at Ketchikan; and wish to state that at Ketchikan during the past year an amount running into hundreds of thousands of dollars has been expended to provide facilities for handling fish taken from the Alaska banks for consumption in the United States, which we believe would, through a protective tariff measure, be handled at American instead of Canadian ports, where this Alaska resource is now centered.

At Prince Rupert, which is now the headquarters of the big fleet fishing on the Alaska banks, there is located but one cold storage, or fish-freezing plant, and this has been subsidized and fostered for the past eight years by the Canadian Government for the purpose of assisting the development at her port of this fishing industry. The products of which are consumed in the United States. The capacity of ice-making and cold-storage plants is estimated by the compressor capacity installed; and the measurement of that of the Canadian Fish & Cold Storage Co. is 150 tons per day. The Canadian Government has provided its wharf with suitable sheds in which fish may be packed in ice for immediate shipment, the ice being supplied by the above cold storage plant.

The above are the entire facilities now in existence at Prince Rupert through which they handled during the past year 25,000,000 pounds of halibut, nearly all of which were caught off the shore of Alaska and consumed in the United States; but the Canadian port has reaped the benefits of the industry, while stagnation has ruled in Alaska. At Ketchikan two substantial cold-storage and fish-packing plants have been constructed with American capital—one of them built entirely by

Ketchikan citizens with no Government aid, as compared with subsidies, amounting to \$300,000, which have been given by the Canadian Government to foster this industry at Prince Rupert.

The compressor capacity of the New England Fish Co. at Ketchikan has been increased this year to 240 tons, and that of the Ketchikan Cold Storage Co. to 170 tons, making a total compressor capacity at Ketchikan of 410 tons, as compared with 150 tons at Prince Rupert. In addition, at Ketchikan we have in existence 1,200 feet of wharf frontage set aside exclusively for handling this class of fish business, and our existing facilities are sufficient to handle four times the volume of business we have had to handle or that we can expect to have without the enactment of a congressional measure which will in effect bring to Alaskan ports the permanent fishing industry which we have permitted Canada to take from us.

KETCHIKAN COMMERCIAL CLUB,
By M. J. HENEYHAN,
Vice President.
By GEO. W. WOODRUFF, Secretary.

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 9, 1922.

SUGGESTED AMENDMENT TO TARIFF BILL.

Fish, iced, frozen, boxed, or otherwise prepared for shipment in a fresh or frozen state other than at a port of the United States, and all other fish entering the United States in fresh or frozen state, shall be subject to the following rates of duty: Halibut and salmon 3 cents per pound, all other fish 2 cents per pound.

REMARKS.

Enactment of this amendment would protect to Alaskan cities and towns the fisheries of Alaska and prevent improper diversion of such fisheries to the Canadian ports of British Columbia. No action by the Congress could more concretely benefit Alaska or accomplish more by way of increasing the population and wealth than to insure by this action the development of its natural resources in the fisheries from Alaskan bases. The sea fisheries of the north Pacific Ocean exist principally on banks upon the continental shelf lying off the coasts of Alaska. They are very properly American fisheries, and at least, so far as the product is intended for American markets, we should require that they be conducted from American ports and by American fishermen and gear.

Unfair differential market advantages were created for Canadian ports on the Pacific, particularly the port of Prince Rupert, by the interpretation of a Canadian order in council issued in January, 1916. The so-called Alaskan fishermen are mainly of foreign birth or nationality and all are not, therefore, wholly irretrievably attached to American ideals. The relative advantages afforded fishermen under the Canadian flag led many of these fishermen to adopt Prince Rupert as their home. Many fishing vessels owned by such of these fishermen as held American citizenship papers have been transferred to Canadian registry. The Canadian order in council referred to predicted that as a result of such order the American fishing fleet engaged in the deep-sea fisheries of the North Pacific would be transferred to the Canadian flag. The transfer of the fleet would undoubtedly have been accomplished ere this had it not been for efforts heretofore made to procure legislation which would establish the fisheries in Alaska, and the fear on the part of the fishermen that the Congress by legislative enactment might interfere with the permanence of Prince Rupert as the base port of fisheries for United States markets.

Fishermen, vessel owners, and Alaskan citizens who are attached to American ideals have opposed the Canadian efforts to absorb the sea fisheries of Alaska and have repeatedly urged upon Congress the necessity of protecting American fishermen operating from American ports against their Canadian competition either by requiring the payment of duties such as are suggested in the amendment proposed or by other form of legislation, which would offset the unfair Canadian port advantage. Paradoxical as it may appear, it is nevertheless true that if the fisheries of Alaska were protected in the manner suggested herein, the cost of the product of the fisheries to the American consumer could be materially reduced and the earnings of the fishermen themselves materially increased. This would be accomplished by elimination of the unfair profits taken by the operators within Canada at such times as they are successful in obtaining control of the market supply and is briefly covered in the following paragraphs and tabulation.

Official reports of the Canadian fisheries by the Canadian Government for the years 1916 to 1920, inclusive, demonstrate as regards halibut that if the landing values be compared with the market values, which is the Canadian export value, the profit taken averages 68 per cent over prices paid the fishermen at the Canadian ports. The following table shows quantities, the landing value or price to the fishermen, the average per pound payment, the market or export value within Canada, the average per pound value, together with the annual percentages by which such export value exceeds the price to the fishermen. The table follows:

Year.	Quantity.	Canadian landing value.	Annual average per pound to fishermen.	Canadian market value for export.	Price per pound for export.	Percentage of profit taken in Canada.
	<i>Pounds.</i>					<i>Per cent.</i>
1916.....	25,328,912	\$1,195,552	\$0.0472	\$2,261,776	\$0.0857	86
1917.....	15,996,176	1,086,608	.0673	2,263,573	.1415	109
1918.....	23,199,568	2,865,151	.1234	5,490,226	.2367	92
1919.....	27,266,288	3,057,632	.1121	5,119,842	.1877	67
1920.....	29,425,312	3,553,969	.1205	4,535,188	.1541	28
Total.....	121,216,246	11,758,912	1.0970	19,670,605	1.1623	168

¹ Average.

It will be noted that during the years 1917 and 1918, when our bona fide American fishermen of military age were serving their country in the war, and the fisheries were principally in the hands of aliens, Canada was exacting from the American people a profit of 109 per cent and 92 per cent, respectively, before the halibut could reach the American wholesale market. The foregoing table does not include the profit upon halibut added within the United States by the distributors of the Canadian-landed fish, which corresponded to the profit taken by the

American dealers upon fish purchased by them at American ports in Alaska or on Puget Sound.

This increased cost to the American consumer is the direct result of price fixing beyond the reach of United States laws. When operators at the Canadian ports are able to procure control of the major portion of the supply of halibut, the public demand for this particularly desirable product is such that fish dealers within the United States who desire a fair share in the marketing of the halibut without pressure readily conform to what they understand to be the desires of the factors within Canada controlling the supply regarding maintaining market prices. When the control of the major production is obtained by United States dealers through the fact that the major portion of the catch is marketed at the American ports upon the Pacific, the market becomes more competitive. This is evidenced by the percentages shown for the year 1920, in which year the major portion of the catch of the north Pacific was landed at the American ports of Alaska and the State of Washington, and the profit obtainable within Canada on that portion of the catch delivered at Prince Rupert or Vancouver was reduced from 67 per cent the year before to 28 per cent. What is here stated with regard to halibut applies in measure to fresh or frozen salmon.

It may be added that the Prince Rupert market discriminates against boxed fish, such as are taken by the smaller vessels operating in Alaska and shipped boxed in ice, in favor of vessel fish, paying from 2 to 3 cents per pound more for vessel fish than the boxed fish. This fact was brought out by Mr. Thompson, of Ketchikan, a fish shipper, and is of record within the Shipping Board rate hearings for 1918. Such differential in price is presumably for the purpose of discriminating against fishermen who choose to use American ports instead of the Canadian ports for the delivery of their catches.

Adopted, the amendment proposed would establish the American fisheries in American ports where benefits therefrom would accrue to citizens of the United States. Such result would be beneficial alike to the fishermen, the fish buyers, and the consuming public of this country. Under such provision of law deep-sea fish would be landed in the ports of Alaska nearest the banks from which they were taken, and the buying of such fish for American markets would be subject to open competition by firms of any nationality at such ports. The free movement of fish landed at American ports either over the railroads of Canada or those of the United States would not be interfered with and competition for the movement of the product would very likely establish lower transportation cost than with the market established at Prince Rupert, where there is absolutely no competition, and shipments must move over on Canadian rail line.

The fisheries once established in United States ports, the business methods of all parties to the marketing of fish would be controlled by United States laws. This would insure equitable consideration to both buyer and seller and would prevent combinations in restraint of trade wholly adverse to the American fisheries and the American consumer, such as are now possible and probable, and have been charged even by Canadian officials to exist at the port of Prince Rupert, British Columbia, where the fish buying for American markets is now largely centered, and is beyond the authority of American regulatory laws.

Under such enactment as mentioned fishermen would find markets for their fish without the necessity of themselves transporting it by uneconomical conveyance distances of 700 to 1,200 miles. The competitive buying would of necessity be established in American ports to enable the purchaser to escape the payment of duty. The fishermen would thus be enabled to spend the major portion of their time fishing instead of in transportation of fish as at present, and would be able to make more money, notwithstanding the fish could reach the consumer at considerably lower price than now.

History reveals that the fisheries are the natural cradle for both merchant marine and navy. Anyone familiar with our own history must be aware of the important part played by the sturdy Americans then engaged in our sea fisheries, and the value of their services in determining the successful outcome of the war for independence. This lesson should never be forgotten and should of itself be sufficient incentive for the adoption of the amendment suggested.

Merchant marines and navies of other nations are noted for an esprit de corps which does not exist in the merchant marine of the United States. This is largely due to the fact that other nations engaged in maritime enterprises are able to recruit their seamen from fisheries conducted by their own nationals, whereas the United States has heretofore permitted its fisheries to be conducted by aliens who give this country but half-hearted allegiance and not infrequently do not understand our language.

The nation which neglects the protection of its fisheries and fails to take the proper steps to encourage its own citizens rather than those of other nations to engage therein is at disadvantage in the expansion of both merchant marine and naval protection. It is thus robbed of the natural advantages of the sea fisheries as the medium for training its citizens to a seafaring life.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Just one word to summarize. As I said a while ago, this provision was put in the Simmons tariff bill here in the Senate in the interest of American fishermen and American capital and the development of Alaska. It went out in conference. One of the ablest, as well as one of the most patriotic Senators on the Democratic side, Senator Chamberlain, urged this provision most strongly, and I have here a letter from him denying an application of an American shipowner to transfer his ships to Canadian registry on account of the situation up there, just exactly what these orders were intended to do. He took the patriotic stand that we ought to encourage our own merchant marine.

So the purpose is to encourage the development of the fishing industry in an American port, and to meet the discrimination and the legislative action of Canada, which had the specific purpose and object of building up Prince Rupert at the expense of America, and to induce the transfer of registry of American ships to Canadian registry. They look after their interests; I hope we will look after ours.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, it would seem to me—and I ask for information—if we impose a tariff upon fish brought to our ports the very object the Senator has just indicated would be accomplished. As I understood him, the British were attempting

to divert the trade from our ports to their ports. They wanted to have the fish caught in the ocean brought to Canadian ports rather than to American ports. It would appear to me that if we desired to have the fish brought to American ports we would effectuate that object much sooner and to a greater extent if we permitted the fish to come in free of duty, but if we impose a high tariff then it would seem to me that the fish would be taken to the ports of other countries.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Senator is mistaken about that. If we were to impose a tariff upon fish brought into this country prepared, or boxed, or iced in a foreign port, then we might accomplish what this amendment is intended to accomplish, but I do not think anything like so effectively. In fact, that is one of the methods proposed by many of the people out there who are interested in this matter. They ask that a tariff duty of 3 cents a pound be placed upon fish brought into this country iced, packed, or prepared in a foreign port. I think this is the more effective way of dealing with the proposition.

On page 13180 and following pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 53, part 13, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session, will be found the orders in council to which I have referred.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, this matter was before the committee. The Senators from Washington were given a hearing, and the conclusion of the committee was that we ought not to use the tariff-making power of the United States for the sole purpose of forcing trade from one foreign port into another particular port. I think there is something a little surprising in the argument that Canadians are trying to get the American trade, and that they are trying to get it by discriminating against us. That is a new method of inviting our trade. I never heard such a proposition made before in any argument.

Let us get at the simple truth of the matter. American vessels and Canadian vessels can go out into the Pacific and catch the fish. They will take those fish to the market that will give them the best price, will they not? If Ketchikan will pay as good a price and is as convenient to the American fisherman, he will take his fish there, will he not? If he is nearer to Prince Rupert or Prince Rupert will give him a better price, he will take them there.

We are asked to interfere with that law of supply and demand. We are asked to interfere with the convenience of fishing fleets. We are asked to tell them that they must go to a port that is often not convenient to them for the purpose of selling their fish, and which may not be able to give them the supplies they want to purchase.

It may be true that Prince Rupert is doing a great many things to induce the catchers of fish to bring their product to Prince Rupert. Of course, they have a right to do that. But the main thing that will induce the fisherman to sell in Prince Rupert is that he gets a better price for his fish there.

There is perhaps another inducement, namely, the ability to get supplies there. He can perhaps get supplies at Prince Rupert that he can not get at the other place, and it may be convenient for him in selling his fish and in purchasing his supplies. There is no law of Canada that will compel an American fisherman to sell his product to a Canadian company or in a Canadian port, but if the American fisherman does so, he does so because he can get a better price or has some other advantage.

That is practically all there is to this proposition. In the matter of discrimination, stop and look at it from another aspect of the case. I claim that this kind of law would be directly opposed to our treaties, outside of the merits of it. What does it provide, in simple terms? It says to the Canadian who deals in fish, "If you buy fish from the Pacific Ocean and land them at your port, you shall not sell them in the United States and you shall not transfer them through the United States."

Think of such a provision in a tariff law! We would say to him, "If you buy them from Americans, you can send them to an American port." Suppose the Prince Rupert merchant desires to sell his goods in Minneapolis or St. Paul, he can not ship them over a Canadian road at all. He can not sell them in St. Paul unless he will send them back to Ketchikan, unload them from an American ship, and give Ketchikan the business.

If that is not violative of treaty obligations, then I do not know the meaning of treaties. Suppose we would say to Great Britain, "You may want to sell a certain line of goods at Savannah, but you can not ship them directly to Savannah or Charleston; you must land them in Boston first." That is practically what this provides.

I do not think a tariff bill ought to be used for the purpose of helping out some companies wanting to buy fish over in Ketchikan but can not compete with the buyers of fish at Prince

Rupert. If they will pay the price to the fishermen, they will get the trade, and if they will not pay the price, they ought not to have the trade, and we should not compel the fishermen to sell their product in an American port as against a foreign port where they can get a better price for their product.

That is the way it strikes me. I do not know just what companies there are in Ketchikan to buy the American product. I do not think there would be much competition, and I think the moment we passed a law of this kind we would destroy all competition for the American fishermen and they would have to sell to a single company or to certain people in Ketchikan. I do not believe that is right.

The basis of the claim for this amendment is the assertion that some one discriminates against us; but the people who are making the petition are not complaining at all of discrimination, because they know that whatever the discrimination is, they are getting a better price in Prince Rupert.

Suppose Canada, as an independent country, passes any kind of a law relative to goods coming into Canada. Is that our business? We object to any country on the face of the earth interfering with our domestic affairs. How can we deny to Canada rights we claim for ourselves?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, we certainly can not deny Canada, nor can Canada deny us. I do not agree with the Senator about the matter of treaties. This does not say one port; it says to any American port and it applies to all the world. It is no violation of the favored-nation clause. I am not arguing whether it should be done; I am not clear about that.

Mr. McCUMBER. But it says to the people of the country, "If you buy fish from the Pacific Ocean"—not from the Atlantic but from the Pacific—"you can not ship them into the United States." That is really what it says. They are making no such claim as that. The Governor of Alaska and the Alaskan people want to build up their own towns. There is no doubt the real estate people have a great scheme to make a great metropolitan city out of Ketchikan, and the way to start it is to pass a law providing that fish caught in the Pacific Ocean by Americans and by Canadians who want to have them come finally into the United States shall be sent through this Mecca in Alaska.

Let us see what they say. I will take the letter which the Senator from Washington introduced. It is a letter dated January 3, 1922, addressed to Hon. W. L. JONES, signed by H. C. Strong. There is not a word of complaint in the letter about the Canadian treatment, but it says:

The sole object of this tariff measure is to make the Alaska fisheries a resource of American ports, instead of permitting them to be exploited by Canadian interests and a fleet sailing from Canadian ports, the product of which is entirely consumed in the United States. The duty suggested will not affect the price of fish to either producer or consumer; it simply moves the market place of the fishing fleet from Canadian to American soil, making it an American asset which will be highly beneficial to the future growth and prosperity of Alaska.

That is why they want this, to build up the town in Alaska, and to force the products of the whole northern part of the ocean to come through that city.

Again, I will take the petition from which the Senator from Washington read and which sounds exactly the same:

MEMORANDUM SUPPORTING TARIFF ON FRESH AND FROZEN FISH.

The offshore fisheries of Alaska—that is, fish taken from the Pacific Ocean or its tributary waters—

I had thought it was only the North Pacific, but they want to take the whole Pacific Ocean and direct its products into an Alaskan town—

is a national resource—

Mr. KELLOGG. The amendment applies only to the North Pacific.

Mr. McCUMBER. It does—

is a national resource which should be the means of supporting large, permanent, and prosperous communities in Alaska.

However, to make this a reality, constructive and protective legislation is imperative. Something must be done which will create in Alaska a market for these products, a market which will bring the producer and the representatives of eastern distributors in the United States together at ports in Alaska.

To-day the economical market for the Alaskan fisheries is in a foreign port at the terminus of a Canadian railway—

Stop and think of it; they admit that the economical market for them is in another country. An economical market means that it is to their economical advantage to sell in that particular market—

and here these fisheries, together with the buyers for the consumers of the United States, are building a big industry. The deep-sea fisheries of Alaska and American markets are jointly supporting a larger population, and a greater volume of business at Prince Rupert and Vancouver, British Columbia, than they are doing for all the coast of Alaska.

Legislation alone—

Now, stop and think of this—

Legislation alone will move this market and its benefits from Canadian to American ports in Alaska. Transportation problems in Alaska will solve themselves when this volume of business originates in Alaska instead of at Canadian ports, therefore Congress is petitioned to enact the following tariff measure.

Then follows the wording of the amendment.

So, Mr. President, it seems to me after all that we are attempting by this amendment to use the power to fix duties to break our treaties with foreign countries with reference to shipments from those countries, so as to compel an enormous trade to go through some other port to which it will not be advantageous for that trade to go.

I agree with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON]. I think the real question is, Which will best benefit the fishermen? You have no right, in my opinion, to use this means for the purpose of building up one town or denying the right of a foreign country to import products which it buys upon the same conditions that we allow other countries.

Mr. President, at this time, if the Senate will allow me, I wish to file and have read a petition, that it may be acted upon day after to-morrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LADD in the chair). It will be read.

The reading clerk read as follows:

We, the undersigned Members of the United States Senate, move to close the debate on the bill (H. R. 7456)—Calendar No. 591—an act to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the standing rules of the Senate:

W. B. McKinley.
W. P. Dillingham.
Truman H. Newberry.
E. F. Ladd.
Albert B. Cummins.
Chas. A. Rawson.
J. W. Harrell.
Bert M. Fernald.
F. R. Gooding.
Geo. P. McLean.
L. Heisler Ball.
Ralph H. Cameron.
Coleman du Pont.
Knute Nelson.
J. S. Frelinghuysen.
Walter E. Edge.
Joseph I. France.
Selden P. Spencer.
Frederick Hale.
I. L. Lenroot.
James E. Watson.
W. L. Jones.
H. C. Lodge.
Charles Curtis.
P. J. McCumber.
Reed Smoot.

Henry W. Keyes.
Thomas Sterling.
Chas. L. McNary.
Miles Poindexter.
Samuel D. Nicholson.
Lawrence C. Phipps.
Samuel M. Shortridge.
Tasker L. Oddie.
Chas. E. Townsend.
Medill McCormick.
H. O. Bursum.
William M. Calder.
Frank B. Willis.
Arthur Capper.
F. E. Warren.
Frank B. Kellogg.
Peter Norbeck.
J. W. Wadsworth, Jr.
Robert N. Stanfield.
LeBaron B. Colt.
G. W. Pepper.
Howard Sutherland.
Richard P. Ernst.
Davis Elkins.
Harry S. New.
C. S. Page.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I believe under the rule no action can be taken upon the proposed petition until an intervening day has elapsed, and that it will come up for consideration at 12 o'clock noon on Friday. Is that correct?

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes; one hour after the Senate meets on Friday.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I shall not take up the time of the Senate to discuss the proposal now. I hope to-morrow to have an opportunity to say something in reference to it, not that I am opposed to a reasonable limitation of debate. I myself once proposed a cloture rule in the Senate. I believe in a reasonable limitation of debate, but I am equally opposed to an unreasonable limitation of debate.

With over 1,000 amendments proposed to the bill by the majority, without the opportunity of the minority to have proposed an amendment yet, because the minority were courteous enough to agree to the request coming from the chairman of the committee that his own amendments should be first considered, I must say that this is not the time, it seems to me, when in fairness the majority should propose to cut off debate, knowing that by doing so they would entirely cut off all opportunity under the consideration of the bill for any proposal to come from those opposed to the measure.

But more than that; under the terms of the rule the discussion of amendments is limited to 10 minutes. Of course, there are many of the thousands of amendments that could be disposed of in five minutes, but there are other amendments that could not be disposed of in an hour's time—I mean intelligently disposed of. One could not in an hour's time present the salient features to be considered.

I think if the Senate is ever going to come to the adoption of a cloture rule on appropriation bills and revenue bills, it should have a proper rule, one that is automatic enough to meet the situation, and not a mere gag rule, as the present rule of the Senate provides. I say it is a gag rule. On some bills

it would not be a gag rule. On some propositions, where there is only one salient feature involved, an hour's general debate might enable each Senator fairly to present his views and 10 minutes on minor amendments would be probably sufficient. But when every item in the bill is a matter in which some business interest in America is concerned, where almost every item in the bill is a matter in which the consumers of America are interested, it seems to me clear that such a rule as the Senate provides for cloture is a rule that ought not properly to apply to this class of legislation.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator said one hour of general debate and 10 minutes on each amendment. If the motion to apply the cloture rule should prevail there would not be 10 minutes on each amendment. There would be one hour altogether, and that would include argument on amendments, on the bill, and everything else; in other words, each Senator would be limited to one hour.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I had not read the rule for some time, and I thank the Senator for his correction. I thought the rule provided for 10 minutes on amendments. I am glad I was corrected, because that makes it more impossible. The idea of discussing a thousand amendments or more than a thousand amendments in 60 minutes, less than a sixteenth of a minute to an amendment! Senators on the other side of the Chamber had better suggest that we have no further debate at all, because that is practically what this means.

In all my legislative experience I have never known a majority to propose to a minority that the majority amendments should be considered first, and, when the courtesy was granted to them, and before the minority had an opportunity even to propose their own amendments, come in with a proposition that the minority should have no opportunity to debate their own proposals.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, in view of the motion which has been filed, I direct respectfully attention to part of the language that is used in the rule, which reads:

Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time.

Senators will take notice that if they intend to propose amendments they ought to propose them and have them read before 12 o'clock on next Friday.

Without discussing the motion or its merits, if it have any—

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

Mr. ASHURST. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. SIMMONS. Would the members of the committee themselves be permitted to propose any amendments unless they proposed them before we voted on the cloture proposition?

Mr. ASHURST. No Senator can propose an amendment unless it is proposed between now and 1 o'clock Friday, if we shall meet at 12 o'clock noon, or between now and 12 o'clock Friday, if we shall meet at 11 o'clock.

I believe out of fairness the Senate ought to agree now that if an amendment is presented to the Senate and ordered printed in the Record before next Friday noon, we may dispense with the reading of the same. I have a number of amendments of my own which will require attention, and I do not want to be foreclosed by any contingency. So I ask unanimous consent that the rule be abrogated, so far as it requires that amendments shall be presented and read.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. ASHURST. Then I beg all Senators to understand that their amendments should be presented and read. Personally, I am opposed to the motion to close the debate, and shall vote against it.

I know of Senators who are absent by reason of illness and because of intimate personal affairs who, if this request is not granted, would be denied the right to offer amendments to the bill.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, every Senator knows that the motion just submitted can not prevail. Every Senator who has attended to-day's session knows that the entire debate has proceeded from the other side of the Chamber. We have considered two amendments, one proposing an increase in the duty on certain nuts and another proposing to levy higher rates on importations of fish under certain conditions. If the proponents of the cloture rule believed that it would be adopted they would not dare submit it. I raise directly the issue of good faith in the presentation of the motion at this time. It is not fair to the Senate; it is not fair to this side of the Chamber; it is not fair to the people of this country, with the most important provisions of the bill unconsidered and undisposed of,

to attempt to shut off debate and to deny Senators the opportunity of presenting amendments.

We have heard during the last 30 days threats of cloture, and now we are confronted with the direct issue of an attempt by the proponents of this bill, who have brought into the Senate 2,082 amendments, to shut off debate before more than one-third of the committee amendments have been considered. Not only is it proposed, as pointed out by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], to shut off debate on pending amendments, but the effect of the adoption of this motion would be to deny to Senators the privilege of offering amendments. Everybody must realize that that would be the effect of the proposal.

The proceedings of to-day disclose that the purpose of this proposed cloture is to stop complaints on the other side of the Chamber, amounting almost to insurrection against this bill. We have heard the debate between the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], the latter openly expressing the intention, if the present method of dealing with the bill is pursued, to vote against the bill when it shall have been perfected. We have noted the controversy between the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] respecting a duty on fish. This bill in the form presented by the Finance Committee is beaten; it is beaten in the Senate by open, courageous, manly debate. During 20 years of service in the Congress of the United States I have never known a debate confined more closely to the issues presented than during the consideration of this bill; and I have never known a debate more effective than has been the debate on this tariff bill. Now, with the tide of sentiment running high against it, with courageous Republicans rising in their seats and threatening to vote against the bill, with the committee amendments scarcely one-third disposed of, it is proposed to bar all amendments other than those proposed by the committee, for no amendment not presented previous to the vote on the motion to close debate can be voted on if the motion prevails. Until the committee amendments have been disposed of other amendments can not be considered, and indeed can not be intelligently presented to schedules which have not been passed upon.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas permit a suggestion?

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. As a result of this debate, the Republican members of the Committee on Finance themselves have come in and changed the rates proposed on many of the articles covered by the bill.

Mr. ROBINSON. The committee have withdrawn amendment after amendment. There has been retreat after retreat; the committee have advanced and retreated over the same ground.

Mr. POMERENE. And, Mr. President, if the Senator from Arkansas will permit me further to interrupt him, when the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] was discussing this question about two weeks ago he made the statement that the members of the committee had presented some 80 or more amendments of their own to the bill as it was originally reported to the Senate.

Mr. ROBINSON. That is also true.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield for a moment?

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts. Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I think since the agricultural schedule has been under consideration at least 25 amendments have been offered by the Finance Committee on the floor increasing the rates. I suppose, however, we ought to remain silent and make no protest.

Mr. ROBINSON. The same thing has occurred with reference to every schedule of the bill that has been considered. The debate has disclosed the obnoxious character of the proposed legislation, and, as a result, the committee itself has repeatedly receded from the position which it at first took. Is there a Senator present who does not know that on the other side of the Chamber there is a growing feeling of disgust which threatens to result, if the attacks are continued, in the defeat of the bill?

I said some weeks ago that there was no great desire manifested to facilitate the prompt disposal of this bill even by those who are sponsors for it. I repeat that declaration. During the last 30 days two-thirds of the time consumed in the debate has been used by those who occupy seats on the other side of the Chamber. Nowhere, neither in the Senate nor in the country, is there a sentiment which justifies this bill as a whole. It is beaten in the public conscience. The committee has recognized that fact time and time again by withdrawing amendments first submitted and presenting others in

lieu of them. Now, with the knowledge of the fact that this motion can not be adopted, for the simple reason that there are not enough votes in favor of it to adopt it, the proposal for cloture is presented as pure buncombe, and some who are favoring it would be glad to see the bill abandoned.

Everywhere in the primary contests where the pending bill has been made an issue its proponents have met with disaster. The press of the country is against it almost unanimously; students of political economy find no justification for it; and in the issues that have arisen the decision has, in some instances at least, reflected the opposition which the country feels to the bill. The action of the Senate to-day in consuming seven hours in the discussion of two relatively unimportant amendments, the discussion coming almost entirely from the other side of the Chamber, reveals the dissatisfaction and the growing differences concerning its provisions arising on the other side of the Chamber.

No one is going to be deceived by this proceeding; no Senator thinks that the motion will be adopted; and some Senators who signed the petition probably would not have done so if there had existed the slightest ground for the belief that the cloture rule would be agreed to.

There is not any desire here—and there is no conduct on this side of the Chamber which justifies the imputation that such a desire exists—unduly to prolong this debate. Any person of ordinary intelligence would have known, when 2,082 amendments were brought in by the committee, that those amendments could not, under the ordinary procedure of a legislative body, be disposed of within a short time; and the time consumed upon the various amendments has been greater from the other side of the Chamber than from this side of the Chamber. Senators in the majority will not fool anybody who is not desirous of being deceived by any such "bluff" as this.

For my part—and I think I am authorized to speak for many of my colleagues—we want the public to understand what it is you are proposing to do in the passage of this bill. Why do you object to the country having information concerning it? The only inference that can be drawn is that you fear that the result of future proceedings will further discredit this measure and its important proposals as not justified by economic and industrial conditions.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] charges us with bad faith—which is a serious charge to make—in offering this motion under the cloture rule.

The request for action under the rule is made in absolute good faith. If any Senator on the other side doubts that it is made in good faith, he has a very simple method of testing it, and that is to vote it through and see whether or not we shall take a vote under it. If Senators think the tariff is beaten, why do they not bring it to a vote? They know that it is not beaten.

The Senator guarded very carefully what he said. He said that the tariff "as reported by the Senate committee" was defeated already. I suppose he used that expression because the committee have made certain changes in what they originally reported.

First and last, since I have been in Congress I have been through some eight tariff discussions, and I have never failed to see in the Senate a great number of amendments offered by the committee in charge, and some of them changed by the committee in the course of the debate. A tariff can not be made in any other way.

I was a member of the Finance Committee when the tariff of 1913 was before us. Of course, I attended none of the meetings in which the bill was made up. They were held exclusively by the members of the majority party, with which I found no sort of fault. I think it is perfectly proper that they should do it. What shifts or changes they then made I do not know; but, as I recall, they brought out some six or seven hundred amendments, and they were discussed here, but at no such length as has been shown in this debate.

Mr. President, the Senator speaks of time being consumed on this side, and a great deal has been consumed on this side; but, if that be true, then it is ourselves that we are cutting off by this proposition, and we are entirely ready to do it. We believe that the country demands prompt action on this bill, and this rule will at least prevent any deception, and will allow the country to know who is refusing to take action. We have had no offer, no suggestion of any agreement. We have had days and days here when no one spoke on this side, of elaborate discussion of perfectly trivial amendments, of matters of no consequence.

I have had some experience in watching delay by debate—not a technical filibuster, but the wasting of time—and I have never seen it practiced on so extensive a scale as by the mi-

pority on this bill. They never have been ready to make any concession of time. They never have been ready to make any arrangement to bring the bill to an end or reach a vote, no matter how reasonable or how extensive the time allowed. They have simply gone on wasting the time of the Senate and of the country in debate, which ought to be cut off, or at least ought to be limited.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. LODGE. I do.

Mr. POMERENE. The Senator from Massachusetts has just suggested that no proposition had been made from this side to limit debate. Has any been made on the other side until this day?

Mr. LODGE. We are perfectly ready to do it and to make arrangements, and suggestions have been made—not openly, but they have been made—more than once; not on the floor, publicly, but they have been made.

Mr. POMERENE. Not until this day have I heard a statement of that kind made.

Mr. LODGE. Not publicly; no.

Mr. POMERENE. I remember very distinctly that this debate had not progressed to exceed three weeks until charges were made on the other side of the Chamber that we on this side of the Chamber were filibustering; and I think those who made the charges were very unfair toward those on this side of the Chamber.

Mr. LODGE. It depends altogether on what you call filibustering. Of course, technical filibustering is taking advantage of every parliamentary point, and insisting on roll calls and quorums, and raising points of order, and an infinite number of things; but as a mere delay, if you choose to call it filibustering, it was developed in the first week that this bill was up by the perfectly reckless way in which time was wasted on wholly insignificant things, particularly in the chemical schedule, and it has been carried on more or less ever since.

I am ready to cut off the debate for both sides if necessary. We offer this rule in perfect good faith. If any one doubts it, let him vote to put it through, and we on this side will all live up to it, and live up to it without complaint, and suppress our own amendments; for there are individual amendments probably on this side as well as on the other; but at least it will have this effect: It will show the country which party is responsible for the delay, which party refuses to stop the debate, which party is unwilling to make any reasonable arrangement to bring it to an end, which party thinks there is political advantage in dragging out this debate all summer and leaving business in a condition of suspense. The worst tariff ever made was better than suspense, and anything is better for the business of the country to-day than to have this long, protracted, weary discussion, no matter who is engaged in it.

I hope that the rule will pass and that an overwhelming majority of the Senators on this side will vote for the rule. If we can not get it, it will be because the other side manage to control a third or more, without which the rule can not be adopted, but we present the rule. We invite its adoption. If it is not adopted, we shall then have no choice except to continue as we have before, and unless we lay aside the tariff altogether and start to bring about a majority cloture we shall be obliged to go on and return to night sessions.

I hope we shall press this rule and offer it again later and demonstrate even more fully to the country where the delay lies and who is causing the delay and why business is held in suspense for purely political purposes, and for no other reason.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I only want to say a word in reply to what the leader of the majority party has just said in reference to responsibility concerning this bill. I realize, of course, that it is natural that a party in power should want to pass legislation that it proposes. It is perfectly natural for it to assume that the delays in the opposition are unwarranted.

This issue has always been a political issue in this country. The two great parties are divided between a protective tariff and a low so-called revenue tariff. Their viewpoints in regard to the matter are entirely different. It was impossible for the Senators on this side of the aisle to go to the majority of the Finance Committee of the Senate and expect favorable consideration of amendments that represented their viewpoint. On the other hand, the Members on the other side of the Chamber had the opportunity to present their amendments to their own committee. They had an opportunity for friendly and full consideration, and their amendments have been considered and have been passed upon. The only opportunity that

we have to make our proposals to the country is on the open floor of the Senate.

As to the delays in this bill, debate may at times have run unduly long on certain items, on this side and on the other side. No Senator in the Chamber can deny the fact that at times the debate has become extended on the other side of the Chamber on various items. The debate has been legitimate, as a whole. It has been to the point, to the bill before the Senate, as a rule. Of course, at times, there has been extraneous debate, but nothing more on this side than on the other side as to matters that were not pertinent to the bill.

The Senator from Massachusetts, the leader of his party, criticizes this side of the Chamber, however, because we have not proposed a cloture, because we have not made a proposal for an early vote on this bill.

Mr. LODGE rose.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Does the Senator want to interrupt me?

Mr. LODGE. I only wanted to say that I did not blame the minority for not proposing a cloture. I said they had made no proposition of an arrangement to bring debate to an end, which is a different thing from a cloture.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is what I desired to reply to. The Senator criticizes this side of the Chamber because we have not been willing to make an arrangement to bring this debate to an end. As a practical proposition it has been impossible for us to do so. This bill has 4,000 items in it vitally affecting the industry and the lives and the health and the happiness of the American people. They are vital issues, most of them.

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

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield.

Mr. KELLOGG. Did not the Underwood bill do the same thing? It involved as many items as this bill, did it not?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes; it did.

Mr. KELLOGG. It was disposed of in seven weeks, was it not?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not remember how many weeks it was debated in the Senate. I was in the House then, and I know that we sent the bill to the Senate by the 1st of May, and it went to conference in September. I do not know; I did not keep up with the debate in the Senate.

Mr. KELLOGG. The bill was in the Senate seven weeks and three or four days.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON. Does the Senator from Minnesota recall the number of amendments reported to the Underwood-Simmons bill by the Finance Committee?

Mr. KELLOGG. I was not here.

Mr. ROBINSON. I think the Senator from Massachusetts stated that there were 600.

Mr. WATSON of Indiana. My recollection is that there were 640.

Mr. ROBINSON. Much less than one-third of the number of amendments which the Finance Committee reported to this bill.

Mr. KELLOGG. But the Senate has already used over 10 weeks, which is the longest time that has ever been used in the Senate to pass a tariff bill.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, it may also be added that the Senate Finance Committee never before took so long a time to prepare and present a tariff bill to the Senate.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Undoubtedly.

Mr. WATSON of Indiana. But the Senator must know that practically all the amendments were changes from the American valuation to foreign valuation.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am not arguing the question from the standpoint of why the committee made the changes. Of course, they had a reason for making the changes, but the changes were made and the bill is here. The bill does not carry on its face any indication that the changes were made because of a change of valuation, although that may have been the reason which actuated the committee. But the Senate is compelled to vote on a lower or a higher rate, and the bill is before the Senate regardless of the reasons of the committee in reporting it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will ask the Senator to suspend while the Chair states the motion, which it must do under the rule. The Chair is in receipt of the following motion:

We, the undersigned Members of the United States Senate, move to close debate on the bill H. R. 7456, Calendar No. 591, an act to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

That is signed by the Senators whose names have been stated.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It is the same paper which the Secretary read, is it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is.

Mr. WATSON of Indiana. The Chair was simply formally stating the motion. It is the same paper.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I understand.

Mr. WATSON of Indiana. Will the Senator permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. WATSON of Indiana. It must be apparent to the Senator, who is a man of long experience in legislative bodies, that if this debate runs on as it has been going on, with the wool schedule and the cotton schedule and the silk schedule, with potash, and sugar, and gloves, and so forth, and so forth, which have yet to be considered, it will go on until the 1st of October. Does the Senator think that the majority party, with 24 majority, should sit by and permit this sort of thing to go on until the 1st of October, with what we think is undue delay in the passage of the bill and which this party promised to pass?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not expect the majority party to do unreasonable things. I think it is very natural that you should want to pass this bill without debate if you can, but you can not expect the Senate to agree to an unusual limitation of debate.

Mr. WATSON of Indiana. Let me ask the Senator another question, kindly. We have made this proposition, and I must take issue with my delightful friend from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], because we have made it in good faith. Fifty-two Senators have signed it. That is more than a majority, more than enough to pass the bill. There will be no trouble about passing the bill. What counterproposition does the Senator make? Unless the consideration of this bill is to run on endlessly, what counterproposition does the Senator make to our proposition?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I was just about to try to reply to the statement of the leader of the majority party, and I have gotten far away from my reply, because I have been interrupted. That is what I was coming to—not to make a proposition, but to state why it has been impossible to make a proposition.

In passing I want to respond now to the suggestion made by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG] that the act of 1913, with 600 amendments, had only 7 weeks of debate and that this bill has now had 10 weeks of debate. But this bill has three and a half times as many amendments to be considered as the act of 1913. If you multiply 7 by $3\frac{1}{2}$ you will have nearly 24 weeks instead of 10 weeks in which to consider it. So if you view it from the standpoint of the actual issue presented to the Senate, there has not been nearly as much time taken up in the consideration of this bill as was taken up in the consideration of the act of 1913.

The Senator from Massachusetts complains that we have made no suggestion in reference to closing debate. How can we make a suggestion? How can we say when we will close debate, the way the bill has been presented to the Senate? If we make an agreement, it must be a reasonable agreement, an intelligent agreement, and when I say "intelligent" I mean it must be an agreement that does not propose to abandon the issues, but an agreement under which we can fairly consider and discuss the issues before the Senate.

We are not responsible because you brought in a bill with over 2,000 amendments. We are not responsible because in the consideration of that bill from time to time you have changed your mind, and changed your amendments on the floor. I am not criticizing you for doing it. If you found out that you had made a mistake, it was only the part of wisdom to make the change. But until you have determined what your issue is in the Senate, how in the world can the minority determine what we propose to offer you by way of amendment?

We foreclosed the proposition of doing that item by item at the request of your chairman. We might have done that as each paragraph came up, but the chairman desired to have all the committee amendments considered first. He asked unanimous consent that the bill might be considered in that way, and we consented. It took unanimous consent, and we granted the courtesy, and allowed him to have the bill considered in that manner.

We do not know what your final disposition of this bill is to be. There may be amendments proposed now which are satisfactory to us, but before you dispose of it they may be very unsatisfactory to us. With this vast number of amendments, how are you going to determine what limitation of debate can be made which will reasonably allow a fair discussion of the issues presented to the country and to the Senate? You can not do it. It is a practical impossibility.

I want to say, so far as I am concerned, that I have endeavored not to occupy any more time on the floor of the Senate in discussing the bill than was necessary to present my viewpoint in part, and the entire time I have taken in the discussion of the bill in the 10 weeks it has been before the Senate I do not think amounts to more than two or three hours. I have repeatedly said to the Senate, and I said to the members of my own party, that although I believe the bill should be fairly considered, I am not in favor of any policy that attempted delay for delay's sake; and I am not and I have not been from the beginning.

I think the larger portion of the time that has been taken has been taken in legitimate debate.

One man can present his viewpoint clearly in 10 minutes. It will take another man an hour to do the same thing. That is the personal equation. It is due to the difference in the way men speak. How could I say to-day, when I do not know what the issues are to be on hundreds of items, how long we should determine to debate them? What kind of a proposal should we make? An hour on each side? You would say that is too long. Do you propose 10 minutes on each item? If you gave 10 minutes to every Senator on each item, or even on your own amendments, instead of passing the bill in October, as my friend suggests, you would not pass it before March. Yet you know as well as I that there are hundreds of items in the pending bill which could not be intelligently discussed in 10 minutes. Nay, more, there are many of these items which could not be fairly presented to the country in an hour.

The real difficulty about the situation is that you delayed reporting this bill to the Senate until you rode into a most ill-advised time to present it—an election year. I do not say that critically. It applies as much to one party as to another. To pass a tariff bill in the face of an election is the most ill-advised thing that a party can do, and I know you realize that. Probably conditions have driven you to do it.

Now we are in the midst of debate. There is not a man on the other side of the Chamber, I know, who will say that he thinks this bill can be fairly considered under the proposal you have made—that there shall be a limitation of one hour's debate to each Senator, and no amendments allowed after 12 o'clock on Friday next.

No matter how much of a mistake the committee should find it had made in the framing of the bill, if you adopted this ironclad rule for the consideration of the bill you would have to destroy American industry. If you find that you have made a mistake in the bill—and you have made many, and you have admitted it by changing it—you will then have your hands bound, and if it happens to be that in that particular instance you have agreed with the House, and they have made the mistake also, you will have to go to the country with destruction in the wake of the bill, you knowing it, because you have gagged the Senate.

You gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber know that this bill can not be considered intelligently under any such rule, no matter what conditions confront you. You know that you can not go to the American people and say you have given intelligent consideration to this measure under this rule.

Unless you can do that you had better not enact the legislation. The country is not going to be destroyed if you fail to enact the legislation, but if you attempt to enact it under a system by which you gag debate in the Senate and gag amendments, which is even more important than debate, you will simply scatter the dragons' teeth to the winds, not knowing what you may sow by your reckless conduct.

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

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. LENROOT. I would like to ask the Senator when, in his judgment, the bill will pass the Senate if there be no limitation on debate?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the Senator candidly that I do not know, but I should be very much delighted if we could come to a final vote on the measure by August. I do not want to stay here. I am not in favor of the bill—I hope it can be defeated—but I realize under our system of parliamentary government that the majority party have a right to enact their laws and submit them to the country. I am perfectly willing. I rejoice in the opportunity to go to the country on the issue. I am not afraid to face it. But I can not tell how long Senators will take to discuss items in the bill on the other side of the Chamber or on my side of the Chamber any more than the Senator can tell. I can only say that I have earnestly hoped that there might be no undue delay in the matter, and I know that I have not indulged in any undue delay.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President—
Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. How can there be any time fixed to vote on this bill when the committee have not completed their work yet? The committee are meeting every morning and changing amendments and changing this bill. How can we fix a time until the committee finally finish their work on the bill?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The Senator is clearly correct. The chairman of the committee has repeatedly stated to us on the floor that from day to day the committee are meeting and proposing new amendments and changing the proposals in the bill, and yet it is proposed by this rule to say to your own committee at 12 o'clock noon on Friday next they shall labor no more and shall not give the bill further consideration, because any proposals of theirs can not thereafter be considered.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator another question?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. LENROOT. The Senator states that he hopes the bill can be passed by August. If that be true, it will only be because debate is limited by action of the Senate or by the voluntary action of Senators. Does the Senator believe that Senators upon his side of the aisle are now willing to curtail debate voluntarily?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I can not speak for anyone but myself, and I do say that I hope debate on items which are not of great importance can be curtailed to an extent so that we can get through by that time. I think it is necessary for us to reach a conclusion, and yet, with the great schedules of wool and cotton and sundries, which carry taxation into every home in America, yet undisposed of, I do not want anyone to think for a moment that those schedules should be passed without reasonable consideration and fair debate. But I think that it can be done. If the Senators look at it from my viewpoint I am sure that it can be done. I may make one or two other speeches on the bill; but I am sure the time I take, if proportioned out to other Senators on the floor, would not carry the passage of the bill beyond an early date in August.

I merely want to say that of course you have your rights. The rule is a part of the Senate procedure. If you can get a two-thirds majority you have a right to gag us, and you have a right to cut off amendments and cut off debate and throw this misshapen piece of legislation into the face of the country, but I say you will make a very serious mistake if you do so.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until to-morrow morning at 11 o'clock.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. I withdraw the request for the present. There are just a few hours during which the rule can be discussed.

Mr. McCUMBER. It can be discussed all day to-morrow.

Mr. HARRISON. It ought to be discussed a little this afternoon. I have here a speech which the Senator made in 1918, in which he said he was against cloture and that an hour's debate was too little, and he argued against the rule at that time. I wanted to read it to refresh the memory of the Senator from North Dakota as to that speech. Will he withhold his motion until I can read a part of that speech to him?

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator can do that to-morrow.

Mr. HARRISON. Very well; the Senator will do it to-morrow.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield for a question.

Mr. KING. I gave notice, or, rather, I voted for the almond paragraph and indicated at the time that I would move to reconsider the vote by which it was agreed to. I just want to submit the motion to reconsider and will take it up to-morrow.

Mr. McCUMBER. That can be done in the morning.

Mr. KING. To-day is my last day.

Mr. McCUMBER. No; it is not. We are still in the same legislative day.

Mr. KING. Very well. With that understanding I shall submit the motion to-morrow.

RECESS.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate (at 6 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.), under the order previously made, took a recess until to-morrow, Thursday, July 6, 1922, at 11 o'clock a. m.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, July 6, 1922.

(Legislative day of Thursday, April 20, 1922.)

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

PAY OF SENATE PAGES.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, in the general appropriation bill passed each year we include a provision for the payment of the salaries of the employees of the Senate, but no provision was made in the last appropriation bill for the payment of salaries of pages of the Senate after July 1 of this year. To take care of the matter the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, introduced a resolution (S. Res. 313), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. I am directed by that committee to report back the resolution favorably without amendment. The resolution provides for the payment of the 16 regular pages from now until the 1st of December, or during such days as the pages may be employed. I ask for its present consideration.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, may I inquire what is the purpose of the resolution?

Mr. CALDER. I will say to the Senator from Utah that in the passage of the regular appropriation bill which takes care of the pay of Senate employees the Senate neglected to provide for the payment of the pages of the Senate. No provision was made for any pay of the pages until the next regular session of the Senate. We are taking care of them through this resolution by providing for the payment of their salaries out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

The resolution was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay from the miscellaneous items of the contingent fund of the Senate the 16 pages borne on the session rolls of the Senate from July 1, 1922, to and including the last day of the month in which the second session of the Sixty-seventh Congress is adjourned sine die, at the rate of \$2.50 per day each.

ADDITIONAL SENATE PAGES.

Mr. CALDER. I report back favorably without amendment, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, Senate Resolution 314 to provide for the continuation of the five additional pages who have been carried on the pay roll for the last year and a half. I ask for the present consideration of the resolution.

The resolution was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution No. 175, agreed to November 10, 1921, authorizing and directing the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate to employ five additional pages for the Senate Chamber at \$3 per day each from the 1st day of December, 1921, to the end of the second session of the Sixty-seventh Congress, to be paid from the miscellaneous items of the contingent fund of the Senate, be, and the same is hereby, amended to continue their employment to and including the last day of the month in which the second session of the Sixty-seventh Congress is adjourned sine die at the rate of \$2.50 per day each.

POLAR FLIGHT OF EDWIN FAIRFAX NAULTY.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, some months ago the importance of Wrangel Island as an air base for flight routes across the Arctic was brought to the attention of the Senate in connection with a controversy respecting the priority of rights by discovery and occupation respectively accruing to the United States and Great Britain. Mr. Edwin Fairfax Naulty, renowned for his investigations in scientific and practical aeronautics, then proclaimed the right of the United States to assert just priority by actual discovery and continued occupation. The importance of the controversy apparently was not fully realized at that time by our Department of State.

About one year ago Mr. Naulty formed and published a plan for a trans-Arctic, transpolar flight. This plan was definite in all its details and was illustrated on a chart supported by known observations of ice drifts, current flow, known directions, known shallows and depths, and other data. This chart was deposited in a Government bureau and no attempt was made by Mr. Naulty to maintain secrecy respecting his plans and purposes.

The Washington Post of August 2, 1921, the Pittsburgh Post-Dispatch of August 4, 1921, the New York Times of September 11, 1921, the Washington Herald of October 12, 1921, and other newspapers published last summer, contained editorials and comments respecting Mr. Naulty's plan for a polar flight. The editorial in the Pittsburgh Post of the date above mentioned points out in definite detail the route of Mr. Naulty's proposed flight and the difficulties probably to be encountered, especially