No. 133; Volunteer, No. 13; Pride of Munson, No. 194; Good Interest, No. 187; Silver Crescent, No. 3; Resolute, No. 77; Pride of Welcome, No. 33; Logan, No. 60; Eden, No. 988; Malto, No. 36; Star of Oberlin, No. 155; Frankford, No. 123; Bellevue, No. 148; Lydia Darrah, No. 110; Clearfield, No. 146; General Putnam, No. 28; Wissahickon, No. 137; Dallastown, No. 105; and West Chester, No. 45, Councils of Daughters of Liberty, all in the State of Pennsylvania, favoring enactment of an illiteracy test; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MOTT: Resolution of Sandy Creek Grange, No. 127, Patrons of Husbandry, of Sandy Creek, N. Y., in favor of a parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, resolutions of Great Bend Grange, No. 642, Great Bend, N. Y.; Pennellville Grange, No. 729, Pennellville, N. Y.; Lafargeville Grange, No. 15, Lafargeville, N. Y.; Jefferson County Pomona Grange, Watertown, N. Y.; Amboy Grange, No. 779, Amboy Center, N. Y.; Star Grange, No. 9, Hannsfield, N. Y.; Thousand Island Grange, No. 593, Omar, N. Y.; Pulaski Grange, No. 730, Pulaski, N. Y.; Cape Vincent Grange, No. 599, Cape Vincent, N. Y.; Oswego County Pomona Grange, Oswego, N. Y.; Indian River Grange, Antwerp, N. Y.; Smithville Grange, No. 60, Smithville, N. Y.; Plessis Grange, No. 629, Plessis, N. Y.; Lewis County Pomona Grange; Adams Center Grange, No. 590; and Gardner Corners Grange, Gardners Corners, N. Y., Patrons of Husbandry, against Canadian reciprocity bill (H. R. 4412); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of International Molders' Union, Local No. 78, of Watertown, N. Y., favoring repeal of the tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Resolutions of John F. Godfrey Post, No. 93, Grand Army of the Republic, of Pasadena, Cal., in favor of Sulloway bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: Papers to accompany bill for claim for arrearages of pension in case of Dr. Joseph Hunter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIS: Petition of Dr. C. F. King and 60 other citizens of Mount Cary, Ohio, against Canadian reciprocity agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, *April 15, 1911.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, the same yesterday, to-day, and forever, whose love fills all space with rays divine, we hallow Thy name for that greatest of all events which demonstrates the power of life over death and which will be celebrated on the morrow with prayers of gratitude and anthems of praise throughout all Christendom; make us worthy we beseech Thee of such love and power. May our spiritual eyes be opened that we may penetrate the veil and behold our loved ones on the golden shore with outstretched arms to receive us.

So long Thy power has blest us, sure it still
Will lead us on
O'er moor and fen, o'er crag and torrent, till
The night is gone.
And with the morn those angel faces smile,
Which we have loved long since, and lost awhile.

And when the tongue is eloquent no more
The soul shall speak in tears of gratitude.

Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER.

Mr. PLUMLEY, a Representative from the second district of Vermont, appeared at the bar and took the oath of office.

RECIPROCITY.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4412) to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4412, generally known as the reciprocity bill.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MURDOCK. Inasmuch as the House is to resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House for a long, extensive, and important debate, I wish to inquire of the Speaker if the Committee of the Whole has any power to grant leave to print or to extend remarks in the RECORD?

The SPEAKER. It has not except to the individual. That has been the uniform practice since I have been here.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman from Kansas, that if there is a desire on that side to have leave to print, I will ask unanimous consent at this time for all gentlemen who speak on the bill to have that right.

Mr. MURDOCK. There is no such desire on this side; there is a desire to curtail it, and I suggest that the gentleman include in his motion a provision that any request in Committee of the Whole for the right to extend remarks, or to print remarks, be referred back to the House and not granted in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will state that that motion would not be in order. The right of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union is governed by the rules of the House, and my motion could not infringe on those rules. These rules clearly provide that the committee can not grant general leave to print, but that it can grant the right to extend remarks.

Mr. GARRETT. Any one Member can defeat it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is true.

The SPEAKER. All this debate is by unanimous consent.

Mr. MURDOCK. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to ask the gentleman from Alabama a question.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. The regular order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan demands the regular order. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Alabama.

The motion of Mr. UNDERWOOD was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. SHERLEY in the chair.

Mr. SHERLEY took the chair amid general applause.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4412, the Canadian reciprocity bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to state that I do not intend to make the opening speech on this bill myself, but expect to close the debate. I yield one hour to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN]. [Applause.]

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, in opening the debate on the pending measure, I shall ask permission at the outset to acknowledge in behalf of the Democracy of the House our thanks and gratitude to the President of the United States for giving us, in this call for an extra session, the opportunity to quicken the fulfillment of our pledges made to the people. [Applause on Democratic side.] How well and how faithfully we have embraced the opportunity thus far the proceedings of this House during the last 10 days attest. I wish, too, to congratulate the Democracy upon its prompt response to the people's will and the quick redemption of its promises.

Believing that the powers vested in and exercised by former Speakers were subversive of the rights of representative government, we pledged the people that if we were given control of the House we would write into its rules that the one-man power should be destroyed, that the Speaker, whoever he might be, should no longer have the power to appoint committees, to pack committees, so that such legislation as the one man, the Speaker, might will should be kept in or brought out. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We have faithfully kept that pledge. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Believing that, in the administration of the affairs of this House, there was wasteful extravagance of the people's money, that there had been useless offices created by the Republican Party and filled as political jobs, we pledged the people that, if we were given control, we would effect economy and abolish every political job in and around this Capitol. We have redeemed that pledge. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We have not only abolished numbers of useless political offices and obsolete committees, but in the current expenses of the House we have effected an economy of 25 per cent, an annual saving to the people and to the Federal Treasury of more than $180,000. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

This, sir, is an earnest of that honest and economical administration which our party would give the country if intrusted with the control of all the departments of the Government.

Believing that the Senate of the United States, and its past several years' record amply justified the belief, was responsive neither to the will nor to the rights of the people, we pledged

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

that, so far as we should be given the power, we would submit to the legislatures of the several States an amendment to the Constitution whereby the Senators should be elected by a direct vote of the people. We have fully and faithfully kept that pledge. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Believing that the American electorate had the right to know before the casting of its ballot to whom each political party was indebted for its campaign funds, we pledged the people that if we were given the power we would enact a law making it compulsory for contributions and the names of contributors and the disbursements to be made public before as well as after the election. That promise has been redeemed. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MADDEN. Before the election or before the nominations? [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. KITCHIN. Under the Republican statute the honest electorate found out only after it had voted who had bought the election. Under the Democratic bill we provide that the electorate before it cast its ballot shall know who is attempting to purchase the election. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, we promised the people that if we were given the power, so far as our jurisdiction extended, instead of violating the pledges, as has been done by our opponents, we would give to the people an honest revision of the tariff downward, and to-day we take the first step in the consummation of that pledge. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Never in the history of the American Congress, either in the term of a Congress or of an administration, has any party effected for the rights and interest of the people so much beneficent legislation and redeemed so many pledges as has the Democracy of this House within the short period of the last 14 days. [Applause on the Democratic side.] If the House did nothing else during this term, I could take its accomplishments and reforms made within these few days and match them against all the achievements of the Republican Party for the last decade. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I am willing to put on one end of the scale our achievements and redemptions of pledges in the House in the last 14 days and on the other end the achievements and redemptions of the Republican Party for the last 14 years, and then appeal to the intelligence, patriotism, and sense of justice of the American people to decide the preponderance. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The administration of President Taft will stand out to the future in unique solitude. It is the first in the history of the Government that has been forced, in the exercise of the power given the President by the Constitution, to convene on extraordinary occasions two sessions of Congress in one term. It is the first time in our history that a President has felt the necessity of calling an extra session when the popular branch of the Government was in the hands of an adverse party. This, fellow Democrats, is a most splendid tribute from a Republican President to the patriotism and wisdom of the Democracy of this House. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Let it be remembered that no Democrat is in the least responsible for this extra session, but that the sole responsibility for its necessity rests upon the members of the President's party in this Capitol.

The Constitution declares that only on extraordinary occasions shall the President convene Congress. The President first exercised this power when, sir, he was but a few days from his oath of inauguration. He felt, he knew, that as the result of 12 years of Republican legislation, the exact age of the Dingley tariff, the condition both of the people and of the Treasury was so distressing that he was compelled to call Congress together to repeal the most important and the most iniquitous law of 12 years of Republican control. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And now, when the work of that session, called to undo former Republican legislation, has been on the statute books less than 2 years, he feels that its resulting conditions, confronting both the people and the administration, are so grave and so extraordinary that it is necessary to call together a Democratic House and a Republican Senate in order to undo the legislation of that extra session. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The first extra session was to repeal the Dingley iniquity; this extra session is to modify and repeal, so far as the President dares to do it in order to hold his face with Republican leaders, the Payne-Aldrich iniquity. [Applause on the Democratic side.] For 10 years I have been accustomed to hear, both from the other side of the aisle and from the White House, and always with a sense of the ridiculous, much talk and rant about Republican capacity for constructive statesmanship. Do you hear anything about that nowadays, gentleman? [Laughter.] Why, my friends, if any Republican in this presence would display the audacity of referring to Republican constructive statesmanship now, in the light of the last two years, every Republican in the House would bow his head in humiliation and mortification. [Applause on the Democratic side.] You and I may differ in our opinion as to your capacity for legislative construction, but one thing is certain, your President believes that every important act you have done requires destruction. [Applause on the Democratic side.] He called your first session together to destroy the only act upon which you claimed the right to control the Government; and he calls this session and begs us Democrats to help him destroy what you did in that session. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And, my friends, we are going to do it the best we can. [Laughter.] I have heard so long and so often on that side for the last 10 years praises for the occupant of the White House that it sounds neither good nor grateful to hear Republicans now denouncing the great dispenser of public patronage. Two years only of their President's administration, and not a Republican leader on that side dares to stand and speak one commending word for their President. On the contrary, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] and my friend from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] and the majority of the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee in the last session, both in their report and on the floor, denounced their own President for turning traitor to Republican policies and principles and indorsing Democratic policies and principles. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I read in the report on the reciprocity measure of the Republican majority on that committee in the last Congress, signed by Mr. DALZELL, Mr. FORDNEY, and others, which no doubt will be adopted as the minority report at this session, a denunciation of the pending measure as "an abandonment of the policy of protection"; and they give that as a reason why a Republican majority in the last Congress voted against and why a Republican majority in this Congress will vote against the bill. [Applause on the Democratic side.] You Republicans denounce your President for his betrayal of Republican principles; we Democrats commend him for his conversion to Democratic policies. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The standpatters say this bill is a blow at Republican protection. For that reason they oppose it. For that reason I advocate it. For the same reason every loyal, patriotic Democrat in and outside of this House ought to favor it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I want to say to my Democratic colleagues that if there was no other reason that presented itself to my judgment to advocate and vote for this reciprocity measure, this report, written by the high chief priest of protection, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], would furnish the strongest reason why I, as a Democrat, should favor and advocate it. It is a blow at Republican protection. Though this blow is a weak one, I will never raise my hand to stay it, especially since the strength of our arguments has so appealed to the judgment of a Republican President that he stands with uplifted arm to make the assault. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Strike, Mr. President, strike! Although I have not an overflowing love for or an overabundant confidence in a Republican administration, I will not abandon our cause because its righteousness has almost converted even a Republican President to our theory of the tariff. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Gentlemen, politics is a great humbler of a man's pride; it excepts not that of a President. Let me present to the House Mr. Taft before and Mr. Taft after the election. Let us see what the President before the election thought and said of us, who are now earnestly, faithfully, and patriotically cooperating with him to enact into law the pending measure. I hold in my hand the Republican textbook used in the campaign of 1910. In the attempt to persuade enough of the voters in this country to return here a Republican instead of a Democratic House, these words of Mr. Taft are carried in large black letters, so that whoever should glance at this book could not fail to see his opinion of my fellow Democrats:

> The difficulty with the Democratic Party, and the reasons why the American people thus far have manifested their distrust of it, is because it has no policy which the country can depend upon.

And yet in less than six months he is beseeching us, in order to win back public favor to a repudiated administration, to help him put upon the statute books a Democratic policy. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Let us read further:

> Its whole stock in trade is that of irresponsible criticism and obstruction, but when charged with responsibility for doing anything it utterly fails.

Oh, my friends, how the vicissitudes of American politics humiliate the pride of even a President. Irresponsible obstructionists! Utter failures! And yet before that libel upon a great and historic political organization, numbering within its

embrace over 7,000,000 voters, becomes cold upon his lips, the desperate necessities of a discredited administration send this President to bended knees, begging before this Democratic majority. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.] Instead of that daring and dashing defiance and cruel slander of the Democratic Party, he comes with outstretched hands and sobbing voice, cooing, loving, beseeching us to save his administration from certain oblivion by voting into law this reciprocity agreement. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Whatever be our prejudices, we must commend his political judgment and wisdom. He finds himself and his administration in distressing straits. He must propose something to check increasing public disfavor. Ransacking in vain the history and record of his own party, he turns to that of our party, and in the hope to regain the people's confidence he resorts to a Democratic policy and presents it to the consideration of the Congress and the people as an administration measure. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

This measure is Democratic. We are twitted by the standpat Republicans in the House, in the cloakroom, in the committee room, and in the press with the taunt that we Democrats are standing by a Republican President. My friends, that talk does not interfere with me. We do sometimes stand by a Republican President and you sometimes stand by a Republican President. The difference is this: We Democrats stand by a Republican President only when he is right, while you Republicans stand by a Republican President only when he is wrong. [Prolonged applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, I regret that we are going to have a few patriotic, loyal Democrats on this side who feel it to be their duty to vote against the pending measure. They tell me that one of the reasons why they can not reconcile it with their consciences is because it is a Republican measure—a Republican President's measure. I want to say to those sensitive Democrats who are so prejudiced and who so hate anything coming from a Republican source, now, at this session, that if they had been equally as prejudiced and equally as sensitive as to the source from which measures came at the last extra session the Democrats would have written, with the aid of a few Republican votes, into the statute books a specific demand of the Democratic platform. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.] And now these sensitive Democrats, here and elsewhere in the Capitol, are so prejudiced against its source that they will vote against the pending bill. Yet they could, during the last extra session, leave the Democratic side and abandon the Democratic platform and join hands and lock shoulders with my friend DALZELL and my friends PAYNE and Aldrich, and other standpat Republicans, and defeat the redemption of a plain Democratic pledge. [Loud applause.]

Oh, my friends, you can not fool the people at home by saying that this is a Republican measure. Who knows whether it is a Republican measure or not, and who says so? Standpat Republicans are denouncing the President because he favors it, declaring it to be a Democratic measure.

The Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee of the last House and more than 95 per cent of the Democratic Members of that House declared it Democratic and favored it and went on record for it. All but one of the 14 Democratic members of the present Ways and Means Committee, from which comes this bill, and more than 95 per cent of the Democratic Members of this House declare it to be Democratic and will vote for it. A majority of the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee of the last House and a majority of the Republican Members of that House denounced it as Democratic and un-Republican and opposed it. A majority of the Republicans of the present House declare it to be Democratic and un-Republican and will vote against it. Read the record vote of the last session. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY], the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Gaines], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], the four high priests of the stand-pat protection synagogue, and a majority of their fellow Republicans against it. The present Democratic Speaker [Mr. CLARK] favors it and declares it to be Democratic. The Republican ex-Speaker [Mr. CANNON] opposes it and denounces it as Democratic and un-Republican. And yet some of my sensitive and partisan Democratic friends, here and elsewhere, are unwilling to support it on the ground that it is Republican and un-Democratic, but at the same time are willing to abandon their Democratic comrades, as the battle wages, and join the ranks of the majority of the Republicans, and, side by side with Mr. CANNON and Mr. DALZELL, try to shoot to pieces the flag we are bearing. And they will go back to an honest, intelligent Democratic constituency and say to them, as they say to us, "I can not stomach this measure because it is a Republican measure." [Laughter.] Oh, gentlemen, that is thinner than moonshine. [Laughter.] You have got to get some other excuse.

Now, I say that my friend DALZELL, in talking about the tariff, for once in his life told a plain political truth when he said that this is a Democratic and not a Republican measure. [Laughter.] Why, gentlemen, freer trade relations with Canada, reciprocity with Canada, has been the Democratic policy for 50 years. Mr. DALZELL is right when he says it is un-Republican. Canada is the one excepted country with which the Republican Party for the last 50 years has always refused to make a reciprocal arrangement. In the debates in the Senate in 1890 and 1892 Mr. FRYE, Mr. Hale, and other Senators said that, while the Republican Party was willing to make agreements for reciprocal trade relations with other countries of the Western Hemisphere, they must except Canada. The Democrats declared then that the one country of all countries with which we should have a reciprocal trade agreement was Canada. John Sherman offered an amendment to the McKinley bill including Canada specifically, and, as I recall, only two Republican Senators favored it—Sherman and Plumb.

It is not a Republican measure; it is not a Republican policy. It is a Democratic measure; it is a Democratic policy. Why, away back in 1848 Robert J. Walker, the great tariff-reform Democrat of that generation, the author of the famous Walker tariff bill of 1846, in his annual report urged upon Congress the wisdom, the benefit, and the necessity of this country making a reciprocity agreement with Canada. In 1854 a Democratic administration, a Democratic Congress enacted into law a trade agreement with Canada known as the Canadian trade treaty. It was substantially similar to the present measure, the main difference being that this provides for reduction of the tariff on a greater number of manufactured articles. It appealed so strongly to the judgment and conscience of all parties in the Senate and in the House that there was neither debate nor division against it. The Republicans in January, 1865, passed an act giving a year's notice, as required, of the termination of the reciprocity agreement. It terminated in 1866.

My friends, since I have opened this debate I have not had the advantage at this session of the argument of the most resourceful and the best debater on the Republican side, my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], but I take it that every argument he can now make against this bill, every reason he can now give why one should vote against it, was given in a most carefully prepared and apparently a most carefully studied speech made in February last. I want to say to the gentleman that I know he did not intentionally mislead the House in that speech. I know that he did not intentionally misquote any of the facts or any of the statistics in regard to the effect and result of the former reciprocal agreement with Canada. He declared to this House, and it stands in the RECORD, that the results of that agreement with Canada were so disastrous to the United States that Congress repealed it in 1865, and to substantiate his statement of the great disaster which it wrought to the people he declared that our exports to Canada dwindled from $20,800,000 the year the reciprocity began to $15,200,000 at the expiration of the 12 years of the treaty, while Canada's exports to us increased from $12,000,000 to $46,000,000 during the same time; that when it began the balance of trade in our favor was $8,000,000 annually, but that during the treaty this had been wiped out and at its expiration the annual balance against us and in favor of Canada was $28,000,000 or $30,000,000. He quoted statistics, gotten from somewhere, sustaining him. He contended that our export trade with Canada was practically destroyed, while Canada's export trade to us was enormously increased.

Mr. Chairman, I know my friend was too busy with other things; he was too much occupied with the lamentations over the results of the last election [laughter] to give sufficient time to substantiate these figures; that the person who did the work of gathering up these statistics for him imposed very seriously upon his statistical credulity. What are the facts? Taking the four years immediately preceding the treaty, our total exports to Canada were only $43,000,000; but in the four years immediately succeeding the treaty our exports were over $104,000,000. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And yet a Representative of 250,000 intelligent, honest, and patriotic people stands here in this House, and in order to obtain a party advantage, in order to defeat a Democratic measure, emanating from a Republican President, tells his colleagues and the country that our exports to Canada decreased from $20,800,000 in the 12 years that followed the treaty down to $15,200,000.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. DALZELL. I want to say to the gentleman that the figures I quoted and that are in my speech are not my figures——

Mr. KITCHIN. I knew they were not. [Laughter.] That is what I said.

Mr. DALZELL. They are the figures of the deceased Senator Morrill, of Vermont. They were given by the Senator on the floor of the Senate; and, as I think, the gentleman will find, if he takes the statistics furnished by the Bureau of Statistics, they are borne out by the official statistics.

Mr. KITCHIN. I knew, Mr. Chairman, that with the sensitiveness of the American people now for truth and right, no man, though it be my friend from Pennsylvania, would admit the authorship of such fallacious and misleading figures. [Applause on the Democratic side.] He goes to the tomb and attributes these statistical fallacies to an honored man who has been in his grave for more than a decade. [Applause on the Democratic side.] If Mr. Morrill gave the figures that the gentleman quoted here to this House and incorporated in his speech, then Mr. Morrill was imposed upon by some greedy protectionist and monopolist as badly as the gentleman from Pennsylvania was. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Why did the gentleman select only 1 year out of the 12 years of the treaty to show our imports from Canada? And why the year 1866, the year following the close of the Civil War? An investigation would have shown him that our imports in that year from all nations amounted to about $100,000,000 more than in any previous year. He dared not give the House and the country another one of the 12 years while the treaty was in force. Why did he not produce the statistics of our trade with Canada for the years between the making of the treaty and the breaking out of the Civil War and compare them with the same number of years before the treaty? Let me say here that, even while that great war was raging and the fate of the Union was in the balance, with the energies and industries of our people halted and paralyzed, our exports to Canada were more than her exports to us. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Let me give the House some accurate statistics compiled by the Department of Commerce and Labor. For the four years immediately preceding the treaty our exports to Canada were $43,948,288, and for the four years immediately succeeding they were $104,510,165. Our balance of trade for the four preceding years was $21,492,000, while for the four succeeding years it amounted to $30,221,000. I remind the gentleman, too, that the total trade between Canada and the United States for the four years immediately preceding amounted to only $66,400,000, and for the four years immediately succeeding to $178,798,000. Our exports to Canada for the 12 years immediately preceding the treaty of 1854 were less than $120,000,000. For the 12 years succeeding, the 12 years of its existence, they amounted to over $300,000,000—nearly three times as much. The total trade between Canada and the United States for the 12 years preceding the treaty was less than $160,000,000, but for the 12 years during its existence it was more than $550,000,000, and a balance of trade for every term of 2, 3, 4, 6, or 12 years was in favor of American production and American manufacture. [Applause.]

My friends, the same influences that are fighting this measure now forced then a Republican Congress to terminate that treaty, not in the interest of American trade, not in the interest of international right or justice, but in the interest of protection and monopolistic greed. [Applause on the Democratic side.] If this reciprocity measure fails to pass, either in this House or at the other end of the Capitol, its defeat will be inspired and caused by the same powerful and avaricious interests. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

My friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] declared in his speech that this reciprocity was against the farmer and in the interest of the protected manufacturers. Oh, my friends, contemplate the phenomenal spectacle of the Hon. JOHN DALZELL opposing any tariff measure that is in the interest of the protected manufacturers! [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] I have got as much credulity as any man in this world, and just as much confidence in my friend from Pennsylvania as any other man has, I reckon [laughter], but to save my life I would strain my credulity to the breaking point if I believed he would oppose any measure that would be of advantage to the American manufacturers, when Pittsburg, his home city, is the very citadel of protection. [Laughter and applause.]

And be it remembered that while he loves the farmer mighty good, each and every one of the manufactured articles which this bill reduces or puts on the free list is made in the city of Pittsburg, the home of the distinguished gentleman who now so loves the farmer. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] Barbed wire, tin plates, galvanized iron or steel wire, and so forth, are put on the free list. They are made in Pittsburg, the home of my friend Mr. DALZELL. The tariff on portable and traction engines, farming implements, knives and forks, cutlery, and so forth, are reduced. They are made in Pittsburg, the home of my friend Mr. DALZELL. And now he comes and opposes this measure because it is going to hurt the American farmer. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] Well, well; did you ever in all your life, gentlemen? [Laughter.]

Let us see how this reciprocity measure is going to injure the farmer from the standpoint of the gentleman and of Pittsburg. The tariff on farm wagons is reduced from 35 per cent to 22 per cent; on feed crushers, field rollers, manure spreaders, from 45 per cent to 20 per cent; on cutlery, from over 70 per cent to 27½ per cent; on table knives and forks, scissors and shears, from over 50 per cent to 27½ per cent; barbed wire and other wire for fencing go to the free list. If this bill passes, the farmer may get his wire fencing a little cheaper; his wagons and other farming implements a little cheaper; his cutlery, his knives and forks, a little cheaper; his salt, his lumber, and many other articles he must have a little cheaper; and Pittsburg manufacturers may have to sell these articles a little cheaper. Therefore, my friends, it is the most natural thing in the world for the gentleman from Pittsburg to have apprehensions that the farmer may thereby be seriously injured. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] No wonder my friend is vigorously opposing this measure in behalf of the farmer [laughter] and making for the first time in his life a public confession of his love for the American farmer. [Laughter.]

My friends, we have all observed that the standpat Republican is the one now who is loving the farmer the most. My friend from Pennsylvania shed more tears over the farmer in the last two months, since reciprocity has been before Congress and the country, than all the insurgents on that side. [Laughter.] I want to say that I am glad to see the insurgents now dancing around the fires with the distinguished standpatter of Pennsylvania, Mr. DALZELL, shouting hosannas and hallelujahs to the farmers. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I want to say to him——

Mr. JAMES. And CANNON.

Mr. KITCHIN. Oh, yes. It is a most delightful thing to see my friends LENROOT, COOPER, NORRIS, MADISON, LINDBERGH, and other insurgents all joining hands around the ring, with my friend DALZELL and my friend CANNON in the middle, singing songs together. [Applause on the Democratic side.] They have a common ground, they have a common love and sympathy and a common desire to fool in the future, as in the past, the American farmer. [Laughter.]

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Most assuredly.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman has been saying much about the necessity of accuracy of statement. I voted for the reciprocity agreement, and I am going to vote for it again, and so is the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MADISON.]

Mr. KITCHIN. Good! I commend your patriotism.

Mr. JAMES. If the gentleman will permit, I would like to say that I think there are about three insurgents who are supporting the President's reciprocity bill.

Mr. KITCHIN. I am glad to hear that. We are going to get them all if they vote right.

I have been here with my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] about 11 years, and I have heard him so often, and I have heard him make many a tariff speech, but I never heard him use the name of "farmer" until this reciprocity came up. I have seen him speak for and vote for a tariff, formulated for the purpose of exacting tribute from the farmer, but I do not recall ever to have heard him mention the farmer's name before. He is a new convert to the farmer's rights. And when he made that speech last session his voice was broken and his cheeks wet with tears as he referred to the poor, down-trodden farmer being sacrificed by the President. But, remembering his past record, in the interest of the Steel Trust and the other trusts, and seeing the tears filling his eyes, a line of poetry came to my mind that I used to see in one of the old readers:

Tears, idle tears, I know not whence nor why they come.

[Laughter.]

I do not mind his fooling himself and other Republicans into the belief that this reciprocity measure is in the interest of the protected manufacturers of Pittsburg and Pennsylvania, thereby causing him to oppose it, but what I regret to see is that he has come over to our side, and even invaded the sacred Democratic soil of my own State and fooled some of us Demo-

crats. [Laughter and applause.] He declares his further opposition to the measure because it "compels the farmer to produce in a free-trade market and to buy in a protected market." Why, gentlemen, if that would be its effect, and my friend DALZELL could really convince himself of it, we would expect him, in view of his public record, to be its strongest advocate. That is his policy; that is what he has been advocating ever since he came to Congress. The inspiration of his public life has been to enact tariff laws so that the American farmer, as well as the American laborer, the American doctor, the American lawyer, the American mechanic, the American shopgirl, the American consumer, of whatever avocation, shall be forced to buy here in the highest protected tariff market of the world [applause on the Democratic side], while he knows that the prices for the products of American farmers are fixed in the free-trade markets, in competition with the farm products of every nation [applause on the Democratic side]; and he further knows that the labor of every American citizen, in shop or field or mine or factory, is sold in the free open markets of the world. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Talk about the free list and protected American labor! Why, everything that an American citizen wears, from his head to his feet, almost everything the American citizen consumes or uses, is on the high tariff list, while all the pauperized labor of all the countries on earth are on the free list. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

He opposes a free list which gives the American farmer, the American laborer, the American consumer some benefit, but is in favor of a free list in labor which gives the Steel Trust, that employs tens of thousands of foreigners, who can not speak the English language, and other protected trusts of Pittsburg and Pennsylvania all the benefit. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I commend to the House the reading of the gentleman's speech. As a protectionist he proves too much. He shows conclusively that American manufacturers do not need protection. He declares, and produces figures to sustain him, that American manufacturers of all kinds are exporting to Canada, in the face of the Canadian tariff, in competition with England, though she has a preferential tariff rate against us, 50 per cent more of their products than do the British manufacturers. He could have added that we are selling Canada, in spite of her tariff, more manufactured products than all the nations of the world combined. It is inconceivable to me how any intelligent man can contend that the American manufacturer needs a high tariff to protect him in our home market against British and other foreign competition, when this same manufacturer is sending his products to Canada, burdened with a tariff one-third heavier than British goods bear, and has actually captured the Canadian market in competition with England and all the other nations of the earth. If our manufacturers can compete and outsell England, with a preferential tariff in her favor, in Canada, it is absurd to say that we can not compete and outsell her here, at our own doors, in the home market. I have said, my friends, that this measure is a Democratic policy.

I have referred to the fact that reciprocity was first urged in 1848 by Robert J. Walker, a Democratic Secretary of the Treasury; that the Democratic administration and a Democratic Congress passed a reciprocity agreement with Canada in 1854 substantially similar with the present proposed one; that under its 12 years of operation our trade with Canada largely increased; that it was repealed by a Republican Congress, against Democratic protest, on the demands of protection and monopolistic greed. The Democratic Party for a half century has advocated freer trade relations and reciprocal agreements with Canada. But some Democrats here and at the other end of the Capitol, to justify their votes against the pending measure, have denounced reciprocity as un-Democratic. Gentlemen who enjoy the franking privilege at both ends of the Capitol have broadcasted my State with denunciations of it as a Republican policy. They have condemned it as against the expressed declaration of our party platforms. They have quoted from the Democratic campaign book of 1902 to prove that our party opposes reciprocity. They have declared that our party in the Senate in 1890, when the McKinley bill was under discussion, bitterly assailed the policy of reciprocity as un-Democratic; that it was the handmaid of protection. They have told the people of my State that Ransom and Vance—the mention of whose names always thrills with conscious pride the heart of every patriotic North Carolinian—fought against and voted against reciprocity because it was un-Democratic. Gentleman who make these charges and send them out to my people ought to know better, and one moment's investigation would show them that there is not a shadow of ground to warrant such assertions. Vance and Ransom, Vest and Beck, as well as other Democratic leaders in the Senate, did vote against the so-called reciprocity amendment of the McKinley bill. They—and, in view of his interviews in the public press on this question, I wish the attention of my friend and colleague from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB]—did denounce it as a "sham reciprocity." But they demanded real reciprocity with Canada and the countries south of us. Senator Gray, of Delaware, a distinguished Democratic Senator, offered an amendment to the McKinley bill providing for reciprocity with Canada and other countries of the Western Hemisphere. This amendment received the solid Democratic vote of the Senate, while the solid Republican vote was cast against it. Ransom and Vance were for it. Neither did any Democrat then nor did the Democratic platform of 1892, which has been garbled in support of the opposition to this bill, condemn reciprocity.

But both the Democratic Senators in 1890 and the platform of 1892 did denounce the Republican sham reciprocity of the McKinley bill. All good Democrats denounced it then, all good Democrats denounce it now, as a sham reciprocity. It failed, as every intelligent man knew it would, to widen the market for a single American product. Instead of providing for the free entry of or the reduction of the tariff on importations, it gave the President power to increase the tariff, to put a tariff tax on tea and coffee that were on the free list; on sugar that the bill itself had placed on the free list, if he should conclude countries exporting such articles imposed unreasonable duties on our products.

Instead of a reduction, it vested the President with the power to increase taxes on American consumption. To show to my people that a vote against this measure is in harmony with Democratic policies and a vote for it is un-Democratic, garbled extracts from the Democratic platform of 1892 have been sent out from Washington to the press of my State. It may not be so interesting to gentlemen here, but the people in my State wish to know the truth, and the whole truth, as to the Democratic position on reciprocity. Let me read the part of the platform which has been scattered throughout my State as a justification for opposing this bill:

> We denounce the sham reciprocity which juggles with the people's desire for enlarged foreign markets and freer exchanges, etc.

The preceding lines of the reciprocity plank in that platform have been omitted in the literature sent to my State.

Let me read that section in the platform as it is:

> SEC. 4. Trade interchange on the basis of reciprocal advantages to the countries participating is a time-honored doctrine of the Democratic faith, but we denounce the sham reciprocity which juggles with the people's desire for enlarged foreign markets and freer exchanges, etc.

You will observe that the three lines showing that reciprocity is a "time-honored doctrine of the Democratic faith" is left out in this antireciprocity literature, and the extract is garbled from the midst of the sentence after the word "but," and makes the platform to read: "We denounce the sham reciprocity," and so forth. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

So, gentlemen, the Democratic platform of 1892 declares that reciprocity is a "time-honored doctrine of the Democratic faith." But if, sirs, that is not sufficiently clear to the doubting, let me read the reciprocity plank in the Democratic platform of 1904:

> RECIPROCITY.
>
> We favor liberal trade arrangements with Canada, and with peoples of other countries where they can be entered into with benefit to American agriculture, manufactures, mining, or commerce.

Both parties have favored reciprocity. But there is a wide difference between Republican reciprocity and Democratic reciprocity. Republican reciprocity is well defined by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, in the speech to which I have referred, thus:

> Republican reciprocity is reciprocity in noncompeting articles and in nothing else. * * * Products admitted to the United States must not compete with ours. * * * Reciprocity in competing products is absolutely inconsistent with the policy of protection.

He defines Republican reciprocity just as Senator Hale and other Republican Senators in the Senate debates in 1890 and 1892; just as the Republican platforms of 1900 and 1904; just as the Republican Handbook of 1908 did, and just as the report of a majority of the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee at the last session did.

Republicans always heretofore opposed and a majority of them in the House now oppose any reduction or removal of the tariff, by reciprocity or otherwise, that will permit any foreign product to compete with the trusts and manufacturers. A reciprocity such as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] and the other stand-pat Republicans favor is the handmaid of protection. They take the broad, bold stand that no products shall touch the American shores that will compete with the Steel Trust, that will compete with Mr. Aldrich's Rubber Trust,

the Woolen Trust, the Sugar Trust, or with any other trust or protected interest that have maintained and controlled the Republican Party for the last quarter of a century. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Senator Vest declared that Democratic reciprocity meant freer trade relations with one or more nations in all articles required to sustain life or give comfort to the American citizen, whether competitive or noncompetitive. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The Democratic Party favors now and has always favored that kind of reciprocity.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield such time as is necessary for the gentleman from North Carolina to conclude his remarks. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I wish now to take up one subject or phase of the pending question about which deception and humbugism have been pushed to the limit. I do not know a Democrat or a Republican who does not put his opposition to this measure upon the apparent ground that by removal of the tariff, as to Canada, on agricultural products, such as wheat, corn, barley, and other grain, cattle and other live stock, the American farmer will be injured. Now, gentlemen, I believe that I can show, not only to an intelligent farmer, but I believe that I can show to even a Member of this House, even a Republican Member [laughter], that this tariff on the farmer's products—his wheat, his corn, his rye, his barley, his hogs, his cattle, all of his live stock—is the most transparent deception that was ever perpetrated upon an honest people and that ever discredited the statute books of an honest government. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KITCHIN. Why, most assuredly, my friend.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. If you are correct in your surmises, why is it that wheat in Dakota is worth over 10 to 12 cents on the bushel more than it is right across the line in Canada, with no difference in freight at all?

Mr. KITCHIN. It is because there is absolutely no foundation for the truth of your statement [applause on the Democratic side], and I am going to show you before I get through, or else I am going to convict every Republican that had charge of the statistical department of this Government for the last 15 years of willfully deceiving the American public. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman further yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. If you are right, why, then, has the Tariff Board reported that there is a difference of 10 cents?

Mr. KITCHIN. The Tariff Board has made no such report. But if it has, it is for the same reason that every Republican has in advocating a tariff on the farmer's product, namely, in order to fool the farmers in the West into voting the Republican ticket, so that the trusts and protected interests can continue to maintain the high tariff wall behind which to rob the American farmer and consumer. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Why, certainly.

Mr. LENROOT. I want to ask the gentleman this question: Less than three months ago the gentlemen upon that side of the House opposed the creation of a tariff commission, on the ground that the members of that commission would be the creatures of President Taft. Does the gentleman think this board now is the creature of President Taft, when they have reported contrary to the views expressed by him?

Mr. KITCHIN. I have not seen the views expressed by him, except in his message. But as to the Tariff Board. We took the position on this floor that a tariff board was a cowardly subterfuge—that you Republicans tried to create a tariff board in order to delay the mandate and orders of 14,000,000 of American voters. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

And Mr. Taft in a public letter or speech, published in the Republican campaign textbook of 1910, substantiates that position. He declared to the people that the time to have revision was after his Tariff Board had reported, and that it would take the balance of his term for it to accumulate proper data upon which to make a report. But let me read from the Republican textbook exactly what he said:

> Now, I think it is utterly useless, as I think it would be greatly distressing to business, to talk of another revision of the tariff during the present Congress. I should think that it would certainly take the rest of this administration to accumulate the data upon which a new and proper revision of the tariff might be had.

[Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Delay! Delay! That is what you Republicans and your President desired to accomplish by the creation of the Tariff Commission. We knew it was a fraud, and we knew it was proposed and established for purposes of delay. You wanted to extend the lease of the trusts to plunder. You proposed a tariff board not to reduce the tariff but to fool the people again and feed them on more promises. Republican promises are in one respect like United States bonds, payable only at the option of the promiser [laughter on the Democratic side], and you have fooled some of the farmers into the belief that they were just about as good as United States bonds. [Renewed laughter.] But they are getting on to you. You have violated your pledges. You have delayed tariff revision; you have fooled the farmer; you have fed him on promises; and you have done that for 25 years. Now you propose to feed him on some new Tariff Board promises in the hope to fool him some more. [Laughter.] Mr. Taft further said, in a letter to Chairman McKINLEY, also published in this textbook, that he would make recommendations as to revision or reduction of the tariff only after his Tariff Board made its report either on the entire tariff or on any of the schedules.

Now, then, if the President was candid and sincere in not desiring, for want of proper information or for other reason, to touch the tariff until his Tariff Board reported, why is it that he sends to the Congress a reciprocity tariff measure that affects more than 200 articles produced in this country not only before his own Tariff Board reports but even before it has made an investigation as to any of them? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Oh, do not tell me about your Tariff Board. [Laughter.]

But the gentleman says the Tariff Board does not agree with the President. If the Tariff Board does not agree with the President and with the standpatters for a protective tariff policy, that Tariff Board is not going to last long, and Republicans will soon be clamoring for us to abolish the "blamed old" Tariff Board. [Laughter.] Tariff boards are created by protectionists, of protectionists, and for protectionists, created to promote protection and to obstruct tariff reform.

Did not the gentleman say that the Tariff Board had reported against this reciprocity measure that reduces the tariff? It certainly made no report and no investigation before the President sent his reciprocity message to the last Congress. But if it has since reported against reciprocity, it corroborates what I said: Tariff boards are made to prevent the reduction of the tariff. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

I understand these insurgents in the West. Any man that did not have sympathy with the predicament in which the insurgents of the agricultural West find themselves would not be possessed of the common virtues of a gentleman. [Laughter.] Why, Mr. Chairman, there is not a single insurgent from the West who could retain his seat here if the grain and livestock farmers of the West were convinced that this Republican tariff on their agricultural products was a fake and a humbug. What other appeal would you have to make to the farmer in Iowa or Wisconsin or Minnesota or Kansas or elsewhere if you should admit that the tariff on the farmer's wheat, corn, live stock, and so forth, is a snare and a fake, as it is? [Laughter.] The very life and political existence of my friend LENROOT and of these other insurgents of the West depends on the fact that the farmer of the agricultural West shall still be kept blind and deceived in the belief that the tariff on his products causes him to get higher prices, and that if the Democrats get into power they will remove the tariff on his products and thereby bankrupt him. You have got to do that, for the very minute you admit—what we are going to prove—that this duty of 25 cents a bushel on wheat and so much on corn and rye and barley and cattle and other farm products is a delusion and a snare, kept there for the express purpose of deceiving your constituents into returning Republicans to Congress, you are undone.

Now, let us take wheat. Oh, yes; these insurgents and these standpatters have been going about the rural districts of this country, and especially in Iowa, and Illinois, and Wisconsin, and Minnesota, and elsewhere out there in the West, telling the people, "Why, gentlemen, you just vote for a Democratic Representative and elect a Democratic Congress and President and he will go there and take the tariff off of your wheat, and off of your corn, and off of your barley, and off of your live stock, and just open these markets to the Canadian wheat and the Canadian corn and other Canadian products, and they will flood our market and destroy the farming industry of the country."

The farmer, being too busy and too tired to investigate himself, often takes your word for it and begins to fear: "Now, here, we must keep the Democrats out, because if the Demo-

crats get in up there in Washington, just as sure as anything in this world they will take the tariff off of wheat and corn and all our stuff, because Mr. LENROOT says they will do it." [Laughter.] Why, gentlemen, I tell you it is absolutely inconceivable to me that any intelligent farmer, or any intelligent man, or even a Republican [laughter], can sit down quietly, without an office sticking up before him, and consider the facts and then arise from his study and say that this tariff on wheat, corn, barley, or other grain, or on cattle and live stock, affects in any way the prices that the farmer receives. You know, I know, and every farmer who is now undeceived by you knows that the tariff on wheat and the farmers' products is absolutely bogus. He knows that the price for his wheat, his barley, his rye, and so forth, as well as his live stock, is fixed not here in America, but in the open markets of the world, in competition with all the world. You know and I know that when we make in this country over a hundred million bushels of wheat more than the American public consumes, that surplus is bound to overflow and go out into the markets of the world in competition with the products of the serfs of Russia, the ryots of India, the fellahs of Egypt to meet at Liverpool and London the surplus wheat of the world from Canada to India, and that surplus fixes the price not only abroad, but fixes the price in the Dakotas, in Minnesota, in Illinois, in every other market of our country. If the surplus shipped abroad does not fix the price, if the farmers of the Middle West or anywhere else in the country do not get as much for their 100,000,000 and more bushels of surplus wheat abroad or their surplus of corn, barley, cattle, and live stock, why, in the name of common sense, do they ship these products abroad when they can get a better price for them at home? I can understand how a farmer who is a big enough fool to let you deceive him into the belief that this tariff is helping him will sell his wheat and other stuff abroad for less than he could get right at home, but I am talking about the intelligent farmers. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from North Carolina yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. KITCHIN. Why, certainly.

Mr. LENROOT. Upon the same theory, will the gentleman be in favor of placing cotton manufactures of every description upon the free list, where there is also a surplus shipped abroad?

Mr. KITCHIN. Why, you protective-tariff fellows, in order to allow the New England cotton manufacturers to exact exorbitant millions of dollars from the American people, are claiming in every campaign and in every Congress that we do not make enough to supply our own consumption, and you want a tariff wall so high as to shut out foreign goods, and by thus giving our manufacturers a monopoly encourage them to make enough to supply the American market.

Mr. HILL. I do not resent the charge against the New England cotton manufacturers, but I simply suggest to the gentleman from North Carolina that in the last year more cotton has been used in manufacturing in the Southern States than in New England.

Mr. KITCHIN. Why, certainly; I hope it is true. We in the South intend to make the New England mills come down and put their mills there, or else go out of business. [Applause.] Because with the cotton right at home, right at our own mills, with the best labor, the most honest labor, and the most orderly labor in the world, we can compete in cotton goods with the world. We are not asking for protection, but you people have been asking our southern mills and trying to fool them into joining you in demanding high protection, so that New England may have the benefit of it. New England is exporting few cotton goods. She is extorting oppressive prices from the American consumer under this tariff; but I want to say to my friend from Connecticut that we are going to break up that system. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HILL. I would like to ask the gentleman for an honest confession, if his own honest manufacturers from North Carolina did not appear here two years ago and demand higher rates?

Mr. KITCHIN. I do not know whether an honest manufacturer from North Carolina came here or not. We have a great many cotton manufacturers in North Carolina that came from Connecticut, the State of the gentleman. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from North Carolina yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. KITCHIN. I do.

Mr. FOCHT. I would like the gentleman from North Carolina, in this connection, with reference to the manufacturers of the South, to explain at length clearly something of the nature of the labor that is employed in these mills of his State.

Mr. KITCHIN. What State is the gentleman from?

Mr. FOCHT. Pennsylvania.

Mr. KITCHIN. I assert that the labor of North Carolina gets more for their work than 90 per cent of the labor in Pennsylvania.

Mr. FOCHT. I deny that.

Mr. KITCHIN. The labor bulletins issued by the Republican department here show that in Pennsylvania, in its coal mines, in the iron mines, in the steel works, and many other protected industries labor is paid less and works longer hours than in any other State in the United States. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FOCHT. I deny that, either on the farm, factory, or anywhere. I would like to ask the gentleman to give us some educational statistics.

Mr. KITCHIN. Why, gentlemen, it never bothers me to hear a Republican repudiate the truth; that is a habit with them. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. FOCHT. Oh, you repudiate your debts even, in the South.

Mr. KITCHIN. Here is an original bill that I hold in my hand, just handed me, an account with a coal miner, who received for 12 days' work in the mines of Pennsylvania the great and munificent sum, under the protective tariff of the Payne-Aldrich Act, $8.40. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FOCHT. He did not earn any more or he would have received it; they are paid by the ton.

Mr. KITCHIN. Now, gentlemen, let me return to this bogus tariff on wheat and other farm products, and show you what a humbug it is.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from North Carolina yield to the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. KITCHIN. Certainly.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I find that it is usual for men to give an opinion on subjects that pertain to matters farthest from where they reside.

Mr. KITCHIN. In other words, upon subjects they know nothing about. If so, I am going to yield to the gentleman and let him talk. [Laughter and applause.] If the gentleman wants to learn the truth to-day, wants really to learn something about wheat and the tariff on agricultural products, if he will take his seat, and if it gets too hot for him I will have the pages throw water on it—— [Laughter.]

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I am very cool now.

Mr. KITCHIN. If he will possess himself in patience and keep cool I am going to show him that no Republican in the House can stand up and say that he honestly wants to ascertain the truth and then go back home and say that the tariff on the farmer's grain and cattle and live stock and other farm products helps him or that its removal will injure him.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Will the gentleman permit a question? I really ought not to have prefaced my question, and I will withdraw it.

Mr. KITCHIN. It is always dangerous to have a preamble. [Laughter.]

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Now, I want some information about wheat.

Mr. KITCHIN. All right, I will give it to you. I have it right here, provided the Republican statisticians that have been in office here 12 or 15 years are correct.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. The gentleman has stated that the price of wheat is fixed in Liverpool.

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; and in London.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Does the gentleman know that we raise different grades of wheat in the United States?

Mr. KITCHIN. Oh, yes.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Does the gentleman know that in the Northwest United States, especially in Minnesota, the banner wheat State of the United States, and in the Dakotas, which are next to it, we raise what is called No. 1 northern and No. 1 hard spring wheat?

Mr. KITCHIN. I will take what you say about that to be true.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Does the gentleman know that to be a fact?

Mr. KITCHIN. I have heard that, yes. Go ahead.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Will the gentleman inform me how much of the Dakota and Minnesota No. 1 northern or No. 1 hard spring wheat has ever been exported to Liverpool or anywhere else?

Mr. KITCHIN. I do not know how much of that particular kind has been exported to Liverpool or any other place.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. That particular grade.

Mr. KITCHIN. I will tell the gentleman this, that if that particular grade is grown in India or in Russia or in Canada or elsewhere, then that particular grade in Canada or in India or Russia brings the same price in the markets as the Minnesota and Dakota wheat. If there is any difference, which some of the Minnesota gentlemen contend, in the Winnipeg and Duluth and Minneapolis markets, it is on account of this superior quality of the Minneapolis and Duluth wheat, and not on account of the tariff, as I shall later show.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I will state this to the gentleman: No. 1 northern and No. 1 hard of Winnipeg is occasionally exported to Liverpool, but I would like to have the gentleman show me where one bushel of No. 1 northern or No. 1 hard of the Minnesota and Dakota wheat, of which we raise about 200,000,000 bushels annually, was ever exported across the water at all; and the reason is that there has been for the last 10 years a difference of from 11 to 15 cents a bushel between the price in Canada and in North Dakota and Minnesota.

Mr. KITCHIN. And that same difference——

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Those are the facts.

Mr. KITCHIN. And that same difference, if it be, exists between Nebraska and Illinois and Kansas wheat?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. They do not ship the Minnesota and Dakota wheat to those places. They manufacture it in Minneapolis.

Mr. KITCHIN. And Winnipeg——

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. That goes to Liverpool because it is from 11 to 15 cents a bushel cheaper than it is right across the line in the Dakotas.

Mr. KITCHIN. I am going to make a challenge to the gentleman now.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. It is the same kind of wheat, too.

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman can not find quotations in any daily paper, published in Minneapolis or Duluth or elsewhere in the United States, showing that wheat is 11 to 15 cents higher in Minneapolis, or other point in the United States, than wheat of the same grade in Canada or other markets of the world, exclusive of the difference in transportation charges.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I can show that for the last 10 years absolutely from personal knowledge on that grade of wheat.

Mr. KITCHIN. Does the gentleman want to make the point that in Minnesota and Dakota a superior grade of wheat is grown to that of any other country?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I do.

Mr. KITCHIN. Then, that is the reason, if you have a superior grade to that of any other country, to that of Canada, that Canada can not compete with you. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Will the gentleman yield? Did I understand the gentleman to say that if they raise the same wheat in Canada the price would be the same?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I want to say that they do raise identically the same wheat.

Mr. KITCHIN. Then the gentleman does not agree with the gentleman from Minnesota. He says they do not; that a superior grade is grown in Minnesota and the Dakotas.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. But the gentleman from North Carolina misunderstood the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota rose.

Mr. KITCHIN. Now, we are going to debate this question just as long as you gentlemen wish, long enough for you to deceive, or try to deceive, the American farmer again as you have in the past. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] made one statement and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] makes another statement, and they cross——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. KITCHIN. You two gentlemen can go out into the cloakroom and settle your contradictions about Minnesota and Dakota and Canadian wheat, but do not come in here and take up the time of men who are trying to teach you Republicans the truth about this wheat situation. [Laughter.]

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I will say to the gentleman this: That because of the climate and the soil the same quality of wheat is raised along the border in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta that is raised in North Dakota, Minnesota, and Montana, and the difference in price on that grade of wheat is from 11 to 15 cents a bushel, just one side of the line or the other, cheaper on the Canadian side than on the United States side, and has been so for 15 years.

Mr. KITCHIN. I need not carry on any controversy with the gentleman longer, because that statement is exactly contrary to the statement that he made awhile ago to the effect that Minnesota and Dakota grew a superior grade of wheat to that of Canada or any other country.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Not at all.

Mr. KITCHIN. If the gentleman wants to make an amendment to it, I will accept his amendment and go ahead.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. My statements are exactly alike.

Mr. KITCHIN. If there is the difference to which the gentleman refers in the price of wheat in Minnesota and in Canada, it is bound to be on account of the superiority of grade or of freight rates, or both. I again challenge gentlemen to produce, now or hereafter in this debate, statistics from the department or quotations from any daily papers showing there was as much difference as 11 to 15 cents per bushel in the price of wheat of the same grade at Minneapolis and Winnipeg. I challenge you to show by the statistics of the department or quotations from the press that there was as much difference in the price of wheat between the Minneapolis and Winnipeg markets as there was between the Minneapolis and the Chicago markets. You will find, as I have found, and everyone will find, that wheat in Chicago, the great wheat market of this country, is from 2 to 5 cents less than wheat quoted in the Winnipeg market and many other markets in Canada, and higher in the Canadian market than in the Cincinnati, St. Louis, and many other markets in this country.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Will the gentleman permit——

Mr. KITCHIN. So if there is from 11 to 15 cents difference between wheat at Winnipeg and Minneapolis, there is a much greater difference between wheat at Minneapolis and Chicago. Do you want a tariff wall between Chicago and Minneapolis? [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] If the tariff, as you contend, makes the difference between wheat at Minneapolis and Winnipeg, what makes the greater difference between wheat at Minneapolis and Chicago? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. The Chicago market, let me inform the gentleman, is based upon southern winter wheat and not upon Canadian northern No. 1 hard——

Mr. KITCHIN. The South makes practically no wheat for the market.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I will give you some exact data from the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. I have not time to yield for that purpose.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I thought the gentleman wanted information.

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman can put it in his speech. Of course, I understand very readily why the gentleman wants to put it in my speech, because he is ambitious, and he knows that my speech will be read. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] And if he puts it in his speech he fears that nobody will ever read it except himself and his secretary. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from North Carolina yield to the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. CULLOP. I want to suggest to the gentleman that the quotations on yesterday show that May wheat was 88½ cents per bushel in Chicago and 91 cents in Winnipeg, showing Canada wheat about 3 cents a bushel higher than our wheat, and it is so all the time; that is, about 3 cents a bushel higher than ours.

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes. Just as I stated some moments ago, quotations are higher in Winnipeg than in Chicago.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. And 96 cents in Minneapolis, the great wheat market of the world.

Mr. CULLOP. Yes; but Minneapolis does not supply all the wheat in the Union or regulate the wheat trade of the world. That was only a local condition existing there. Now, one other question. One gentleman said the President's proposal as to reciprocity with Canada made the price of wheat go down. I want to ask if it made wheat go down, did it not also make barley go up, which was quoted yesterday at $1.12 a bushel in our markets, the highest price ever known in the production of that grain for years? If it made wheat go down, then it surely made barley go up.

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. SIMS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KITCHIN. I do.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask a question of the gentleman from North Carolina, and that is if it is not a stock Republican protection argument, and of other protectionists,

that whenever you remove a duty from a foreign article that the foreigner immediately raises the price of the foreign article to the American level, and that the American consumer does not get the benefit of it?

Mr. KITCHIN. Why, they make any kind of argument that is inconsistent and fallacious. [Laughter.]

Mr. SIMS. And according to that argument Canadian wheat will immediately go up on the passage of this reciprocal trade agreement——

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. And it did, and ours went down 10 or 11 cents.

Mr. KITCHIN. Now, Mr. Chairman, I am going to approach the Canadian and foreign wheat ghost. Why, they tell us, if we remove the tariff the wheat of Canada and of the world is going to flow in to us. What is going to bring it here? Who needs it here? Would not the wheat farmer of Canada, of Argentina, and of Russia be the biggest fool in the world to try to ship his wheat here when we are already producing more than 120,000,000 bushels more than we need, more than we can sell here, more than the American public consumes, and which we are yearly sending abroad, in grain and flour, to the markets of the world? Why do we want their surplus? Who is going to buy an article when he has got more of it than he needs and is trying to dispose of the surplus? Let us see about this immense wheat flood that is going to inundate the United States and that seems to alarm our friends so much.

Since the Statistical Abstract for 1910 is not yet published, I shall use the four years from 1906 to 1909, both inclusive. Let me remind my frightened friends that the total imports of wheat from all the world for these four years amounted in value to only $656,000, while we exported for the same years, in competition with Canada and all the other wheat-producing nations of the earth, over $256,000,000 worth, and in addition to this over $236,000,000 of flour made of American wheat. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We produced that much more than we needed for home consumption, more than the American public could consume. In other words, we exported in this enormous surplus to the markets of the world in competition with Canadian wheat, with Indian wheat, with Argentine wheat, with Russian wheat, 400 times as much wheat and over 225 times as much flour as we imported from all the world.

And yet as against this stupendous amount—these hundreds of millions of dollars of wheat sold abroad by us in competition with the world at a better price than at home—these antireciprocity gentlemen are trying to scare the farmers to death with this little half million dollars of wheat imported here, perhaps as seed wheat for the farmers. You can fool the Republican farmers out in Wisconsin and Minnesota and other Western States, but I just dare you to come down into North Carolina where the intelligent farmers raise a little wheat and try such a poppy-cock argument on them. [Laughter.]

Mr. JAMES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. I will.

Mr. JAMES. If the argument made by our Republican friends is true, that wheat sells for more here than it does in Canada, and the farmer would be affected by free wheat, why was it that the American farmer shipped $256,000,000 worth of wheat abroad and sold it there when he could have sold it for more here at home?

Mr. KITCHIN. Their argument is not true, and the fact is that every bushel of this enormous amount of wheat brought a better price abroad than they could get at home. That is the reason it was sold there. Now, as to corn. No man outside of the insane asylum and the Republican Party believes or has the cheek to insist that a tariff on corn affects its price. We grow in the United States 80 per cent of the corn of the world. In the four years 1906 to 1909, inclusive, we exported $165,460,335 worth of corn, while we imported of all kinds and for seed purposes only $216,796; that is, we exported more than 700 times as much as we imported. We exported to Canada in the last four years over $20,000,000 worth of corn, while we imported practically none. But still there are Republicans who go back to Iowa, Illinois, Wisconsin, Nebraska, and other corn-growing States and tell the farmers that President Taft and the old Democrats down here are trying to destroy the corn industry of the West by removing the tariff and admitting the Canadian corn to swamp our markets [laughter], when there is not an agricultural township in any State in the West that does not produce more corn annually than does Canada with all her Provinces. I shall not discuss further this bogus corn tariff. In fact, every honest man and some Republicans [laughter] admit that the tariff does not and can not influence in the least the price of corn. Let us take some other products of the farm, such as barley, oats, rye, cattle, and horses. In these four years we exported $21,087,222 worth of barley and imported only $258,755, or nearly 100 times as much as we imported, and last year we imported less than $1,500 worth and exported more than $4,500,000. Of rye, we exported $4,700,781 worth and we imported only $197 worth, or over 20,000 times as much as we imported. Of oats, we exported $19,335,127 worth and imported $2,868,775 worth, or over 6 times as much as we imported. Now, as to horses and cattle. We exported in the four years $124,042,692 worth of horses and imported, exclusive of horses for breeding purposes, only $4,089,831 worth, or more than 30 times as much as we imported. Take cattle. Our exports of cattle for the four years amounted to the large sum of $124,042,692, while our imports, exclusive of cattle for breeding purposes, amounted to only $4,089,831; that is, we exported, in competition with the cattle raisers of the world, more than 30 times as many as we imported. In addition to this we exported over $125,000,000 of beef products. In the four years we exported of hog products—hams, bacon, shoulders, pork, lard, and so forth—the enormous sum of $450,000,000, while we imported practically none.

Mr. Chairman, in the face of such facts, showing that we are producing a surplus of such agricultural products far in excess of American consumption, far more than we can sell in the United States, which surplus must seek foreign markets in competition with the world, which markets, by the law of supply and demand, must fix the price both at home and abroad, it is incredible to me that any intelligent, honest man will continue to insist that the tariff here on such farm products does or can affect the prices.

But, it is asked, if the surplus shipped abroad fixes the price of the farmer's product at home and it is unaffected by the tariff, why does not the surplus of manufactured products, such as those of the meat packers and the United States Steel Corporation, shipped abroad, fix the home price, unaffected by the tariff? The answer is easy. If the farmers could combine and organize in a trust, such as the Meat Trust, the Steel Trust, and other trusts, thereby having the power to control the output, to say when, where, and how much should be put on the market and to fix the price, they could take advantage of the tariff and charge their purchasers in the home market the world-market price plus the tariff. But, being so many in number and so diffused and scattered throughout the country, it is impossible for them to so combine and organize. On the other hand, the meat packers, the steel, and many other manufacturing plants are so few in number and vast in influence they can and do organize into trusts, control the output, fix the price, hold up the American consumer to the world price plus the tariff, and then sell their surplus abroad to the foreigners at the cheaper world-market price.

Mr. Chairman, I am anxious to expose, once and for all, this tariff fraud and deception that have been practiced on the American farmer, especially the farmer of the West, by the Republican Party for the last third of a century. I have attempted to show by the logic and reason of the thing, from the facts and statistics, that the tariff on the farmer's products, wheat, rye, corn, barley, oats, cattle and live stock, and so forth, is absolutely bogus. I shall now undertake to sustain the proposition by authorities so high, respectively, both in Democratic and Republican opinion, that neither Democrat nor Republican can dispute. I wish to say that if any Democrat, in his opposition to reciprocity, takes the position that it is going to hurt the farmer by a removal of the tariff from his products, he will be giving the lie to Democratic campaign speeches, Democratic campaign books, and Democratic Senators and Members of the House for all these years. It has been the Democratic position, sustained by the facts and by common experience, that this tariff on the farmer's product is a fraud and a delusion and put on by the Republicans to catch and fool the farmer into electing a Republican Congress so that it might write tariff laws to enable the monopolists to fasten their relentless grasp on the throats of the 90,000,000 American people. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Let me read to my Democratic friends extracts from speeches and reports of the Democratic leaders of the past.

The late Senator Beck, Kentucky's great Senator and statesman, in a minority report against the tariff bill reported by the Republican Committee on Finance in the Senate in 1888, said:

> Intelligent men everywhere concede that protection can not protect any product of this country which is raised or prepared for market here cheaper than it can be elsewhere, or is produced in such quantities that our own people can not consume it. Cotton, wheat, beef, pork, provisions, tobacco, oils, and dozens of other things illustrate this.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> It is absurd to talk about protecting either cotton or wheat.

I will now read from the report of the Democratic Ways and Means Committee, in 1890, against the McKinley bill:

> For the further purpose of inducing the farmers of the country to believe that they can and will derive some benefit from the protective policy, this bill imposes various rates of duty upon certain important

agricultural products which it is well known could not be imported to any material extent with or without duty. For instance, corn is subjected to a duty of 15 cents a bushel; corn meal, 20 cents a bushel; oats, 15 cents per bushel; rye, 10 cents per bushel; wheat, 25 cents per bushel; wheat flour, 25 per cent ad valorem, etc.

* * * * * * *

We produce a great surplus of all these articles and many others every year, which we are compelled to send abroad and sell in the free markets of the world in competition with similar products from other countries.

It is impossible to protect the farmer against foreign competition in his home market for he has no such competition, and the insertion or retention of these articles in a tariff bill is a device which will deceive no one who gives a moment's thought to the subject.

* * * * * * *

This statement shows how futile it is to attempt to afford protection to the farmers of the country by imposing duties upon the importation of these products, and this large and intelligent class of citizens can not be reconciled in this way to a policy which increases taxes upon their clothing, tableware, carpets, earthenware, glassware, agricultural implements, and other necessary articles.

This report was signed by such men as John G. Carlisle, R. Q. Mills, Benton McMillan, C. R. Breckenridge, and R. P. Flower.

I call attention to the report of Hon. William L. Wilson, in behalf of the Democratic Ways and Means Committee, in 1894:

Of the staple agricultural products, including meats and provisions, we are such large exporters, and must continue to be such large exporters, that any duties upon them are useless for protection and fruitless for revenue, and generally can only be imposed for the purpose of deluding the less intelligent of our farmers into the belief that they are receiving some consideration and benefit under the tariff, although the prices of their products are fixed in the world's market in competition with like products produced by the cheapest labor of the world. For the producers of our great export staples, which, having fully supplied the home market, must overflow and seek large purchases elsewhere, the only effect of a protective tariff is to take from one-fourth to one-half of the products for which they could exchange their surplus should they venture to buy in the market where they are obliged to sell or to compel them to give a like portion of the avails of their labor, when turned into money, by increasing the cost of what they buy in the home market.

Senator Vest, the great Senator from Missouri, who for years was the Democratic leader of the Senate, in a speech made in the Senate on August 27, 1890, said:

Now, we ought to be perfectly candid with each other. These increases are made to catch the farmer vote under the pretense that an increase duty, where there is no competition at all, helps the farmer. I do not know an intelligent man in this country who is not aware that there is no competition whatever between foreign cattle that are brought into this country and those we raise. It is the most transparent humbug that was ever attempted, even in politics.

* * * * * * *

Mr. President, is there any man who does not know that what the farmers of this country need is more market, not more protection? They want more opportunity to sell.

If Senators will turn to the wheat importation, to which we shall come directly, which was manufactured on the same fraudulent basis to impose upon the farmers, it will be found that we exported in 1889 46,000,000 bushels of wheat and imported 1,998.

This whole schedule—the agricultural schedule—made to allure the farmer into the belief that it is for his protection, is manufactured in the same way and for the same purpose.

Senator Beck, Senator Vest, Mr. Carlisle, Mr. Wilson, and all the Democratic leaders denounced it as fraud and humbug. I want now to call the attention of the House, and especially the attention of my State colleagues to the opinion of Senator Zeb Vance, North Carolina's great commoner, whose public life to this day is, and I trust will ever be, the inspiration of its Democracy. In a speech in the Senate he said:

Now, sir, here are three great classes of producers of our country—the agriculturists, the miners, and the manufacturers—and they have made this compact—or, at least, it has been made for them—that the taxes are to be levied upon the articles made by the manufacturer for their "encouragement" and "protection" against competition; and taxes have been levied upon articles that compete with the miners who dig ores of iron and coal and everything of that kind from the soil. To give it the appearance of equality and justice tariffs are also levied upon the wheat, and the corn, and the oats, and the cotton, and so forth, grown by the farmer. That, on paper, looks fair, but it so happens that it is a reality for the manufacturer and miner and it is a delusion and snare for the farmer.

* * * * * * *

The miners and the manufacturers together have grown rich and accumulated enormous wealth by this protective arrangement. But how has it been with the farmer? He has found that there is nothing to compete with him. A duty of 25 cents a bushel is laid upon his wheat, 10 cents on his corn, and so forth, but it turns out, in fact and in truth, that there is no competition with him coming from abroad; there is nothing to protect him against.

I say, therefore, that when this beautiful theory of protection came into practice, while it was a reality, and a substantial reality, for the manufacturer and miner, the agricultural man finds it to be a delusion and a cheat.

The prices of all his products are fixed by the markets abroad; and why? Because he makes more than will supply the home market and the surplus which goes abroad fixes the price of what is sold in the home market.

Vance denounced it as a cheat and delusion, yet we have Democrats that want to go back to North Carolina and tell the people that old "Zeb" Vance when he denounced this tariff as a fraud was lying [applause], and that the Republicans were telling the truth when they said that this tariff was a genuine benefit to the farmer. The people of my State will ask the question: Who is right, "Zeb" Vance or these antireciprocity Democrats? I venture the statement that whenever you see a good Democrat against this reciprocity bill you must scratch a little deeper than corn, rye, barley, oats, live stock, and so forth, to find the real reason for the opposition. [Applause.]

Scratch a little and you will find lumber reduction [laughter and applause]; and a little deeper and you will find wood-pulp reduction, and the biggest wood-pulp plant south of the Potomac is in North Carolina; scratch a little deeper and you will find some mica reduction, and there is some mica made in North Carolina. [Applause and laughter.] Now, when a Republican President and many Republicans here are willing to concede that they have been fooling the farmers for 30 years about the tariff on their products, some of our Democrats come along and say, "Do not admit that, because we want to fool the farmer as you have been doing, and get protection for lumber in our State, for wood pulp and mica in our districts." [Laughter.] Gentlemen, I can stand here and read all day extracts from Democratic reports of the House and Senate, from Democratic campaign books, and from leading Democrats in denunciation of this tariff fraud. It is unjust to the Democratic Party, unjust to its record; it is unjust to great Democrats like Beck, Vest, Carlisle, McMillin, Wilson, Ransom, and Vance for Democrats in this House now to repudiate their teachings and the position of the Democratic Party and adopt the old worn-out, threadbare Republican argument of deception. I am going to quote from one gentleman in North Carolina, living to-day, and who has the confidence of thousands of Democrats in the State, and whose opinion upon this question of the tariff on the farmer's product will be taken as authority by many people in North Carolina. That gentleman, if it is not unparliamentary, is the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS].

Mr. SIMMONS has been a Senator for nearly 12 years. He is and has been for years a leading Democratic figure in North Carolina. He was for years chairman of the Democratic executive committee of that State. He was when he was elected to the Senate, and he remained for years, the chairman of the Democratic State executive committee. In the campaign of 1902 Senator Pritchard, a Republican Senator from North Carolina, was making a canvass for his reelection. Senator SIMMONS, as chairman of the Democratic executive committee, on the 11th day of October, 1902, made a great speech in reply to Senator Pritchard, answering the arguments and showing the fallacy of the Republican position on the tariff. The Democratic executive committee was so impressed with the logic and strength of his argument that it sent out through the State as a campaign document many thousand copies of this speech. I want every friend of Senator SIMMONS here and in North Carolina to read that speech. Permit me to read a part of it, to which I call the especial attention of my State colleagues:

The truth is, the whole Republican argument that tariff regulates the price of farm products is utterly false. Every corn and wheat and cotton farmer knows that the price of these crops is regulated by the laws of supply and demand, that we export of these crops from one-fifth to one-third of all we produce, and that the price of the whole crop is regulated by the price which the surplus brings in the foreign markets. The cotton and corn and wheat farmer knows that the bulk of that part of his crop which he does not sell at home for home consumption is purchased for shipment abroad, and the purchaser does not pay him any more than it will bring when sold abroad.

* * * * * * *

Our chief raw materials are cotton, corn, wheat, and other products of the farm which can not be benefited by protection, because we export them in large quantities.

That was Mr. SIMMONS's carefully prepared, carefully written, and carefully delivered speech, not only as our Senator, but as a leader of North Carolina Democracy; and yet in the face of that there are Democratic gentlemen in this Capitol—and it is unparliamentary to name them here—who enjoy the franking privilege, who in justification of their opposition to this measure are spreading with approval throughout North Carolina the old, fraudulent Republican argument that the tariff on agricultural products is a great benefit to the farmer and its removal will greatly injure him.

Mr. GUDGER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question, and that is whether he refers to me when he speaks about gentlemen sending out Senator SIMMONS's or any other man's speech under a franking privilege?

Mr. KITCHIN. No; I said it may be unparliamentary for me to use the name. Of course, it would not be unparliamentary for me to use the gentleman's name here. [Laughter.]

Mr. GUDGER. Does not the gentleman think it would be fairer to name the party than to leave the suspicion that because I oppose reciprocity I am one of those men?

Mr. KITCHIN. Did the gentleman have the franking privilege when Mr. SIMMONS's speech was sent out?

Mr. GUDGER. I have had the privilege of franking ever since I was elected to Congress.

Mr. KITCHIN. And what was the gentleman's question?

Mr. GUDGER. I asked the gentleman if he does not think it would be fairer to name the men who are sending out Senator SIMMONS's speech rather than to leave the reflection upon all of us from North Carolina who are opposing reciprocity?

Mr. KITCHIN. I presume that the gentleman who made that speech is sending it out. [Laughter.]

Mr. GUDGER. Then why does not the gentleman say so?

Mr. KITCHIN. But it is unparliamentary to say so in this body [laughter], because we are not permitted to criticize or even use the sacred name of a Senator of the United States in such a body as this. [Laughter.]

Gentlemen, that is not all. This same distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, who honors us in the Senate, made a speech on June 25, 1910, only a few months ago, and that speech was such a good one that the campaign committee sent it out in the Democratic campaign book of 1910. In that speech he said:

> The tariff does not help the farmer either to fix or control the volume of his products or their market value. As to his products the tariff is almost entirely inoperative, even when a duty is imposed pretendedly for their protection. Neither can he control nor influence the prices of his products. That is determined by natural law, over which he has no control.

In this speech he contends, and truly so, that the prices of the farmer's products are fixed in the markets of the world in competition with the world, and he denounces the tariff on his products as a "fake." And yet, within a few short months after, on the 3d day of March, 1911, this same distinguished gentleman made a speech in the Senate, which has been widely circulated in my State, in opposition to the Canadian reciprocity, putting such opposition on the grounds that the removal of the tariff on agricultural products, even as to Canada, would be "oppression to the farmer"; that it would "press down the price of farm products."

I shall refrain from any comments on such a sudden and complete change of position, and shall refuse to scratch for the reason. I might make the observation, however, that there is in the reciprocity bill a removal of the tariff on rough lumber, on wood pulp, and many other tariff reductions.

Gentlemen, I have read you Democratic authority; now I am going to produce Republican authority to the effect that the farmer's tariff is a fake and a fraud. The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], in a most elaborate speech in the Senate on January 28, 1910, contended that the tariff on agricultural products, of which we made a surplus and exported, had no influence on the prices of such products. I will read a short extract from it:

> There are articles upon which a tariff duty is imposed which this country exports and would not import under any system of duties, because we have a surplus for sale. Under this head comes practically all the food products, both vegetable and animal, and a removal of the duties on food products would obviously have little or no effect on the prices, because we export such articles and can sell them in the world's market at a profit.

He, however, overlooked the fact, established by the hard experience of the American consumer, that when the farmer's raw products gets into the hands of the trusts and becomes their finished product, then the trusts, such as the Meat Trust, charge our own people the world's price with the high tariff added, while they sell their surplus abroad at the lower price of the world's market.

Senator LODGE may not be good authority in the opinion of some of the Republicans here. I understand why you insurgent Republicans will not believe anything that a standpat Senator like Mr. LODGE says, but I have insurgent authority. Where is that renowned New England insurgent, an insurgent always, the Hon. AUGUSTUS PEABODY GARDNER? Where is he? [Laughter.]

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I am here. [Laughter.]

Mr. KITCHIN. As I said, I do not blame you insurgents for not believing anything that a standpat Republican says. I do not believe much they say myself. But you must believe what your colleague and insurgent friend says. Now, gentlemen, the older Members will recollect that beautiful chart that was exhibited here before us on the 24th of February of last year by my friend, the honorable insurgent from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER], and his eloquent speech, in which he attempted to prove and to be used as a Republican campaign document, and, I believe, was used in the campaign book, that the prices of foodstuffs, of the farmer's products—wheat, corn, meat, and so forth—were lower here than in any other nation under the sun. It was a confession on his part, by chart and speech, that the Republicans had been hoodwinking the farmers all these years.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Do I understand you to include wheat?

Mr. KITCHIN. You included flour. What do you make flour out of? I will include wheat. Reread your speech and you will find wheat included and discussed.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. It was not there. Naval vessels do not buy wheat for their crews. That chart showed the actual prices paid by the naval training ship *Ranger* for its crew.

Mr. KITCHIN. Did you not then prove or try to prove, and did you not assert, that the prices of farm products were lower here than anywhere else in the world?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I do not remember such statements. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] And I defy the gentleman to find a single word in my speech which will uphold that contention.

Mr. KITCHIN. Of course, I do not want to waste my time reading a Republican speech. [Laughter.] I know what you said here. I do not know how that speech reads in the RECORD. I will say now to the new Members who have just entered Congress that a speech made on this floor is sometimes entirely different from the speech put into the RECORD. We have a sort of courtesy here—letting a fellow revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.

But I will say to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER], I do know what took place in this Chamber, because I replied to his speech the next day and showed how ridiculous it was for him and the Republican Party to go up and down this country, in the agricultural sections, as they had been doing for 30 years, preaching to the farmer that the price of his products was raised and kept high by the Republican tariff, and then at that late day admit that they had been deceiving the farmer all the time—that the tariff had nothing to do with the prices of his products; that they were lower here than in any other country.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. KITCHIN. I yield; certainly.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I find that the chart which I exhibited last year——

Mr. KITCHIN. Oh, what the gentleman said was a great deal more significant and interesting than what he showed on the chart.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I trust the gentleman will allow me to make a full statement, inasmuch as he has made an imputation. I did not mention either flour or wheat when I told the relative prices paid in the nine foreign ports and in the port of Boston by the Massachusetts training ship *Ranger*. I did, however, read the following statement, and this is the only thing that would justify the gentleman in his assertion:

> The immigrant finds on coming to America that if he can buy in quantity (and in cases when he need not) his flour, fuel, potatoes, etc., all cost less than in the land he left.

[Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. KITCHIN. All of which, Mr. Chairman, sustains my argument. But the gentleman did in his speech, if not in his chart, discuss wheat and attempted to show that it was as high or higher elsewhere than here.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman allow me——

Mr. KITCHIN. I will get Mr. UNDERWOOD to give the gentleman all the time he desires.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. No, sir; that is not fair. Those are the words of Samuel Gompers that I was reading to you. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. KITCHIN. Well, I want to say this, as I said then, if you indorse what Samuel Gompers says, it is the first time you or any other Republican ever indorsed anything that a labor leader said. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Do you want to contradict him? Are you contradicting him as usual? North Carolina, unlike Massachusetts, is not a labor State.

Mr. KITCHIN. I am going to give you all the time to explode in after I get through. [Laughter.]

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Do not attack me by saying that I print in the RECORD words which I do not utter on the floor of the House, unless I have the express permission of the House to do so, and do not say that I suppress anything which I utter.

Mr. KITCHIN. I say, and every Republican and every Democrat in the House at that time knows it, that the whole burden

of the gentleman's argument here before the House was that the prices of food products in this country were lower than they were in any other country in the world, and every man knows that was the gentleman's argument, and I do not care what he put in the RECORD.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I absolutely admit that that statement of the gentleman is correct, and that food prices are lower here; but what I object to is the statement of the gentleman that I suppressed words which I had uttered on the floor of this House. I have never done so since I have been in Congress.

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman might omit them by mistake; but the gentleman admits now that I am right, that the farmer's products must go out into the world and meet the competition of the world, and that the prices of farm products are as low or lower here than anywhere else on the face of the earth. I have been trying to prove here for the last hour what the gentleman now admits. This being true, the tariff does not affect the price of the wheat, barley, corn, rye, cattle, and other live stock of the American farmer, and a removal of the tariff from them can not, therefore, diminish the price and injure the farmer.

I shall now proceed to unmask with its own hand the Republican Party, and out of its own mouth expose in its nakedness its false pretense and deception, to which the American farmer has been a patient victim for the last third of a century.

On February 9, 1910, the Senate, under resolution, appointed a select committee to investigate the prices of commodities and the cause of any increase in same. The Republican members were Senators LODGE, of Massachusetts; GALLINGER, of New Hampshire; MCCUMBER, of North Dakota; SMOOT, of Utah; and CRAWFORD, of South Dakota. The Democratic members were Senators CLARKE, of Arkansas; JOHNSTON, of Alabama; and SMITH, of South Carolina. After months of investigation report was made to the Senate, the Republican members filing the majority and the Democratic members a minority report. I hold in my hands both reports. I call the attention of the House—and I wish every farmer in the country could hear it—that this unanimous report of the Republican Senators, after a full and thorough investigation, expressly declares that the tariff on wheat, corn, rye, barley, oats, cattle, and live stock, and the agricultural products has nothing to do with their prices. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It further declares that the prices of these products of the farm are fixed in the markets of the world, and it contends and produces figures to show that these products are higher in London and Liverpool and the world's markets than they are here in high-protection United States. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

But let me read from this remarkable report:

The tariff seems to have been no material factor in causing the advance in prices during the last decade. The greatest advances have been made in commodities upon which the tariff has little or no effect, and the absolute removal of the tariff on many of these commodities could not afford any relief at the present time, for the reason that the prices of these commodities, with a few exceptions, were as high or higher in other countries than in the United States.

It then mentions, as the articles which the tariff does not and can not affect, "the principal farm grains—barley, corn, oats, rye, and wheat—cattle, and live stock."

I have not time to quote more, but it devotes page after page in proof that the tariff does not and can not have any influence one way or the other on their prices; that the prices for them, both at home and abroad, are fixed in the markets of the world; that these prices are as high, and in many markets higher, than in the United States. In other words, it confesses that this tariff is a fraud and false pretense practiced on the farmer. As I said, the Democratic Senators on that committee filed a minority report. While there was much difference of opinion as to the effect of the tariff on other subjects, both reports, majority and minority, agreed on the fact that the tariff on these products of the farm had absolutely nothing to do with their prices; that such a tariff was purely bogus. I commend this report by Republican Senators to the reading of every Republican.

Mr. Chairman, this is not all. I shall now produce an authority which should forever estop the Republican Party from again palming off on the people, and especially the farmer, its old, false, and fraudulent argument that the tariff on the farmer's product affects and increases its price. I have here the campaign book for 1910 of the Republican Party, entitled "Republican Textbook." I am going to quote from it in order to nail forever the bald admission by the Republican Party of its willful and persistent deception of the American farmer. Turn to page 144, and we read:

The present advance in prices is, as has been stated, primarily an advance in farm products and food of domestic production. * * * The tariff seems to have been no material factor in causing advance in prices during the past decade. * * * The advance in prices during the last 10 years appears to have no relation with tariff legislation.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

But more. From pages 146 and 147, we read:

That the tariff is not the cause of the present advance is conclusively shown by the fact that the greatest advance has been made in commodities which are usually produced in such quantities to furnish a large surplus to other countries.

Of such products it mentions "barley, corn, oats, rye, wheat," and live stock, "consisting of cattle, hogs, sheep," and so forth. It continues:

But the fact that exports of products of the farm continue in such large quantities indicates that the price movement is due, not to the tariff, but to a world-wide movement upward in the prices of these commodities.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

But to emphasize its past deception and its present confession, it concludes:

The course of prices indicates plainly that the world is demanding our food supplies and that the prices have advanced here, not by reason of the tariff, but with the general upward movement.

[Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

My friends, the Democratic Party has for 25 years, in this Capitol, on the stump, through the press, denounced this farmers' product tariff as a fraud and a sham, put on and kept on by the Republicans for the purpose of fooling the farmers into voting the Republican ticket; and now when the Republican Party, through its President, through its senatorial report, and through its textbook, is ready to confess its guilt and admit that we have been right all the time, to my surprise and regret, we have a few Democrats here and at the other end of the Capitol who object to the Republicans making such admission and are trying to prevent them from doing it. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] And yet, in the face of that senatorial report, in the face of that Republican textbook, there are Republicans, insurgents and standpatters, who will have the audacity to stand here before us and on the stump before the people, and still insist that the farmer's prosperity depends upon a tariff on his wheat, corn, rye, barley, cattle, live stock, and other products. Stand where you may, that report, that textbook, will stare you in the face and condemn you of false pretense and deception. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It is not honest, it is not right, for Republicans here or elsewhere to persist in the attempt to further humbug the American farmer.

Mr. Chairman, there is no reason why any American farmer should become alarmed over the enactment of this Canadian reciprocity agreement. To him it will prove a benefit. I call attention to one sweeping fact that ought to convince every intelligent man that the American farmer has nothing to lose but all to gain by this reciprocity. Canada buys from us annually five times more of agricultural products than we buy from her. In the last five years we have yearly, on the average, exported to Canada more than $20,000,000 worth of farm products, while she has exported to us less than, on the average, $4,000,000. In other words, Canada needs our farm products five times as much as we need hers. For the five years 1906 to 1910, inclusive, we exported to Canada $4,442,307 worth of wheat, while she exported to us only $776,239 worth; she bought from us over five times as much as we bought from her. Of corn, we exported in the five years to Canada $21,704,317 worth and imported less than $10,000; that is, she purchased of us more than 2,000 times more than she sold us. I have been unable to get the figures as to the barley trade between the two countries for the last five years. I have it only for 1910. For that year we sold to Canada $99,810 worth of barley and purchased only $1,221. Of cattle, we sold to her $1,578,179 worth and purchased $958,138; that is, we sold her over $600,000 more of cattle than she sold us. Of horses, we sold Canada $14,172,075 worth, while we purchased only $2,648,301, a balance in our favor of over $11,000,000. For apples, berries, and other fruits, vegetables, tobacco, cotton, peanuts, and other agricultural products Canada is our customer, notwithstanding the fact that she levies a tariff duty upon their importation. Reciprocity removes the tariff against our agricultural products and gives them free entrance into Canada. Why is Canada in favor of reciprocity with us? It is not to open a market for her surplus wheat or any of her surplus farm products. She has the same market for her surplus wheat and other surplus farm products as we have for ours; the same means as we have to get her products to the markets of the world. She ships her surplus to Liverpool and London. We ship our surplus to Liverpool and London, and both the exporters of the United States and of Canada get the same price in the same markets for the same products.

But Canada wants our market here for her other products, and these products the American public wishes to buy. She produces lumber, shingles, laths. The American farmer does not. She produces wood pulp and paper. The American farmer does not. She produces coal, copper, asbestos, nickel ore. The American farmer does not. Canada's great exports to us consist of lumber, shingles, laths, lumber and timber products, wood pulp, paper, copper, nickel ore, and other mineral products, fish, and chemicals, none of which our farmer produces, and many of which he must have. What Canada wants is a removal or lowering of our tariff walls against these products which her people wish to sell us, and the removal and lowering of her tariff walls against our products which her people wish to buy and which we wish to sell. She wants reciprocity and we want reciprocity, so that she can sell us these products, and with her increased sales from them buy from us more of our horses, cattle, grain, vegetables, fruits, cotton, tobacco, peanuts, and other agricultural and manufactured products, which she needs.

This measure gives the farmer of Iowa, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Kansas, the Dakotas, Nebraska, and other Western and border States cheaper lumber, cheaper shingles. It gives him cheaper wire for fencing. It gives him cheaper salt, cheaper wagons, and many other articles he must have. It is inconceivable to me how any Member on this floor, especially from the West, who claims to be the friend of the farmer, can fail to vote for this measure that provides some relief at least from the trusts who are yearly plundering the farmers. But in order to stand by the Lumber Trust and lumber kings, the Paper Trust, the Steel Trust, the Salt Trust, and all the trusts and special interests, on whose products the tariff is either removed or lowered by this bill, the Republicans, insurgents and standpatters alike, under the leadership of Mr. CANNON and Mr. DALZELL, are fighting this measure under the flimsy pretext and excuse that reciprocity will hurt the farmer. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Certainly.

Mr. LENROOT. There are many on this side who are willing to vote to amend this treaty by placing every trust-made article upon the free list. Are you?

Mr. KITCHIN. I am in favor of placing these trust-made articles on the free list, and I am going to vote for it, and if you are honest and sincere about it we Democrats are going to give you, within the next few days, an opportunity to vote for such a bill, without amending and thereby jeopardizing this or any other good measure. [Prolonged applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I wish to call the attention of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] to the fact that, although we are unable to change a pact made by the two Governments, the Democratic Party have reported this bill to the House with a third section added, which invites the President of the United States to put every article on the free list between this country and Canada. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. KITCHIN. Ah, our Republican friends are anxious about the free list, and those most anxious to get it now are those who heretofore have been most vigorously opposed to a free list. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I observe, too, that those who now seem most earnest for a free list for the farmer are the strongest opponents of this bill, and are trying the hardest to put something onto it which they hope will defeat both reciprocity and the free list, in the House or in the Senate. Let us see about the free list. I hold here the free-list bill which we have introduced. What do you want on the free list for the farmer? Do you want farm implements? All right, here they are, every kind and description. Do you want salt? Here it is. Do you want lumber, rough and dressed, shingles, laths, posts? Here they are. Do you want boots and shoes? Here they are. Do you want wagons and carts? Here they are. Do you want cotton bagging and ties and grain sacks? Here they are. What do you want on the free list that we are not going to give you an opportunity to vote for?

My friends, we will hear much during this debate about amending this reciprocity bill by placing on the free list something for the farmer and the laboring man, and many amendments will be offered by those opposed to the bill, not with a desire to better it, but to defeat it. The opponents will play the same game at this session that they did at the last when the reciprocity bill was pending. My good friend from Pennsylvania, Mr. DALZELL, the leader of the opposition forces then, as well as now, made a motion to recommit the bill, with instructions to add a long string of articles to the free list, including meat products, flour and other food products, farming implements, and so forth. I said to the House then that the Republicans were not sincere in demanding that meat products and other food products should be placed on the free list, because there had been bills introduced by Republicans pending before the Republican Ways and Means Committee for six months, putting flour, meat, and other food products on the free list, and that neither Mr. DALZELL nor any other Republican on that committee had voted to bring out any such bill. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I remind Republicans, and especially the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. DALZELL, that we have put in our free-list bill every single article that was contained in his motion to recommit. [Applause.] And I say to the gentleman that we are going to expose him when he votes against that free-list bill as the most consummate——

Several MEMBERS. State it.

Mr. KITCHIN. Lover of the farmer in the United States. [Laughter.]

The gentleman from Pennsylvania is going to love the farmer so good that he is going to vote against everything that we have on the free list for the farmer. [Laughter.]

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from North Carolina yield to the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. KITCHIN. Why, yes.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. If you have a bill containing the same items that are contained in the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to recommit, why did you vote against that motion?

Mr. KITCHIN. Because the motion was not made in sincerity. The gentleman from Pennsylvania knew and the gentleman from Minnesota knew that it was made to defeat reciprocity; knew it never could become a law with that in it. Both knew that reciprocity and the gentleman's free-list items would be defeated. Now, if you are in favor of removing the tariff on those articles, we are going to give an opportunity to test your sincerity. [Applause.]

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Let me finish this question. You say that it was put on there insincerely for the purpose of defeating the treaty?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] was candid enough in his speech to say that it was done for that very purpose. I do not know whether a Republican will tell the truth about such matters; the gentleman knows better than I do. [Laughter.]

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Did the gentleman ever know of a tentative reciprocity treaty being changed by an amendment put on it?

Mr. KITCHIN. Oh, there is no use discussing anything of that sort.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I will assert from my knowledge that there never was one defeated. I wanted to say that I voted for the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania sincerely, and I shall vote for it again. [Applause.]

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman voted for it because he wanted to kill it.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. No, sir. I voted for it absolutely and sincerely.

Mr. KITCHIN. I am glad the gentleman is the only man that was fooled by the motion. [Laughter.]

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I voted for it in the interest of the consumers.

Mr. JAMES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Certainly.

Mr. JAMES. I want to show to the House how badly fooled the gentleman from Minnesota has been and has continued to be by the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] to amend the reciprocity treaty. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] had in that motion to amend placing articles on the free list, and among these items was fresh meats, which Canada had refused to accede to the United States and reciprocally place upon the free list, and the adoption of the Dalzell amendment would have absolutely killed the reciprocity bill, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania will not deny it.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. How does the gentleman know that?

Mr. JAMES. I have it from the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee [Mr. UNDERWOOD], who told me that the President of the United States told him so.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. It was rumor to that effect?

Mr. JAMES. No, sir; it is the word of the President of the United States.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I should question whether the President of the United States ever said it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from North Carolina yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Certainly.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will state that I asked the President of the United States himself why it was not put on the free list, when cattle were put on the free list, and the President stated to me that he wanted to put meat on the free list, but the Canadian commissioners refused to do so. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I understood the President said this, and the public interviews showed that he was in favor of making absolute free trade between Canada and the United States, and they objected to that, but that he did not specifically deny or state that they objected to meat alone.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am not talking about an interview; I am stating what the President of the United States said to me, and I will assure the gentleman that if he will go to the White House this afternoon the President will so state to him.

Mr. HILL. It is entirely fair to supplement the statement of the gentleman from Alabama that in making the reciprocity treaty Canada yielded on fresh meats seven times as much as the United States did in order to get together.

Mr. JAMES. Will the gentleman from North Carolina yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Certainly.

Mr. JAMES. I want to ask if the gentleman from Minnesota will persist in the statement that he will again vote for the motion made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL]?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. For the purpose of putting those items on the free list I will vote every time to put them on the free list, no matter in what form they appear.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I would regret to see any Democrat, in the face of Democratic policies, in the face of Democratic pledges to honestly revise the tariff downward, in the very teeth of a specific demand of the Democratic platform that the tariff on lumber, on wood pulp, on print paper should be removed, enroll himself among the opponents of this measure. It is in line with reciprocity policies, as I have shown you, which have been pursued and indorsed and advocated by Democrats for 50 years. It goes further. It incorporates in it, in part, the express declaration of the Democratic platform in favor of free print paper and free wood pulp and free lumber. I can not see how any Democrat can vote against it unless that Democrat wants to vote either for the Lumber Trust, the Salt Trust, the Farming Implement Trust, or the Wood Pulp and Print Paper Trust, or the Steel Trust, or the mica producer, on whose products the tariff is either removed or reduced in the interest of the American consumer.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I want to ask the gentleman if he is talking to that side of the House on the reciprocity measure or the measure that he is talking of introducing?

Mr. KITCHIN. Oh, if the gentleman has not intelligence enough to know what an intelligent gentleman is talking about, I can not take up time explaining to the gentleman. [Laughter.] I will have to refuse to yield further to the gentleman. I am going to quit you and let you take a second thought. [Laughter.]

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Well, I want to ask another question.

Mr. KITCHIN. Well, then, quick.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. In talking about that you ask them about free lumber. I want to say this does not put lumber on the free list.

Mr. KITCHIN. It puts rough lumber on the free list, and thus makes a reduction on every kind of lumber, whether rough or planed, of from $1 to $1.25 a thousand feet. Does not that help your farmers out in North Dakota?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am from Washington.

Mr. KITCHIN. Oh, you are from Washington! Oh, I see why the gentleman is against it. Washington! [Laughter.] The home of timber kings and lumber trusts! There are four men in the State of Washington who, with their companies, own more standing timber than there is pine timber in the whole 13 Southern States! Lumber trusts, lumber kings, from Washington; certainly; certainly! [Prolonged applause and laughter.]

Why, no wonder that a shrewd, smart Republican can fool a busy farmer when that gentleman over there came very nearly fooling me. [Laughter.] Why, he looked so sincere and so candid and so meek when he was talking about the tariff on the farmer's wheat that I really thought he was even fooled into the belief that a tariff helped the farmer, and now I see back behind him old man Weyerhaeuser, who and whose companies own more lumber than all of the standing timber in all of the Southern States. [Applause and laughter.]

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota rose.

Mr. KITCHIN. Now, please sit down. [Laughter.] Let me get through.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Does the gentleman refuse to yield for a question?

Mr. KITCHIN. Let me get through this——

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. It is on North Carolina lumber.

Mr. KITCHIN. Oh, all right. Go ahead.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Did the gentleman have an opportunity to vote for free lumber during the enactment of the Payne-Aldrich bill?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; and I voted for it.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. So did I.

Mr. KITCHIN. Two good patriots! [Laughter.]

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. How about the balance of the North Carolina delegation?

Mr. KITCHIN. Well, boys, I am almost ashamed to say. [Prolonged laughter.]

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. How about the 38 Members more on the Democratic side? How did they vote on free lumber?

Mr. KITCHIN. They voted mighty, mighty bad. [Laughter.] All right; now the gentleman is asking me a question, and let me ask some.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. And did they not defeat free lumber?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; with the aid of an almost solid vote on that side. I never have said that all Democrats were at all times and under all circumstances good patriots. [Laughter.] I have often said there are a few Democrats as bad sometimes as most Republicans are all the time. [Laughter.] Now, you ask me why a little minority of 38 Democrats (there were only 32, as I recall) voted against free lumber. Let me ask you, why did over 75 per cent of you Republicans over there vote against free lumber? More than 75 per cent of the Democrats voted squarely with the platform for the removal of the duty on lumber, and 75 per cent, yes, 85 per cent, of you Republicans voted with the Lumber Trust, the timber kings, to keep it on [applause on the Democratic side]; and yet you ask me how a little minority on our side voted.

Mr. Chairman, the proof that the tariff on agricultural products, which is removed by this bill, is a sham, is so clear and overwhelming that it will sweep the intelligent mind to conviction in spite of itself. We underrate the good sense and intelligence of the American farmer if we delude ourselves into the belief that we can vote against this bill in the interest of the timber kings, the Paper Trust, Steel Trust, and other trusts, and then plead to him the excuse that we did so because it removed, as to Canada, the tariff on his products. He knows that such a tariff is a fake. He knows that it does not and can not affect the price of his products. He knows that each year his products go out into the markets of the world in competition with the world, and the price at home and abroad is fixed by the world's market. He knows that what he needs is not the retention of a fake tariff on what he sells, but a removal or reduction of the real tariff on what he buys. He knows, or will find out, that this bill, among other things, puts salt, rough lumber, barbed wire and other wire for fencing on the free list; that it reduces the tariff on cutlery from over 70 per cent to 27½ per cent; on scissors and shears and knives and forks from over 50 per cent to 27½ per cent; on clocks and watches from over 40 per cent to 27½ per cent. He knows, or will find out, that it reduces the tariff on farm wagons from 35 per cent to 22 per cent; on feed cutters, crushers, field rollers and manure spreaders from 45 per cent to 20 per cent; that it reduces the tariff on shingles, laths, and many other articles which he must buy.

He knows, or will find out, that because of this removal or reduction of the tariff on these articles the Lumber Trust and timber syndicates of the West, the Salt Trust, the Steel Trust, the Farming Implement Trust, the Watch Trust, and all the other trusts whose articles are reduced are "raising heaven and earth" to defeat this bill. He knows that those on this floor who have heretofore been supposed to be the most friendly to the trusts and the special interests are the most vigorous opponents of this measure. When you vote against this bill and go back to your district, the farmer, whom you hope to delude, will be the first to ask, Why did you vote in the interest of the Salt Trust against removal of the tax on salt? He will ask you, Why did you vote in the interest of the Lumber Trust and timber syndicates against putting rough lumber on the free list and against reducing the tax on shingles and laths? What are you going to tell him? He is going to ask you, Why did you vote with the Steel Trust and other Representatives on this floor against putting barbed wire and other wire for fencing on the free list and against a reduction of the tax on cutlery, scissors and shears, and knives and forks? What answer will you, what answer can you, give? He will

want to know why you voted with the Watch Trust against the reduction of the tariff tax on watches and clocks. He is certainly going to ask you why you voted in the interest of the Farming Implement Trust against a reduction of the tax on wagons, feed cutters, grain crushers, field rollers, and manure spreaders? What will be your answer? Are you going to have the cheek to put up the old, stale, fake plea of a "tariff on the farmer's products"? Are you going to discredit his intelligence by trying to fool him again about a tariff on wheat, corn, rye, cattle, and so forth? Why, gentlemen, he will laugh in your face. The trusts and special interests must furnish you a better plea.

There is another gentleman in your district who is interested in this bill and who is going to ask you some questions. The laboring man knows that this bill puts fish on the free list; that it reduces the tax on flour from—at the present prices—$1.15 per barrel to 50 cents per barrel; that it reduces the tax on bacon and hams from 4 cents to 1¼ cents per pound, on shoulders, sides, salted pork, and beef and dried and smoked meats from 25 per cent to 1¼ cents per pound; that it removes the tax on butter and cheese. He knows, or will find out, that the big flour mills, the Meat Trust, and the Elgin Butter Trust are bitterly fighting this bill. He is going to ask you why you voted in the interest of the big flour mills against a reduction of the tax on flour. Why did you vote against giving the laboring man and his family untaxed fish, untaxed butter, and cheese? He is certainly going to make you tell him why, in opposing the reduction of the outrageous tax on meat and beef in these hungry days of the high cost of living, you saw fit to vote in favor of the Meat Trust, the huge Armour-Swift-Morris combine, and against the laboring man and his wife and children. What are you going to say to him? You can not put up to him the bogus excuse of the "farmers' tariff." The Meat Trust will have to hunt for you a better plea to satisfy him.

Still another gentleman in your district will have some questions to put to you. The editor of the country weekly paper, as well as the city daily, knows that this bill puts on the free list print paper; that it loosens the grip which the International Paper Co., known as the Paper Trust, has on the throats of the tens of thousands of newspaper owners throughout the country. He is going to ask you why you voted in the interest of the Paper Trust against removing the tax on print paper. And if you are a Democrat, he is going to read to you the Democratic platform, which demanded the "immediate repeal of the tariff on print paper."

My friends, the humor of some of the opponents of this bill, both on this side of the Chamber as well as on that, is most delightful. They say that they oppose it because it is in the interest of the trusts and the protected manufacturers. It seems never to have occurred to them that if this bill is in the interest of the trusts and manufacturers that the ex-Speaker [Mr. CANNON], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY], instead of leading the opposition, would be the strongest advocates of this measure in this body. And they say that Canada does not ship to us any wire fencing or cutlery or wagons or meat products or other manufactured articles. But why? Because our tariff wall is too high. This bill proposes to lower it. The manufacturers and trusts are fighting it. The Armour-Swift-Morris combine know that with the Canadian tariff on our hogs, cattle, and other live stock removed, and our tariff on beef and meat products removed or reduced, that English and Canadian capital will establish in Canada larger meat-packing plants, and these will compete in the American market with the Meat Trust in purchasing the farmer's cattle, hogs, and other live stock, and will compete also with the trust in selling to the American consumer meat products, and thus the live-stock grower will have another competing buyer and the American consumer will have another competing seller of meat products. So it will be with wire fencing, cutlery, farm wagons, and other articles whose tariff is reduced by this bill. The trusts in the United States fear, with a reduced tariff on their products, the establishment by Canadian and English capital and, perhaps American capital, of competing plants across the line in Canada.

Mr. Chairman, we know that the positive, organized opposition against reciprocity is not the American farmer, but the American protected monopolist. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Every Democrat and every Republican on this floor knows that the two great organizing forces behind the opposition are the International Paper Co., known as the Paper Trust, that controls 80 per cent of all the paper used throughout the length and breadth of this country from the big metropolitan daily to the smallest country weekly, and the Lumber Trust and timber kings of the West, who own and control over 80 per cent of the standing timber of the United States. They have organized the protected forces against it, and, pretending great anxiety for the agricultural interests, have had the shrewdness to play upon the fears and to alarm some of the farmers against it.

My friend from Washington [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] came near fooling this whole House in the belief that he was anxious about the farmer, and then we happened to find out about those old lumber kings out there in Washington.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from North Carolina yield to the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. KITCHIN. Certainly.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I would like to ask you what I said or what led you to believe that I was speaking in favor of the lumbermen?

Mr. KITCHIN. Oh, the lumbermen, who have a real keen and shrewd advocate on this floor, will not let him talk lumber. He must talk wheat and vote lumber. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Do you decline to answer my question?

Mr. KITCHIN. You would be the most foolish representative of the Lumber Trust in the world if you would stand here on the floor and say, "I represent the Lumber Trust in the West." Oh, no. In order for the trust to get some votes against reciprocity, you have got to be for the farmer. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I will promise you this, that I will vote for free lumber if you will vote for free sugar on any bill that you put in.

Mr. KITCHIN. I will vote for both when the time comes, and you will vote for neither. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, let me remind opponents of this bill, who have deceived themselves into the belief that a sufficient excuse to their rural constituents is the assertion that it is in the interest of the American protected manufacturers, that the American Protective Tariff League, the lobbying organization of the manufacturers and trusts, does not take the same view. There are no smarter fellows than the members of this league. They know what they want. They know whether this bill will help or hurt the protected interests. They are waging a most active and vigorous campaign against it.

Let me read from an Indiana paper, the Daily Sun:

> We have received a package of postal cards from the American Protective Tariff League, accompanied by the request that they be handed to voters who will fill out the blanks and mail them to Members of Congress. On the back of the card is a request that we "cooperate and help defeat the Canadian reciprocity bill."

I have here one of the postal cards referred to in this paper, sent out by the league to a voter and by the voter to his Representative. The league is playing the same old game of fooling the farmer. It recognizes the fact, as Republicans here do, that unless the American farmers can be kept deluded as to protection on his products the manufacturers and trusts can not hope to get his vote for protection to them.

Let me read two of the several "whereases" on the address side of the card:

> Whereas, in our judgment, the Canadian reciprocity agreement is a gross violation of the policy of protection, in that it unfairly sacrifices the interests of American agriculture.

How anxious and how alarmed are these organized plunderers of the farmer over the "sacrificing of the interests of American agriculture" by this bill!

But the next "whereas" exposes the grounds for such anxiety and alarm:

> Whereas the manufacturer can not hope to retain protection for his industry when protection shall have been denied to the farmer.

We must fool the farmer; we must make him believe that this scheme of tariff robbery embraces his interest as well as ours. He must save for us the right to plunder, by this scheme, the American farmer and the American people.

Now let me read the "resolve" of the league:

> *Resolved*, That the American Protective Tariff League is unalterably opposed to the adoption of the Canadian tariff agreement, and urges that all friends of protection bring to bear every proper influence upon the Congress of the United States against the adoption of said agreement.

In the face of that resolution of the American Protective Tariff League, what Democrat or Republican will have the audacity, here or at home, to offer as an excuse for voting against this bill that it was in the interest of the trusts and manufacturers? Gentlemen, if I had made no investigation of the subject, after seeing that resolution and knowing the bitter opposition of the American Protective Tariff League to the bill, I would have felt it, not only my duty as a Democrat, but my duty as an honest, patriotic citizen, to vote for this reciprocity

bill and against the demands of the American Protective Tariff League. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer apologies for consuming so much time. If, however, my good Republican friends had not interrupted me so often, I would have finished long ago. Before concluding, I wish to express regret that it became necessary in this debate—a necessity anticipated because of the character of the discussion at the last session and the minority report of the Republicans—in advocating reciprocity with Canada by which freer intercourse between the two peoples should be established, to descend to the low level of bushels, and pounds, and yards and feet, and dollars and cents.

But in the minority report and in the speeches last session of the opposition they gave notice of the ground upon which they would give battle, and that impelled me to meet and refute their sordid arguments. I wish in this debate we could raise the question to a broader and higher and more patriotic plane. There is no more reason why a tariff wall should be maintained between this country and Canada, stretching 3,000 miles, than there should be between the State of Pennsylvania and the State of New York. The people of Canada are our people. We are of the same blood. We have the same ancestry. Hundreds of thousands of American citizens have crossed the line and made homes there. They have our institutions. They have our aspirations; they have our inspirations. They have the same thrift and industry. We allow them to cross any part of the 3,000 miles of the imaginary dividing line with their wives and children and friends; foreigner or native, they come or go anywhere in America; but just as soon as one of them takes a chicken, a horse, a bushel of wheat, any property the product of the mine, the farm, or the factory, the law steps in and penalizes him—taxes his people and our people. This is a cruel injustice and wrong to both people, which this bill partly remedies. When we bind together that country with this, not with the cords of entangling treaties and alliances, but with the stronger ties of mutual intercourse and commerce, we form a bond of such strength that human power can not break it asunder. I want the comradeship and love and peace of Canada for our people. They want and need ours. When we have joined these two together in bonds of commercial interest and intercourse—and I hope this will lead to absolute free trade between the two countries—then in the future, when our peace, our happiness, our safety, our commerce are threatened, as in the days of the Revolution there came up from South Carolina the cry, "The cause of Boston is the cause of all," so there will come up from every Canadian throat, from Columbia to Quebec, "The cause of the United States is the cause of all." She will realize that what affects our peace will affect her peace; what will affect our commerce will affect her commerce; what will affect our safety will affect her safety. Every instinct of self-preservation, every sentiment of peace, of prosperity, and of happiness will impel her sympathies and her good offices to our side.

Mr. Chairman, as I said in the beginning, this is only a step in the right direction, but still a step. I trust that when the vote is taken every Democrat on this side, for the good of his party and his country, will fall into ranks, and that we will take that step all together in one solid phalanx. [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] consume some of his time?

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, how much time has been consumed by that side?

The CHAIRMAN. Three hours, exactly.

Mr. DALZELL. I yield one hour to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HINDS]. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maine is recognized for one hour.

Mr. HINDS. Mr. Chairman, before I begin the few remarks I shall have to make, I ask permission that I may revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD. A portion of what I have to present will be somewhat technical in argument, containing some statistics, with which I would not weary the House. Therefore I ask that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD at their conclusion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maine asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. JAMES. I shall not object to that, Mr. Chairman. I think that permission ought to be granted to all Members of the House; but some gentleman here this morning interposed an objection. I am not going to object to the right being extended to the gentleman from Maine, but I think it ought to be extended to every one who wants it, on both sides of the Chamber.

Mr. HINDS. I will cooperate with the gentleman to secure that privilege.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. HINDS. Mr. Chairman, I can not remove from my mind the firm conviction that the policy proposed in this bill is of an importance out of all proportion to the scantiness of the investigation which has preceded it. The farmers of this Nation are more than a third of its people, and whatsoever affects the basis of their industries affects all. I know how hard it is to bring the realization of this fact home to those who dwell in great cities, especially to those who control stupendous industrial and commercial interests, besides which a farm of 150 acres seems an inconsiderable enterprise. Even the great intellect of Horace Greeley succumbed to the prevailing delusion, if we may credit the statement of the brilliant eulogist of Lincoln who said that Horace Greeley thought himself a bigger man than Abraham Lincoln because he lived in a bigger town. But I am convinced that if the dwellers in cities will look below the surface of this question they will see that it does not concern the farmer alone. If in what I am to say I shall seem to speak of him entirely, it is because his industry is at the foundation of our prosperity, and in speaking of him I speak of all. The dwellers in cities can not disassociate their interest from that of the farmers. Diminish the purchasing power of the American farmer and you diminish by so much the prosperity of every city and of every laborer, clerk, merchant, and banker within its limits.

A hundred and twenty-five years ago, when our fathers were first agitating the question of a tariff, the New York Chamber of Commerce reminded the opposing farmers that agriculture could not flourish without commerce. To-day the merchant and manufacturer may well be reminded that commerce and manufactures are not likely to flourish without a successful agriculture.

THE QUESTION TO BE ARGUED ON BROAD NATIONAL GROUNDS.

The question is too great and important to be argued on anything but broad national grounds. Grievously as this bill affects industries of the State of Maine, I am not here to argue that it affects Maine more than it affects every other State in the North or in the South, in the East or in the West. In Maine we see more clearly because we are nearer the conditions, but if the gentlemen of the Democratic Party succeed in carrying this bill through this House and this Congress, its ultimate effects on the economic and social life of this Nation must be such that Maine will be neither the loudest nor the most inconsolable in her lamentations.

I do not mean to say by this that the challenges which are ringing out from the States bordering on Canada are to be disregarded. When the sentries on the picket line begin to challenge and fire it behooves the whole army to take notice.

BURDENS AND BENEFITS NOT JUSTLY APPORTIONED.

The manner in which this bill distributes its supposed benefits and its undoubted hardships violates mankind's fundamental idea of justice and equity. Since the dawn of time, through all mythologies and religions, man has expressed his inborn idea that to those who have the suffering and self-denial should come the bliss of the better world, the peace of the Elysian fields, the joy of the golden streets. That is real reciprocity. But this bill introduces into that ancient, instinctive idea of equity, a new principle; that one class of citizens is to have the sacrifices, while another class enjoys the rewards. The dairymen of New York and Ohio are to tread the earthly pathway of self-denial, and in reward the makers of barbed-wire fencing are to roam the Elysian fields [laughter]; the wheat farmers of the Dakotas are to keep the long vigil of unrestricted competition, and in return the automobile makers of Detroit are to speed over the streets of gold; the fishermen of Gloucester who keep watch and watch with death on the banks of Newfoundland are to surrender their market, and in return the Connecticut clock makers are to set up their timepieces in the realms of bliss, where a thousand years are but as a day; the potato farmer of Maine or Michigan is to have the troubles of Lazarus, but the maker of harvesting machines is to rest his head on the bosom of Abraham. [Laughter and applause.] One class sows that another may reap, and you call it reciprocity.

Names count for much with us, and the names of Blaine and McKinley are being used to commend this proposition. There is no warrant for this. In his youth in 1864, as a Member of this House, Mr. Blaine voted to repeal an arrangement with Canada far better than the one proposed now, since it gave free coal, which this does not. And in his later days Mr.

Blaine in his Twenty Years of Congress referred to that reciprocity as "one-sided, vexatious, and unprofitable." Mr. McKinley made the very tariff duties which you are now trying to sweep away; and, like Mr. Blaine, never favored reciprocity in competing products.

FREE TRADE IN FARM PRODUCTS REVERSES THE POLICY OF A CENTURY.

The broad proposition which is before us is that tariff duties levied on our borders against commodities produced by foreign people, be swept away, so far as the principal and practically the only competitors of our farmers are affected. We are giving the farmer free trade and are pleading in justification that it will not hurt him and will help the consumer. If these two pleas are consistent and truthful, well and good. If either or both be fallacious, we must know it.

One significant fact may arouse in our minds a suspicion that we are wrong in removing the protection from the farmer's products. Protection for the farmer is an old national policy coeval with the Constitution itself. In 1789 living was simple. There were not many food products of the farm that could be imported. Potatoes were raised abroad only in limited quantities. The peasantry of France still believed them poisonous. The bread eaten by the American people was principally made of Indian corn, wheaten bread appearing on the table only when the minister came. But there was one foreign article that could compete in our markets—cheese. And the statesmen of 1789 put a duty of 4 cents a pound on cheese. For a hundred and twenty-five years, with few intervals, there has been a tariff on cheese, usually 4 cents a pound, in 1816 as high as 9 cents. Under the Democratic Wilson tariff it was 4 cents, to-day it is 6 cents. Our fathers made it 4 cents when the nearest competition was 3,000 miles away, over an ocean. Freight ran into dollars and weeks. To-day our tariff on cheese is only 6 cents a pound, and one of the great cheese-making countries of the world is separated from our markets only by a few cents and a few hours.

You propose to reverse the policy of a hundred and twenty-five years and give us, not lower duties, but free trade with our only competitor, not only in cheese, but in all the principal farm products. Many of us have hoped for a reasonable, symmetrical tariff on manufactured goods founded on scientifically acquired information. How can that ever be if we are to proceed against the farmer with this crude violence?

LONG ESTABLISHED POLICY SHOULD BE REVERSED ONLY AFTER CAREFUL EXAMINATION.

I am not one of those who believe that a policy should always continue because it has continued a century and a quarter. Because butter, wheat, oats, and potatoes were protected in 1824 is not in itself a reason why they should be protected now. Because even the Democratic tariff makers in 1857 and again in 1894 considered it wise to give the farmers a substantial protection is not a compelling reason to constrain our acts here and now. But when wise men and partially wise men in certain situations have at different times reasoned out the same line of action, what they have done has attained great authority and dignity. Statesmen and jurists have used their acts as the mariner uses the lighthouse. They have been disregarded only after the fullest investigation and the most mature deliberation.

To-day and here, however, we are brushing aside the experience of our past. We are disregarding the progressive and enlightened conclusions of statesmanship in Germany, France, and England and are doing this great thing without investigation worthy the name.

One night the States-General of France voted a king off the throne and changed the order of society. That stands as the great precedent of precipitate legislative action. But the people of France had read, studied, and pondered for nearly 10 years the Red Book of Necker, wherein the greatest finance minister of the age had set forth the state of the nation. You are proposing to-day a great new policy that goes to the very social fabric of America, and where is the great committee of this House that has probed to the bottom of it, and where is the book that has spread its investigations before the American people?

THE NECESSITY OF ACCURATE REASONING ON THIS QUESTION.

To many this thing seems simple. Because Canada has New-World conditions which, generally speaking, are like our own, therefore there can be no harm in letting her agricultural products compete in our markets. That seems plausible, and it has the ear of the American people to-day, because we have always thought of tariffs as applying chiefly to manufactures. But right here let us stop and examine, for here is the fork of the road.

It was my good fortune once to hear from the gallery of the English House of Commons a debate on the management of English railways. And one plausible orator, with much confidence of assertion, declared that statistics showed the loss of life to be far greater on American roads than on English. From this he deduced conclusions unfavorable to American skill and capacity. But a member from the Government bench answered him; I do not know the name or the rank of that modest, well-poised gentleman. I have no doubt he had been trained in one of those two great universities where the scholars of England—greater than her Wellingtons and her Nelsons—have for a thousand years taught the youth of England to search for and know the truth. Taking up the statements so detrimental to the United States, so flattering to English pride, he admitted that the statistics did show a greater loss of life on American railroads, but he pointed out that America was a very great country; that many thousand miles of her road had been extended hastily in sparsely populated regions. It was to be expected that there would be great loss of life on such roads. But in the older settled East, where fixed conditions prevailed, the loss of life was so little as to show that American skill and capacity were not to be compared unfavorably with English. I do not recount this narrative to read any lesson to the brilliant and discriminating intellects in this Hall. I do it merely for the sake of the argument I am about to make, to arrest your attention, especially the attention of the Democratic majority before it pushes home this blow at the prosperity of the farmer and the social life of the Nation.

GREAT DISTINCTION BETWEEN THE FARM HOME AND THE FACTORY.

The fact that Canada has New-World conditions, that her labor is not crushed down as in the older countries, furnishes, I will admit, a fair argument that you might with safety remove the duties on manufactured goods in the future when conditions of labor shall have equalized. The argument, then, may some day be sound when applied to factories. Is it sound when applied to farms?

No; and for this reason, that the farm is primarily not a factory, but a home.

Capitalists gather up money, build mills, call in laborers, and turn out product for the main purpose of paying dividends on the capital they have gathered up.

The farmer acquires land that he may found a home.

It is not the lack of bricks, machinery, or factory sites that checks the expansion of factories, but the disappearance of dividends.

The expansion of farms ceases only when there is no more land under the western sun.

Dividends are the fundamental conditions of manufactures.

Areas of land for homes are the fundamental condition of agriculture.

If the factory's product falls in price below the dividend-producing line, the factory shuts down to wait for better times. The building of new factories is discouraged.

Did any of you gentlemen ever hear of the farms shutting down as factories shut down because the bottom fell out of the market for their products? We heard that the farmers of Kansas once burned their corn when they could not sell it. But farming went on, because the homes could not stop.

When cotton goods fall in the market, the cotton mills curtail production and save loss by running fewer weeks in the year.

When the farmer's products fall in the market, he must produce not less but more, because the expense of the home must be met.

Manufactures, organized by trusts and gentlemen's agreements, easily control output and prevent overproduction.

Farmers, by the necessities of their condition, are controlled in their production only by the Almighty's dispensation of sunshine and rain.

The farm is evidently to be distinguished from the factory. And may we not make a blunder—a great blunder such as Napoleon said was worse than a crime—if in our reasoning here we apply to the agricultural schedule of our tariff the same formulas that we apply to the manufacturing schedule? [Applause on the Republican side.]

At this point let us guard against a confusion of thought. I am not trying to show that farming creates homes and manufacturing does not. But in manufacturing the homes are the incident, not the object. A corporation with a thousand employees curtails production without responsibility as to its effect on the families of those employees. The human-life necessities do not impel an overproduction disastrous to the market. But when we turn to agriculture, the human-life necessities do that very thing. It is because of this that we must vary our accustomed formulas if we would not work a fearful havoc when we deal with the agricultural schedule.

INDEPENDENCE OF THE FARM HOME AND ITS RELATION TO MANUFACTURES.

A century ago the farm home was more preeminently the unit of civilization than to-day. It was almost independent within itself. The father and sons tilled the fields, cared for the cattle, and especially the sheep, while the mother and daughters kept the house and spun and wove the clothing. The daughters were the spinsters, and to this day an unmarried woman, whether she dwell in humble cottage or princely castle, is a spinster—living monument of the old independence of the farm home. In process of time the factory has taken over the family industries, as well as most of the village trades. The farmer and his family devote themselves to the simpler products, the raw materials; and after their own food supply is secure, must sell enough surplus to pay for the manufactured goods, professional services, and so forth, which are needed to satisfy their wants and tastes. It is obvious that if all in the world were farmers, there would be no people to buy the surplus. It is evident, then, that there must be other people, not engaged in farming, to buy and consume this surplus of the farmer, else he will be unable to purchase manufactured articles. It seems most consistent with reason that these other people who are to purchase the farmer's surplus should be his own neighbors, or, at least, of his own Nation or region, and especially those of his neighbors who are engaged in manufacturing the very articles which he needs to buy. And it is evident that both farmers and artisans will be most prosperous and the happiest when there are enough farmers to take the artisan's goods at a fair price, and enough artisans, professional men, and so forth, to take the farmer's surplus at a fair price.

EQUILIBRIUM BETWEEN AGRICULTURE AND MANUFACTURES.

This brings us to the question of proportion, or equilibrium, of manufactured and agricultural products. And it is right here on this point that the whole situation likely to be created by this reciprocity treaty develops itself. Our manufactures, syndicated as they are by trusts and associations, are easily controllable and do not tend to run into an overproduction, disastrous to profits on capital or the wages of labor. But the farms, being an aggregation of homes, disorganized, and each impelled by its own necessities, tend constantly to overproduce. And this overproduction becomes disastrous unless the limitation of acreage possible to be cultivated intervenes to prevent. Therefore the element of prime importance in this discussion is the relation of acreage to the capacity of the home market furnished by the nonagricultural classes.

Of this doctrine of the equilibrium of the home market we have heard little among English-speaking peoples, because England hopelessly destroyed the equilibrium of her home market when, as a result of the stimulation of the Napoleonic wars, she got more people into manufacturing than her acres, in the opinion of a dominating school of her statesmen, could possibly feed, even under the highest development of her agriculture. Then she felt forced to open her markets to the agricultural products of the world. We, who found our market in her necessities, have not examined her situation. But England herself is awakening, and in 1906, after exhaustive investigations, her tariff commission made a significant report. There has been, that report says—

a broad contrast between the policy adopted by foreign countries and that adopted by the United Kingdom. Generally speaking, all foreign and European countries accept as the basis of their economic policy the necessity for maintaining a flourishing agriculture. This is partly due to economic reasons, partly to considerations of national defense and security. The result, speaking generally, is that these countries, instead of pursuing an exclusively manufacturing or an exclusively agrarian policy, have endeavored to maintain a balance between agriculture and manufactures.

"A balance between agriculture and manufactures!" Have any of us studied it before plunging into this great departure from the pathway traced by the instincts of our statesmen for a century and a quarter?

RELATION OF THE EQUILIBRIUM TO NATIONAL POWER AND SOCIAL LIFE.

"Consideration of national defense and security!" Have any of us studied the relations of agriculture to that great subject? We have thought of battleships and forts and have registered our thoughts in billion-dollar marks.

Have we forgotten that the farm home is the greatest nursery of men and women that a nation has? When Bismarck turned from free trade to protection and established Germany's agricultural duties, he did it on the ground of the salvation of the Prussian State and the German Empire. [Applause on the Republican side.] Wealth and factories are great assets of a nation, I grant you. I hope we and our neighbors will always have an abundance of both; but if we look over the history of our race in the parent country for the long course of time the word that comes oftenest from the pens of historians and the tongues of orators is not "wealth" or "factories," but "yeomanry." From Crecy to the Crimea, and on to this day, the yeomanry of England have been her proudest boast. And when the statesmen who but recently formed England's tariff commission came to examine the condition of the realm one of their most striking recommendations was a duty on agricultural products as an important means of encouraging small farmers—men of the yeomanry class.

Do you remember what the Boer War revealed to England? That her military recruits were undersized and that their vitality was lowered by the conditions of crowded city life. Well may her statesmen have turned their eyes backward to those stalwart farmer boys, the yeoman archers of England, who laid low the mailed chivalry of France, or those other country boys, stalwart in form and stern of conscience, whose valor at Dunbar and Worcester commended their leader to immortal fame and their model of organization to English-speaking soldiers for 250 years. And so the English statesmen—bethinking themselves of valor as well as of trade—recommended a tariff on agricultural products. [Applause on the Republican side.]

That is what English statesmen recommended after investigation and study. What you propose to do here and now is to tear down American agricultural duties after neither investigation nor study. [Applause on the Republican side.]

HOW THE EQUILIBRIUM OF THE FARMERS' MARKET WAS LOST.

Since other nations have thought it worth while to study the equilibrium of the farmers' market, it may be worth our time to halt for a moment the speedy onward course of this bill and reflect on it ourselves. It concerns all, the proudest city and the smallest town. It overrides all consideration of special profits or losses that we may think we see in this agreement.

Up to 1850 this equilibrium between agriculture and the home market was maintained the world over, because transportation was still costly on land and sea, and agricultural products, being bulky, were restrained by the cost of freight from flooding any particular market. But from 1850 onward the application of steam to land and water transportation revolutionized the economic condition of the world, and soon brought to the front one great and all-controlling economic phenomenon—the opening of the broad and fertile prairies of the western United States.

Farm products began to fly through space and hurl themselves upon far-distant places in unheard-of quantities. This was especially so with farm products raised on new lands, under the stimulus of nature's stored-up fertility. In 1878 the fast-freight and refrigerator car came into activity, and the dairyman of the West was constructively moved up to the door of the eastern farmer, and the two went merrily to work to make one another poor with overcompetition. The equilibrium of the market between the farmer's surplus and the artisan's product, from being constant and sure, under the eyes of all, became a flighty and inconstant thing, doing unexpected acts in response to distant voices. That a German farmer on the sands of Brandenburg should find the conditions in the little market town where his fathers had resorted for three centuries turned upside down by some farmers on a River Platte in a land called Nebraska, thousands of miles distant under the westward sun, was a phenomenon astounding and portentous. Well may it have driven Bismarck, imbued with the free-trade theories of the universities and sharing the prejudices of the country squires of Germany against manufactures, from the free-trade to the protection camp. [Applause on the Republican side.]

EFFECTS OF THE DISTURBANCE OF THE AMERICAN FARMERS' MARKET, ESPECIALLY IN NEW ENGLAND.

The markets of four great communities afford us an instructive lesson as to the effects of this phenomenon: The eastern United States, England, Germany, and France. Eastern United States, North and South, being in the same Nation with the new lands, met the flood of cheap products under free-trade conditions as it fell with full force in the years between 1870 and 1890. Many men in this Hall remember the dearth it produced. The Tariff Board in its brief contribution to this subject refers to it. If, in illustrating it, I refer to New England, it is only because I am most familiar with that region.

In New England this destruction of his markets brought the farmer a great revolution and a long dearth. The measure of that dearth is found in the values of farms and farm buildings in those six States. When agriculture has a fair chance, farm values ought to increase. The accumulations of industry ought to result in permanent improvements, the betterment of buildings, the fertilization of the land. What was the case? The total value of the farm realty of New England in 1890 was very little more than it had been in 1860, 30 years before. In those

30 years that splendid race of farmers practically stood still, and $20,000,000 measures the only increase in the value of their property. From 1890 to 1900 the increase was nearly $40,000,000, and from 1900 to 1910, when the equilibrium of markets was restored, the increase was over $170,000,000. [Applause on the Republican side.] I dwell on this feature of the equilibrium of markets because the percentage of this increase bears a striking resemblance to that between 1850 and 1860, when the old equilibrium existed.

The following table, prepared by the Census Bureau, tells as eloquently as columns of figures can the story of the long dearth on New England farms and the long halt of 30 years:

Average value of land, buildings, and other improvements per farm for each State from 1850 to 1910.

Year.	Total.	Maine.	New Hampshire.	Vermont.	Massachusetts.	Rhode Island.	Connecticut.
1910	$3,798	$2,659	$3,176	$3,442	$5,238	$5,287	$5,166
1900	2,753	1,628	2,392	2,510	4,189	4,206	3,616
1890	2,579	1,590	2,270	2,473	3,710	3,977	3,609
1880	2,802	1,591	2,367	3,078	3,806	4,164	3,957
1870 [1]	3,240	1,722	2,719	4,120	4,393	4,019	4,871
1860	2,589	1,413	2,285	2,980	3,462	3,616	3,607
1850	2,222	1,173	1,181	2,129	3,202	3,170	3,240

[1] One-fifth should be deducted for depreciated currency.

THE DEARTH NOT PECULIAR TO NEW ENGLAND.

While the effects of the long dearth were more pronounced in New England, perhaps, than elsewhere, yet in the whole North Atlantic Division, which includes New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, as well as New England, in 30 years, from 1860 to 1890, the value of farms and farm buildings increased only two-thirds as much as it had in the single decade from 1850 to 1860 under normal markets. This North Atlantic Division of the United States shows the effect of the opening of new lands on the old lands, as no other section of the United States could do at this time. With the best home market in America in their midst, with the much-vaunted world's market of Europe nearer to them than to any other farmers on this Continent, with the inherited appliances and improvements belonging to established countries, the farmers of the North Atlantic States could barely hold their own for 30 years. The West was the new and growing region; she will figure as an old and settled country in the new influx. So also will the South, which then did not notice, amid the ravages of war, the minor ravages of competition.

Our Tariff Board, in its meager report on this vast subject—meager because in the hot haste with which this House is moving there is no time for the scientific examination which I believe Mr. Emery and his associates would make so well—comments on one fact which it has found, but on the vast significance of which it has had no time to dwell. It says of the most flourishing Canadian Province—Ontario:

> Ontario, while reporting the highest Canadian land value, shows the lowest Canadian rate of increase. It is worthy of note that Ontario is feeling the competition of western Canada, just as some years ago the eastern part of the United States felt the competition of our western lands.

The farmers of Ontario are already losing the equilibrium of their markets. All eastern Canada will soon be in the throes of it. And we are now proposing to tear down our ancient dikes and invite the flood to roll over us. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The New England farmer saved himself by courage and intelligence. The census shows that of the 12,000,000 acres of improved land in the six States in 1860, only 7,000,000 acres remain improved. But the officials of the Census Bureau advise me that a difference in methods of classification of improved land accounts for much of the difference. Yet, undoubtedly, there has been some decline. Take as an example, and not an extreme example, the State of Maine. "The acreage of improved land increased steadily until 1880," says the census report, "when a marked decline began, and in 1900 the percentage of farm land improved was smaller than ever before reported." And the Director of the Census went on to specify as one of the causes of this "the competition of western lands in cereal production."

After an agonizing struggle the New England farmer moved to a new base. He ceased to raise beef and sheep, he went out of wheat and the cereals, and became a dairyman, a grower of fruits, and a market gardener. He lessened his acreage, but kept in the business, for the farm is a home and is hostage of fate for the farmer in bad as well as good times. And to-day the census of 1910 shows that there are over 3,000 more farms in New England than there were in 1860. On a new basis that splendid race of farmers are reversing the decadence of two generations. And just in the hour of victory the statesmen of America, without scientific investigation, with hardly a hearing that deserves the name, propose to turn loose on them the competition of a new empire. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Can not the gentlemen on the Democratic side of this House see how futile a plan it is to bring on the American farmer the destruction of equilibrium in his markets and then expect to recompense him by lowering the duties on a few of the things he buys? You bring upon him a colossal calamity and then propose to salve his wounds with commercial percentages. You destroy his business and then pretend to cheapen the tools with which he carries it on. [Applause on the Republican side.]

SIMILAR EFFECTS IN THE ENGLISH FARMER'S MARKET.

England also met the deluge under free-trade conditions. What happened is succinctly stated by Mr. James J. Hill in his new work, Highways of Progress:

Agriculture in England—

He says—

> has suffered in the last 25 years by the opening of new land in America and the cheapening of the world's transportation.

The English tariff commission gives in 1906 the same report:

> The causes of the decline in agriculture are world-wide in their operation, affecting all importing countries. The striking feature in the case of the United Kingdom is that agriculture has been more depressed than in any other country and more depressed than any other branch of economic activity. During the last 25 years the course of all agricultural prices has been the same downward direction, with the result that agriculture has been subject to a great combination of causes, all tending toward its depression.

And, most significant of all, that commission goes on to say:

> European countries generally have pursued a policy involving import duties on agricultural produce, whereas in the United Kingdom agriculturists have been subject to the unrestricted importation of foreign produce on terms not dissimilar, in many cases, from those experienced by manufacturers who complain of dumping.

These dry official statements give little of the tragedy of England's position. Forty thousand of her acres went out of culture last year. In the county of Buckingham farms sell as low as $63 an acre.

Buckingham County is about 30 miles from London and halfway between London and Birmingham. Many railroads connect it with both those cities. London is that great world's market that is dangled so temptingly before our farmers when some one wants to trade shadow for substance with them. London is the great capital of trade and commerce. It is also a capital of want and misery. The rise and fall of her tide of paupers is recorded in the journals as we record the prospects of a wheat crop. They are a host greater than the men who held with Meade the heights over Gettysburg. How could it be otherwise when the virgin soil of New Zealand and Canada can put out of business farmers within 30 miles of the world's market?

Dairy and grazing farms in Surrey sell for $123 an acre. Surrey is near London, and London is the world's great market for milk, butter, and cheese. But that market is not the English farmer's market. The Canadians, the New Zealanders, and the Danes possess it. Do you wonder that the English tariff commission recommends a duty on butter and cheese?

HOW THE GERMAN FARMERS ESCAPED THE TROUBLES OF THE AMERICAN AND ENGLISH FARMERS.

As we turn from England and her sad picture, we find another story in Germany and France, where statesmen and people united to preserve the equilibrium of the home market. I will quote again from Mr. James J. Hill's book, because Mr. Hill, one of the world's great captains of industry, is an unrivaled observer of economic facts. I wish that at this juncture his farm was bigger than his railroad, for where a man's treasure is there is his heart also. [Laughter.] Mr. Hill says:

> How to meet German competition is to-day the study of every intelligent leader of industry and every cabinet on the Continent of Europe. It will be found that a large share of her world-wide success is due to symmetrical national development. Agricultural industry has not been slighted. Behold a contrast that throws light upon the idle host of England's unemployed marching despondently through streets whose shop windows are crowded with wares of German make. Between 1875 and 1900 in Great Britain 2,691,428 acres which were under cereals and 755,255 acres which were under green crops went out of cultivation. In Germany, during the same period, the cultivated area grew from 22,840,950 to 23,971,573 hectares, an increase of 5 per cent.

The German farmer owes his proud position largely to the wisdom of Bismarck, a statesman of that school who investigate first and then act, instead of acting first and investigating afterwards. [Applause.] He had been a free trader, but facts

converted him, and in May, 1879, he bore this testimony in the Reichstag:

Is not the moment approaching when our agriculture will no longer be able to exist because corn is pressed down to a price at which it can not be remuneratively produced in Germany, taxation, the cost of living, and the cost of land being as they are? When that moment comes, then not only agriculture but the Prussian State and the German Empire will go to ruin as well.

And then and there the tariff duties of Germany on agricultural products were established, and the trend of her policy has been to raise them and not lower them.

HAPPY POSITION OF THE FRENCH FARMER UNDER PROTECTION.

In France we find the same lesson, yet France was menaced. "The trouble in France, as elsewhere," writes Meredith, an English authority, "centered in the persistent fall in the prices of agricultural produce, due in part to the general appreciation of gold, but due principally to the cheapening of transport and the appearance on the home market of transoceanic cereals and meat. The result was the increased protection of agricultural products in 1885 and 1887 and the tariff of 1892."

Mr. Hill, who is inclined to free trade, does not in his book notice the protective legislation of France and Germany, but the prosperity of France's agriculture to-day he paints in the most brilliant colors.

TARIFF ON AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS PROTECTS FROM TROUBLE.

It seems to me proven beyond a doubt that the opening of large areas of new lands tends to destroy agriculture in the old lands, and that the wisest statesmanship of the world forfends this calamity by protective tariffs.

When trouble comes to manufacturers, everyone—the statesman included—knows it. The great capitalists are in these halls; idle workmen are on the streets; outgoing steamers are crowded with foreign laborers returning home; other laborers search new employment. Willing minds study remedies, for the smoke no longer rises from the tall chimneys, the channels of trade dry up, and all know that times are hard. It is a sad thing when manufacturers are in trouble.

When the long dearth comes to the farmer there are no spectacular accompaniments. He finds one day that his market has dropped below the line of profit. He drives home sadly, searching his mind in vain for a cause that may lie at the end of a railroad a thousand miles away, or 10,000 miles away across two oceans. As prices continue low, he goes quietly to the local Pharoah, and soon the farmer holds the title and pays the taxes, while the Pharoah holds the mortgage and gets what little income there is, although there is not much in it for even the Pharoah. And so the long struggle goes on. When the farmer's arm fails, the children take up the battle—the son or the daughter. When the trouble comes to the factory, the machinery stops and the smoke ceases to roll from the tall chimney. The smoke does not fail in the farmhouse chimney, for on the hearth burns the oldest altar fire of the race. The farm goes on through the long dearth, but the hardship is more or less great.

It is because of the insidious ills that come with the destruction of equilibrium in the farmer's markets that legislative interference should be taken only after careful inquiry. Those bulwarks which you to-day are proposing to tear down without inquiry worthy of the name were last established by the labors of three great men—William McKinley, President; Thomas B. Reed, Speaker; and Nelson Dingley, chairman of Ways and Means. In a modest capacity I had the fortune to sit in their councils many times during their seven years' battle. With the greatest care and the utmost caution they raised the defenses of the farmer's market. They were wrong, you say. If they were wrong, then the systematic and painstaking German statesmen are wrong to-day. If they were wrong, then the philosophic statesmen of France are wrong to-day. If they were wrong, then the tariff commission of England toiled for years to search out truth only to produce error. Those three men had visions that reached the future, but they never let their feet stray from the highway of fact.

Agricultural prosperity was destroyed so long in the old-settled parts of this country that we are regarding as something abnormal the recent advance. There is, however, nothing abnormal about it. The West is coming to a normal condition of settlement; our wise tariff prevents foreign dumping; the natural equilibrium of markets is restored. No one who examines can doubt this. Prices—I mean those the farmer gets, not what the consumer pays—have been dropping for the last year, indicating that there are no abnormal increases.

WHAT WILL CANADIAN COMPETITION DO?

We now confront the next great question: "Will the opening up of our markets to Canadian farm products disturb this equilibrium and throw us back into the old distress?"

In other words, will enough Canadian farm products come over the line to disturb disastrously our markets? There is a great chorus from the large cities that no trouble need be feared by the farmer, that the consumer will pay about as much as ever, but that "trade relations" will be improved. But while this chorus is going on some very shrewd gentlemen in Wall Street are indulging in prophecy. The Canadian Pacific is the greatest railroad on the North American Continent. It connects all Canada and runs into all the great northern markets of the United States. If great quantities of Canadian products are coming in, that road will do most of the hauling. The day the trade agreement passed the House in March Canadian Pacific stock touched the highest point in its history, and it has been soaring ever since, in notable contrast most of the time to the American railroads. Some shrewd men evidently think that some butter, cheese, cream, milk, hay, potatoes, apples, wheat, and so forth, will come over the line. The situation recalls the story of the newspaper reporter who went to find out whether an eminent clergyman was going to accept a call to another city. "There is no decision about it," said the daughter, who met the reporter at the door, "father is upstairs praying for guidance, but mother is downstairs packing the trunks, so I guess we are going."

I do not propose to dwell long on the statistics of present trade in farm produce over the border. It is small and proves nothing except that Canada sends little here. But she sends much to England, and thereby proves that she could send much to our nearer markets.

In 1908 when Canada was sending us only 23,000 dozens of eggs she was sending England 1,200,000 dozen. While she has in the last five years sent to us an average of less than 100,000 pounds of butter a year she has sent to England as high as 33,000,000 pounds in a year. In the same five years she has sent us an average of less than 150,000 pounds of cheese a year, but her normal annual export to England was, until New Zealand began to shut her out, about 200,000,000 pounds. In 1909 she sent to us less than 20,000 barrels of apples, but in the same year she sent to England more than 1,000,000 barrels.

When a Canadian farmer sends cheese to England he meets there the competition of all the world, and the competitor whom he has to watch the sharpest is a man from the opposite side of the earth—the farmer of New Zealand. If the barriers along our border were down, if the greatest and best home market on earth was thrown open to his milk, cream, and butter, do you suppose the Canadian farmer would toil to make cheese to compete with a New Zealander in a market on the other side of an ocean 3,000 miles wide?

RELATION OF GREGORY KING'S LAW TO THE INFLUX OF CANADIAN SUPPLIES.

Does anyone know how much produce will break our market? Has any committee of this House investigated this great problem before plunging ahead to reverse the economic policy of a century and a quarter? We do not know on this floor, but one thing we can do is to examine the general nature of markets. More than 200 years ago Gregory King discovered the law of prices that bears his name. That law which Prof. Thorold Rogers tells us "is not thought of in times of high and low prices as it should be" is as follows:

In a commodity a deficit of—

1	tenth	raises	the	price	above	the	common	rate	3 tenths.
2	tenths	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	8 "
3	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	16 "
4	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	28 "
5	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	45 "

And this law applies similarly to the effects of a surplus in lowering the price below the common rate.

This law, called by a high authority "one of the most important generalizations in statistics," must not be neglected in the vast problem before us to-day.

GREGORY KING'S LAW AS ILLUSTRATING THE POTATO SITUATION.

In connection with this law of Gregory King, the potato situation in the United States is worth considering. While the consumer in the cities has found potato prices high the farmers know that potatoes have been low, around 25 cents a bushel. Our own farmers have overstocked our own home market, great as that is, our manufacturing industries alone disbursing to their officers and employees, who are consumers, over $3,000,000,000 a year in salaries and wages. Do you know how little of acreage participates in the overproduction that knocks down the potato market—to the producer, not to the consumer necessarily? Potatoes are produced all over the United States to an extent that meets a large proportion of the local demand, but 13 counties in what are called the 5 potato States, Maine, New York, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota, make up the deficit and produce this year the two-tenths, or five-tenths of surplus, which, under Gregory King's law, drives down the price

eight-tenths or forty-five tenths. Our 13 counties are liable to overstock even our magnificent home market, where $3,000,000,000 of industrial wages are floating about, and our potato farmer prospers only because he gets good years in with the bad. But add to our 13 counties the acreage of the great potato Provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Quebec, with the hope of our near-by home market to stimulate their farmers, and bad years must inevitably be constant. Their whole surplus will pour over our line, because they have no home market to absorb it. The industrial disbursements of those Provinces are but little more than those of the little State of Rhode Island.

If you want to know the capacity of the potato land of New Brunswick I will cite you to the fact that the single Maine county of Aroostook, which lies adjacent to New Brunswick and has similar land, produced in 1909 about one-tenth of the entire potato crop of the United States. I understand that the Legislature of New Brunswick, like the Legislature of Maine, has withheld its sanction from this trade agreement. Some gentlemen have thought this strange. It seems to me that there is nothing strange in it. If, under the glittering lure of the American market, Canada develops her potato land—and to-day she is not doing it, for want of a market—she will make the American farmer poor and her own farmer poor, too. The destruction of the equilibrium of our market will not in the end benefit her. When the western United States farmer was flooding the cereal and dairy market of the eastern United States, he did not prosper. Kansas appeared to bleed in those days as she had never bled before. And the potato farmers of both Maine and New Brunswick, who now have to pay millions of dollars annually for fertilizers, may look with alarm to that rich virgin soil of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta, where the few straggling pioneer farmers in that vast domain produced in 1909 10,000,000 bushels of potatoes.

CONDITIONS IN CANADA'S FOUR EASTERN PROVINCES.

Canada has all the conditions for a great agricultural development inevitable to destroy the equilibrium of our market. Except in the Province of Ontario, she has no home market to speak of to absorb the surplus of her farmers. In the four Provinces of Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Quebec, out of 2,500,000 people at the last census about 150,000 were wage earners in industrial establishments, and their annual wages amounted to a little over $50,000,000. The little State of Rhode Island alone had that year two-thirds as many industrial wage earners and disbursed to them over $43,000,000 in wages. But those four Provinces of Canada have an area far greater than all New England, with New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois added. The four Provinces live to themselves. When we speak of growing Canada we mean Ontario and the west. In the 20 years comprised by the two last Canadian censuses, the four vast eastern Provinces added to their population 300,000. In one decade of that 20 years the State of Massachusetts increased nearly twice 300,000, and Mr. Archibald Blue, commissioner of the coming Canadian census, is quoted in the papers as predicting scarcely any increase in the eastern Provinces, but a large growth in western Canada. There is little prospect for advance in those eastern Provinces unless we divert to them purchases we now make from our own farmers. The farmers of eastern Canada, having no markets except the distant English market, live to themselves. But if stirred into life by access to our home market, they will show great capacity for exportations, because they have no home market to absorb their surplus.

BOUNDLESS RESOURCES OF WESTERN CANADA AS A COMPETITOR.

When we turn to western Canada we have a repetition of the conditions which once prevailed in the United States. Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, and British Columbia are an empire of a million square miles. The Canadian representative at the International Institute at Rome told the delegates last year the prairie provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta were as large as England, France, Germany, and Italy. The five great western Provinces, rich in a fertile soil, have a domain as great as that of the combined States of Illinois, Missouri, Iowa, Wisconsin, Minnesota, the two Dakotas, Kansas, Nebraska, Oklahoma, and Texas. When you remember the vast flood of agricultural produce that those States have poured into the markets of the world we can form some idea of what western Canada will do to the equilibrium of markets for the next two generations of Americans. The London Economist, England's great journal of finance and trade, has recently sent a correspondent into Canada west. After noting that the United States produced 600,000,000 bushels of wheat in 1910, this correspondent records that in the Canadian west there are 200,000,000 acres of wheat land not yet touched by the plow that can produce 3,000,000,000 bushels of wheat annually, and there are furthermore 250,000,000 acres suitable for cattle raising. But wheat and cattle are not the only products. In 1909 Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta produced 10,000,000 bushels of potatoes, and in the last year the dairy commissioner of Canada has noted that the dairying industry is growing rapidly in northern Saskatchewan and northern Alberta. Northern Ontario, hitherto almost unknown, but now opened up for mining, has been found to have splendid potato land, equaling the best in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. The Canadian Pacific and Grank Trunk are opening up this region to settlers and promise to make it as populous as older Ontario.

We have supposed that western Canada was a cold country, but last year in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta half the seeding was done by the end of March; in Saskatchewan young stock began to run on the prairies early in March; and in October last the superintendent of the Government farm at Indian Head, Manitoba, wrote that the cattle were still in pasture, while fall plowing continued in Alberta until November 25. It has been assumed that corn can not be raised there, but in August, 1910, the superintendent of the experimental farm at Brandon, Manitoba, wrote, "Corn is a splendid crop." Such, then, is Canada, west and east, in what are known as the nine Provinces. They have an area of agricultural lands nearly equal to half the entire area of continental United States. Its possibilities for agricultural development are unlimited. Give to those lands our home market and two generations of American farmers will not see the equilibrium of their market restored.

When we had the last destruction of equilibrium and the long dearth began there were no riots, no outcries, but there was sadness and consternation in many hillside homes. And as they always do when the home farm becomes unprosperous, the young people went forth to what they heard were richer lands. In my youth I saw them go and witnessed the tears and lamentations of that going. I have lived to see their children come back to visit the old homes, strong men and noble women, strangers to their father's home, but Americans all, with the common traditions and the common hopes of the land of the free.

Pass this bill, put into force this old reactionary policy that the rest of the world has discarded, that even England wants to discard, and the dearth will begin again, the young men and the young women will turn their faces again to the setting sun—not to Missouri or Iowa, but to Saskatchewan and Alberta. And some day their children will revisit their father's homes. I do not doubt the magnificence of the manhood and the womanhood they will bring; but they will not be of the assets of this country. They will come from an alien land, from under a foreign flag, and out of strange eyes they will look on the countrymen of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln. [Applause on the Republican side.]

VAST POSSIBILITIES OF AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE UNITED STATES.

If we admit, as we must, that Canada will destroy the prosperity of our agriculture, yet we have to deal with the insistent question of those who press this bill, "What are we to do for food in the United States if we do not have Canada's supplies?" This question is none the less insistent although the prices the farmer gets are falling right along in the face of increased crops.

If we are honest with ourselves, the answer to this question is startling. What the United States needs to-day, if there is a shortage of food, is not the wholesale and slap-dash addition of vast areas to the sphere of our home market, but the systematic and gradual improvement of the acres we have. It is not flattering to our pride; but in our agricultural methods we rank with the second-rate nations, Spain, Russia, India, and not with the leaders, Great Britain, Germany, France, Austria, and Hungary. The International Institute at Rome has averaged the wheat yield for the world for the five years preceding 1908 and finds that where the United States produces less than 14 bushels to the acre Great Britain produces over 31, Germany over 29, France over 20, Austria over 19, Hungary over 17.

To quote again from Mr. James J. Hill's book, Highways of Progress, he has this about agriculture in the United States:

> Only one-half the land in private ownership is now tilled. That tillage does not produce one-half what the land might be made to yield, without losing an atom of its fertility.
>
> In profit we are satisfied with a small yield at the expense of the most rapid soil deterioration. We are satisfied with a national annual average product of $11.38 per acre at the cost of a diminishing annual return from the same fields, when we might as well secure two to three times that sum.

WE SHOULD ENCOURAGE AND NOT DISCOURAGE THE FARMER.

I feel as humiliated as Mr. Hill does at this showing of American agriculture. But there is a reason and excuse for it. For 30 years an opening of new lands at the expense of the old kept the farmer poor and discouraged by destroying the equilibrium of his markets. Discouraged farmers do not progress. The development of English tillage occurred in the days before the deluge from new lands; and that its excellence has been maintained through what the London Times of last June called "so protracted a struggle with overwhelming foreign competition" is a notable tribute to one of the finest races of farmers on earth.

The American farmer will forge to the front if our statesmanship will cease smashing his markets. [Applause on the Republican side.] The chart of our Agricultural Department shows that in the last few years, since his markets have been reaching equilibrium, the average production per acre in 10 leading crops has been the highest in 50 years. I am proud to say that in this development the farmers of Maine have an honorable preeminence.

MAINE AN EXAMPLE OF WHAT FAIR MARKETS WILL DO.

I will again cite Maine as an example of the benefits of fair markets as contrasted with unbalanced markets and as an example of what farmers will do under proper conditions. In that State in the decade just closed farm lands have increased 75 per cent in value, or a total for that State of $30,000,000 increase. The farm lands and buildings in that State in the last decade have increased over $62,000,000 in value. From 1880 to 1900, 5,000 farms, every one of them a home, had ceased to exist. From 1900 to 1910 the farms of Maine increased in number by nearly 500, and the long tendency toward abandonment was practically checked. This was not the only healthful sign. The number owning farms increased, the number of tenant farmers decreased, the annual expenditures for farm labor increased from two and a half million dollars to $5,000,000, and most significant of all, the expenditures for fertilizers increased from a little over $800,000 to more than $5,000,000.

I have commented on the shortsightedness of considering this question from the standpoint of the farmer alone. This prosperity of the farmer has reacted on the cities. In Maine, the metropolis, Portland, has grown as in no previous decade of her history. When 5,000 farms of Maine were going out of business progress was slow. With the farmer prosperous, all else prospers, for he spends his money at home. But if by this new policy we are to increase the purchasing power of the potato farmer of New Brunswick, Ontario, and Saskatchewan, the apple farmer of Nova Scotia, the dairyman of Quebec, those farmers will spend their money in their own cities. If they spend it in ours they must hoist their goods over a high Canadian tariff wall before they can get them home, because of the articles for which we might have a market in Canada very few are made free by this bill.

If I may be pardoned again for citing the example of Maine, which is the great agricultural State of New England, I will call attention to a most happy effect of the restoration of equilibrium in the farmer's market. That is the increase of rural population in towns under 4,000.

In the two decades preceding 1900 all the growth of the State was in the cities and large villages. The rural communities made a startling decrease. In the gain of the whole State in the last decade—a gain which greatly exceeds that of the preceding decade—the cities do not contribute all and then help make up a deficit for the country. The country and small villages gained one-third of the total gain, and even the towns under 2,000 population turned the tide of loss. Give us equilibrium of markets for another decade and the old prosperity of country life in America will return, for what the census shows as to Maine will undoubtedly be found true in many other States, especially in the East and South.

THE GREATEST OPPORTUNITY FOR CONSERVATION.

There is no limit for many years to the progress which our farmers may make for themselves and for the cities which supply them. To quote again from James J. Hill's book:

An industrious, fairly intelligent, and exceedingly comfortable agricultural community can raise from the soil food enough for the needs of 490 persons to the square mile. Adopting that ratio, the 414,498,487 acres of improved farm lands in the United States on the date of the last official report—an area materially enlarged by the present time—would support in comfort 317,350,405 people, enabling them at the same time to raise considerable food for export and to engage in necessary manufacturing employments. Applying the same ratio to the entire acreage of farm lands within the United States, both improved and unimproved, which was at the same date 838,591,774, the population indicated as able to live with comfort and prosperity on the actually existing agricultural area of this country, under an intelligent system and a fairly competent but by no means highly scientific method of agriculture, rises to 642,046,823.

[Applause.]

Let any gentleman who sees golden visions of prosperity in buying from the Canadian farmers instead of from our own farmers apply Mr. Hill's estimate to his own State. Such a development of agriculture, with a harmonious supplementary development of manufactures on her great water powers, would give to Maine a population of 5,000,000 people. Her commercial metropolis, Portland, would find in that population business to justify a great and healthy growth, based on a prosperous country about. Is not that growth better than the congestion of people driven from unprofitable farms to seek employment in the city, like the idle thousands of London who tramp the streets in want while the acres of England are going out of cultivation? [Applause on the Republican side.]

Here lies the greatest conservation opportunity ever placed before a nation. It is an opportunity that can be seized only by the efforts of the farmers. And yet we to-day are proposing to take the heart out of their efforts by destroying the natural equilibrium of their home market. [Applause on the Republican side.]

THE FARMER NOT RESPONSIBLE FOR COST OF LIVING IN THE CITIES.

While the proposed proceeding against the farmer is evidently indefensible, the outcry in the cities against the high cost of living impels us onward in our search for a victim. We all admit the high prices; many of us are oppressed by them; few of us know that wholesale prices have been falling for nearly a year, so much does the retail price affect us. But has anyone proven that the ruin of the American farmer will lower prices in the cities except as it may shrivel the business of the cities? And ought not some one to prove this before we proceed to spoil the farmer's home market for the next two generations?

To give a little personal experience, while the farmers of Maine have been getting 25 cents a bushel for potatoes, I have been paying for them a dollar a bushel. You may think this an extreme illustration of the difference between the price the farmer gets and the price the consumer pays. I am not certain that it is. Unfortunately we have had no investigation on this highly important point. In another distinguished body an inquiry was proposed last year, but, unless my memory is at fault, an appropriation for it was defeated by objection from the Democratic side of the Chamber. But our own observation and that of others will show us that there is a vast difference between consumers' prices and farmers' prices. Last summer Mr. B. F. Yoakum, head of the Frisco Railway system, published in the Saturday Evening Post an article on "The farmer and the cost of living," in which he set forth, after what he considered "a careful investigation," the food bill of New York City for the year as related to the farmer. Here it is:

	Received by farmer.	Paid by consumer.
Onions	$821,000	$8,212,000
Potatoes	8,437,000	60,000,000
Coffee	2,402,000	12,009,000
Rice	1,354,000	6,191,000
Cabbages	1,825,000	9,125,000
Milk	22,912,000	48,880,000
Eggs	17,238,000	28,730,000
Meat and poultry	219,300,000	291,000,000
	274,289,000	464,147,000

Mr. Yoakum was not arguing on the tariff question, but on the need of railroad development, and therefore he may be considered an unprejudiced witness so far as this subject is concerned.

Mr. Yoakum shows that the price of the onion increased 10 times on its way from the farmer to the New York City consumer. If this high authority is correct, has anyone searched those people who have that onion between the time it leaves the farmer's hands and gets to the consumer? And if no one has, ought it not to be done before we try and convict the farmer as the robber and sentence him to lose his paltry protection of 40 cents a bushel on onions. Is the one who takes one-tenth for an onion he has planted and raised to be pursued and those who take nine-tenths escape investigation even?

Mr. Yoakum shows that the price of the potato increased more than seven times on its way from the farmer to the New York City consumer. If this high authority is correct, has anyone searched the people who have that potato between the time it leaves the farmer's hands and gets to the consumer?

And if no one has, ought it not to be done before we try and convict the farmer as the robber and sentence him to lose his paltry protection of 25 cents a bushel? Is the man who takes one-seventh for a potato he has planted and raised to be pursued, while no questions are to be asked as to those who get the six-sevenths?

Mr. Yoakum shows that the price of rice increased five times from the hands of the farmer to the hands of the consumer. If this high authority is correct, has anyone searched the people who have that rice between the time it leaves the farmer's hands and gets to the consumer? And if no one has, ought it not to be done before we try and convict the rice farmer and take from him the duty of 2 cents a pound. This bill, it is true, does not touch rice; but does the rice farmer of the Carolinas think that protection is going to last for the few after it is stripped from the many?

Mr. Yoakum shows that the price of eggs doubles from the time they leave the farmer's hands to the time they reach the consumer's hands in New York. As our own Agricultural Department has published figures tending to confirm this estimate, it gives confidence in the estimates as to other commodities, startling as they may seem.

Who gets the great increases between the farmer and the consumer? I see no evidence that the retail merchant gets more than his necessities as to rent, display, advertising, labor, and service compel him to take. We can conjecture as to the causes, but we have not ascertained scientifically.

THE TARIFF OF NO EFFECT ON PRICES TO THE CONSUMER.

The price of coffee is estimated to increase five times from the producer to the consumer; and as there is absolutely free trade in coffee, here is a patent suggestion that the tariff, while it has important bearing on the equilibrium of the farmer's market, has very little influence on what the consumer pays. In the very height of high prices last fall the minority Democratic members of the investigating committee of another distinguished body came to this conclusion:

Notwithstanding the large increase in the price of farm products, the farmer has realized a small net return on his labor and investment.

Can not you leave the farmer this small net return? Can not you do it in consideration of the long dearth he has suffered? There he stands, the dampness of honest toil on his brow, in his heart the satisfaction that he has lasted through the trial. He is a hero. He has won the long fight. He has done it with brains as well as muscle. When the onset was fiercest he reduced his acreage and intensified his culture; that is, he contracted the wings and strengthened the center. If he had been a man with a sword we would have given him pension and office, and that exquisite American adulation of accepting every word from his lips as the last thing in wisdom. But as he is a farmer, and as farmers are organized very imperfectly for unity of action, we pat him on the back, say he is a good fellow, and, without investigation, without even an unscientific investigation worthy the name, we turn loose on him new and unnumbered hordes. [Applause on the Republican side.]

CONSUMERS OF COAL, FLOUR, AND MEAT.

By admitting that this question should be settled on broad, national grounds only, I do not wish to be understood as condoning in any way the great injustices committed on certain industries and certain sections of the country. It has been a longing of New England, stimulated by the Democratic orators for more than half a century, that she might buy coal at those great and near-by mines of Nova Scotia. Gov. Foss of Massachusetts told us last fall that free coal was one of the great blessings of reciprocity for us. But realizing the benefit of the broad national policy of protection, the better judgment of our people has favored buying coal in the distant fields of Pennsylvania and West Virginia, although the freight paid to the railroads is a burden on industry. The old reciprocity treaty of 1854 gave this Canadian coal free entrance, and the official documents of the time seem to show that it found a large market on the Atlantic seaboard. This new treaty lets in over the border line freely every natural product that New England produces herself; but this one great commodity that she does not produce, that her northern climate makes so precious to her people, is denied her. The old treaty wrote in "coal" in bold, satisfying black letters; this agreement, if it does anything in this line, makes only a penurious little concession by reducing the duty on coal screenings to 15 cents a ton, which it was in the Dingley law, where it was intended to be in the Payne law. That may help some big mills, if they use these screenings, and is good as far as it goes; but the most sedate New England farmer, if he can control his anger at the injustice, will hardly control his mirth at the ridiculousness of an arrangement that sets in motion into his market free as air all the potatoes, beets, turnips, hay, cabbages, butter, cheese, hoof-parting and cud-chewing animals that Canada can produce, and allow himself and his neighbors such coal as will strain through a hole half an inch square.

It would be possible to go much further in criticism of details of this agreement. If duties between this country and Canada are burdens, which I do not admit, it may be pointed out that we are taking all burdens off the flour-makers and leaving much on the flour consumers; that we are taking all burden off the great incorporated butchers' trust and leaving much on the consumers of meat.

THE FISHERIES AND OTHER INDUSTRIES.

If this were a council of national defense I would recall that the two great militant civilizations of Europe, Germany and France, protect by ample duties the hard-won spoil of their fishermen, that they may have those fishermen in their hour of need, as we have had ours in every crisis since Washington crossed the Delaware. After preserving in the field of diplomacy the fishing rights won by our fathers on the field of battle, John Quincy Adams transmitted to his posterity a seal intended to commemorate the glory both of his country and his family. And the legend on that seal was such as you could not honestly write across the face of this bill—"Piscemur, venemur, ut olim"—"We keep our fishing grounds and our hunting grounds as of old."

THE SAFE AND UNSAFE COURSE.

It is because we are in doubt as to the main features of this great problem and are overriding facts where inquiry seems to have removed doubts, that I confess a great impatience of this capital move that the House seems about to make. The European nations, where scholarship and scientific inquiry is applied to political problems as nowhere else on earth, Germany and France, strictly maintain their agricultural duties. The tariff commission of England, after collecting volumes of facts, has recommended agricultural duties for England.

Years ago, on a stormy afternoon, a gallant steamer sailed down an eastern harbor on its way to a coastwise port. As she went down that harbor other steamers running to that same coast were coming back, for the sky and sea promised ill, but that one steamer went on in defiance of the common judgment of the sea that afternoon. And she went to one of the great sea tragedies of the Atlantic.

Is this House to disregard the common judgment of the nations and without investigation plunge forward to do this great thing? Even before you change the postage rates on a few magazines you have an investigation by a learned commission. But you propose to change the fundamental conditions of 6,000,000 farm homes with no investigation worthy the name.

As one Member I protest against this dangerous haste and against this bill, as tending to break up farm homes, retard rural development, and increase the congestion of the cities. [Loud applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania to yield some further time on his side.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I am afraid I have no person here now to whom I can do it, it is so late.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I hope that hereafter this debate will run in the afternoon longer than it has this evening.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I quite agree with the gentleman, but he should remember that this is Saturday afternoon.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that this is Saturday afternoon and that to-morrow is Easter, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SHERLEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 4412, the Canadian reciprocity bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

SENATE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bill and joint resolutions of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

S. 745. An act providing for the erection of a statue to Thomas Jefferson at Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on the Library.

S. J. Res. 5. Joint resolution to create a joint committee to continue the consideration of the revision and codification of the laws of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

S. J. Res. 8. Joint resolution authorizing the selection of a site and the erection of a statue of Alexander Hamilton in Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on the Library.

ADJOURNMENT.

Then, on motion of Mr. UNDERWOOD (at 4 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until Monday, April 17, 1911, at 12 o'clock m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Deckers Creek, W. Va. (H. Doc. No. 14), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 5286) for the erection of a public building at the city of Upper Sandusky, in the State of Ohio, and appropriating moneys therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5287) for the erection of a public building at the city of Bellevue, in the State of Ohio, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5288) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Clyde, Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5289) for the erection of a public building at the city of Fremont, in the State of Ohio, and appropriating moneys therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 5290) to define the true intent and meaning of section 48 of the act of August 28, 1894, levying taxes on distilled spirits, to regulate the business of reclaiming waste spirits from empty whisky barrels, and to define the status of persons engaged in such business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 5291) to promote the safety of travelers on railroads by compelling common carriers engaged in interstate commerce to strengthen the construction of day or passenger coaches, mail cars, chair, smoking, and combination cars and tourist sleepers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DENVER: A bill (H. R. 5292) for the erection of a memorial structure to Gen. Ulysses S. Grant at Point Pleasant, Ohio; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 5293) to provide for the collection, transcription, and publication of material relating to the history of the United States; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. WOODS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 5294) for the purchase of a site for a post-office building at Algona, Iowa; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5295) for the purchase of a site for a post-office building at Carroll, Iowa; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5296) to erect a memorial to Gen. Nathaniel Lyon; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. PALMER (by request): A bill (H. R. 5297) to place certain soldiers on the pension roll; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 5298) for the erection of a public building at Madison, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5299) to provide for the erection of a public building at Redfield, in the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. PUJO: A bill (H. R. 5300) for the construction of a dam and lock in the Mermentau River, La., and appropriating $75,000 therefor; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5301) to erect an extension to the post-office and Federal court building at Alexandria, La.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5302) for removal of drift and bar at the mouth of Bayou Cortableau, St. Landry Parish, La., for the maintenance of navigation, and appropriating $100,000 therefor; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5303) for the construction of a dam and lock in the Mermentau River, La., and appropriating $75,000 therefor; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5304) for the improvement of the channel of the Red River at Alexandria, La., and appropriating $20,000 therefor; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5305) for the construction of an interstate inland waterway, and appropriating $300,000 therefor; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5306) to erect an extension to the post-office and Federal court building at Alexandria, La.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5307) to provide for improving the navigable capacity of the Calcasieu and the Mermentau Rivers, La.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5308) for protecting the caving banks of Red River at Boyce Landing, Rapides Parish, State of Louisiana; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5309) for the improvement of navigation in Bayou Plaquemine Brule; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5310) for the erection of a public building at Jennings, La.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5311) to erect an extension to the post-office and Federal court building at Alexandria, La.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5312) for the completion of the jetties at Calcasieu Pass and the construction of a channel through Calcasieu Lake, and appropriating $1,150,000 therefor; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ROTHERMEL: A bill (H. R. 5313) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 5314) for a public building at Decatur, Ala.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5315) to provide for a public building at New Decatur, Ala.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 5316) to provide for the removal of the body of the late Maj. Gen. Winfield Scott Hancock from Norristown, Pa., to the national cemetery, Arlington, Va., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5317) authorizing the Secretary of War to procure medals for the Logan Guards, of Lewistown; the Allen Infantry, of Allentown; the Ringgold Light Artillery, of Reading; and the Washington Artillerists and National Light Infantry, of Pottsville, Pa., who were the first soldiers to arrive, on April 18, 1861, for the defense of the city of Washington; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5318) to provide for the purchase of a site for a public building at Lewisburg, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5319) to provide for site and public building at Lewisburg, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5320) to provide for site and public building at Lewistown, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5321) for the erection of a monument to the memory of Conrad Weiser; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5322) to provide for the purchase of a site for a public building at Waynesboro, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5323) to authorize the extension of Underwood Street NW.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 5324) providing for leave of absence for certain civilian employees of the United States Government; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CAMERON: A bill (H. R. 5325) to amend section 2, chapter 1159, United States Statutes at Large, volume 32, part 1, page 405, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. RUBEY: A bill (H. R. 5326) to correct the military record of the officers and enlisted men of the Enrolled Missouri Militia and other militia organizations of the State of Missouri that cooperated with the military forces of the United States in suppressing the War of the Rebellion; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5327) to extend the provisions of the pension acts of June 27, 1890, and of February 6, 1907, to all State militia and other organizations that were organized for the defense of the Union and cooperated with military and naval forces of the United States in the suppression of the Rebellion; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 5328) to regulate the issuance of restraining orders and injunctions and procedure thereon and to limit the meaning of "conspiracy" in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES: A bill (H. R. 5329) to establish the Fredericksburg and adjacent National Battlefields Memorial Park in the State of Virginia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAMLIN: Resolution (H. Res. 95) to give to the respective committees on expenditures in the several executive departments of the Government authority to send for books and papers and other evidences, to subpœna witnesses and examine them under oath, and in other ways to conduct investigations under the rules of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BUCHANAN: Resolution (H. Res. 96) directing the Committee on Labor to investigate the various systems of old-age insurance, old-age pension, and annuities that are now in operation in different countries of the world, and to determine the practicability of establishing such systems in the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CARTER: Resolution (H. Res. 97) authorizing the Speaker to appoint a committee of three to investigate the administration of the affairs of the Five Civilized Tribes by the different departments of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 5330) granting an increase of pension to Edmond R. Ash; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5331) granting an increase of pension to Augustus Snyder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5332) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Scheufler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5333) granting an increase of pension to Daniel F. Babb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5334) granting an increase of pension to Abram H. Handal; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: A bill (H. R. 5335) granting an increase of pension to Frank Craig; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 5336) granting an increase of pension to William Carey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 5337) granting a pension to Samuel H. Weaver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5338) to correct the military record of Thomas J. W. Richards; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 5339) for the relief of Parsey O. Burrough, surviving member of the firm of Henry S. Hannis & Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 5340) granting an increase of pension to Romeo J. Crossland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 5341) granting an increase of pension to Henry Flesher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5342) granting an increase of pension to Camille Mayer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also a bill (H. R. 5343) granting an increase of pension to George H. Bolsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5344) granting an increase of pension to Stephen O. Weston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5345) granting an increase of pension to Charles S. Phelps; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5346) granting an increase of pension to Latimore T. Pinnell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5347) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Barton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5348) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Henry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5349) granting an increase of pension to John N. Baty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5350) for the relief of James Graves; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5351) for the relief of Thomas D. Flynn, alias Thomas D. Allen; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 5352) for the relief of the estate of Moses M. Bane; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DICKINSON: A bill (H. R. 5353) granting an increase of pension to Abraham M. Heifner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DODDS: A bill (H. R. 5354) granting an increase of pension to James H. Hope; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5355) granting an increase of pension to Mary Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5356) granting an increase of pension to William A. De Hart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5357) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5358) granting an increase of pension to John Q. Walling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 5359) granting an increase of pension to Joseph W. Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5360) granting an increase of pension to Peter Beicher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5361) granting an increase of pension to William H. Bobbs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5362) granting an increase of pension to Benneville De Long; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5363) granting an increase of pension to John R. Leffard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5364) granting an increase of pension to Jacob A. Wolfe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5365) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5366) granting an increase of pension to James K. Brewer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5367) granting an increase of pension to Alfred Clelan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5368) granting an increase of pension to John Cluck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5369) granting an increase of pension to David M. Corbett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5370) granting an increase of pension to David Criswell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5371) granting an increase of pension to Samuel De Armitt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5372) granting an increase of pension to Adam Dengler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5373) granting an increase of pension to John Donachy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5374) granting an increase of pension to David B. Dromgold; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5375) granting an increase of pension to Israel Duke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5376) granting an increase of pension to Henry Dunlap; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5377) granting an increase of pension to Oliver Fields; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5378) granting an increase of pension to James E. Forrester; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5379) granting an increase of pension to David Funk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5380) granting an increase of pension to Peter B. Gardner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5381) granting an increase of pension to William Gilbert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5382) granting an increase of pension to Henry Halk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5383) granting an increase of pension to John C. Hamer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5384) granting an increase of pension to Ephriam Hommel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5385) granting an increase of pension to Augustus Hawn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5386) granting an increase of pension to John J. Houswerth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5387) granting an increase of pension to Henry Ickes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5388) granting an increase of pension to Israel A. Kent; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5389) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Locke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5390) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Long; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5391) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Long; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5392) granting an increase of pension to Galen H. Lotz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5393) granting an increase of pension to Henry Loudenschlager; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5394) granting an increase of pension to William B. Long; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5395) granting an increase of pension to Catharine C. Loy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5396) granting an increase of pension to David A. McClure; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5397) granting an increase of pension to William E. McKinstry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5398) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Mader; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5399) granting an increase of pension to John Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5400) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Pope; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5401) granting an increase of pension to William Pope; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5402) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Prough; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5403) granting an increase of pension to Austing Ramsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5404) granting an increase of pension to Lewis A. Ranck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5405) granting an increase of pension to Henry Reed; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5406) granting an increase of pension to Martin L. Rex; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5407) granting an increase of pension to David C. Rhodes; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5408) granting an increase of pension to John J. Rosensteel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5409) granting an increase of pension to John Rourke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5410) granting an increase of pension to David Secrest; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5411) granting an increase of pension to John C. Shaffer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5412) granting an increase of pension to Soworrow F. Shaffer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5413) granting an increase of pension to Jacob B. Shuman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5414) granting an increase of pension to James K. Snyder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5415) granting an increase of pension to Arthur V. B. Sonders; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5416) granting an increase of pension to George M. Spanogle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5417) granting an increase of pension to John A. Speck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5418) granting an increase of pension to George W. Stahl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5419) granting an increase of pension to Amos M. Stroh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5420) granting an increase of pension to Charles S. Swineford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5421) granting an increase of pension to George W. Vertz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5422) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Vandling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5423) granting an increase of pension to George Wineland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5424) granting an increase of pension to William M. Witherow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5425) granting an increase of pension to John Wogan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5426) granting a pension to John D. Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5427) granting a pension to Samuel Bair; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5428) granting a pension to Sadie Doan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5429) granting a pension to William Francis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5430) granting a pension to Sarah E. Hood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5431) granting a pension to Jacob H. Howell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5432) granting a pension to Allison F. Kohler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5433) granting a pension to Casper Wickey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5434) for the relief of W. H. H. Carrigan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5435) for the relief of George W. Clevenger; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5436) for the relief of Peter Keckler; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5437) for the relief of Cyrus E. Kennedy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5438) for the relief of Michael Nave; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5439) for the relief of John M. Querry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5440) for the relief of Jackson Taylor Vann; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5441) for the relief of John Weil; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5442) for the relief of Henry C. Wolfe; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5443) for the relief of the legal representatives of Thomas P. Mitchell; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5444) for the relief of the trustees of Tonoloway Baptist Church, Fulton County, Pa.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5445) to correct the military record of George W. Parker; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GREGG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 5446) granting a pension to Margaret R. Rorabaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENSLEY: A bill (H. R. 5447) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Cooper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HINDS: A bill (H. R. 5448) for the relief of Fred A. Emerson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 5449) for the relief of lock masters, lockmen, and other laborers and mechanics employed by the United States Government in the locks and dams of the Kanawha River, in West Virginia; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 5450) granting an increase of pension to William P. Routt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JONES: A bill (H. R. 5451) for the relief of the heirs of Richard S. Rew, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LANGLEY (by request): A bill (H. R. 5452) for the relief of Elizabeth Lynch; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 5453) granting an increase of pension to James S. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAYS: A bill (H. R. 5454) providing for the releasing of the claim of the United States Government to Arpent lot No. 87, in the old city of Pensacola, Fla.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5455) releasing the claim of the United States Government to that portion of land being a fractional block, bounded on the north and east by Bayou Cadet, on the west by Cevallos Street, and on the south by Intendencia Street, in the old city of Pensacola, Fla.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5456) releasing the claim of the United States Government to lot No. 306, in the old city of Pensacola, Fla.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 5457) granting an increase of pension to William H. Oppelt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 5458) granting an increase of pension to Emma H. Hackett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5459) granting an increase of pension to Edgar A. Whitaker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5460) granting an increase of pension to Frank M. Horton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5461) granting an increase of pension to Martin Sarvin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NORRIS: A bill (H. R. 5462) to correct the military record of Augustus J. Fairbanks; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5463) to correct the military record of Aaron S. Winner; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5464) to correct the military record of Nathaniel Monroe; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER: A bill (H. R. 5465) granting an increase of pension to A. J. Stafford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5466) granting an increase of pension to Esek B. Chandler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5467) granting an increase of pension to T. J. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PUJO: A bill (H. R. 5468) granting an increase of pension to Henry E. Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5469) granting an increase of pension to John Humphreys; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5470) granting an increase of pension to Charles J. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5471) granting an increase of pension to Peter W. Fredricks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5472) granting an increase of pension to Aaron H. Waitt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5473) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Hetrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5474) granting an increase of pension to J. A. Goodale; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5475) granting an increase of pension to Peter W. Fredricks; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5476) granting a pension to Fannie L. McVey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5477) granting a pension to Florinda Butler Evans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5478) granting a pension to Elizabeth P. Bell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5479) granting a pension to James R. Pittard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5480) for the relief of David Siess; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5481) for the relief of G. S. Cheves; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5482) for the relief of Alonzo L. Boyer; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5483) for the relief of J. Martin Compton; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5484) for the relief of Florimand Izard; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5485) for the relief of Martin Guillory; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5486) for the relief of Odon Ducatte; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5487) for the relief of Blaize Motte; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5488) for the relief of W. T. Maddox and others; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5489) for the relief of Marcelin Martin; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5490) for the relief of Mrs. Octave Simoneaux, of Alexandria, parish of Rapides, La.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5491) for the relief of the estate of William Bailey, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5492) for the relief of the estate of Francois Joseph Vantrot, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5493) for the relief of estate of Pierre C. Richard, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5494) for the relief of the estate of Theophile Sanvald; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5495) for the relief of the estate of Babtice Joubert, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5496) for the relief of the estate of Abraham Wimberly, deceased, late of Acadia Parish, La.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5497) for the relief of the heirs of Francois Pitre, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5498) for the relief of the heirs of Dalicourt Pitre, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5499) for the relief of heirs of Joseph Gradengo; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5500) for the relief of heirs of Hillaire Paillett, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5501) for the relief of the heirs of Felix Dejean; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5502) for the relief of the heirs of Pierre Goudeau; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5503) for the relief of the heirs of Rodolphe Chachere; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5504) for relief of the heirs of J. Casimir Le Blanc; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5505) for the relief of the heirs of Joseph D. Guidry; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5506) for the relief of the heirs of Felix J. Guidry; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5507) for the relief of heirs of Victor Lastrapes, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5508) for the relief of heirs of Emile Lambert, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5509) for the relief of heirs of Robert M. Morrow, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5510) for the relief of the heirs of Jean Marie Tatin, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5511) for the relief of heirs of Laura H. Cheves, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5512) for the relief of heirs of Mrs. Louis Valliere, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5513) for the relief of heirs of Jean Baptiste Rabot, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5514) for the relief of the heirs of Jabez Tanner, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5515) for the relief of heirs of Jean Baptiste Malveau, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5516) for the relief of the heirs of Daniel Goos, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5517) for the relief of heirs of Thomas J. Hickman, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5518) for the relief of the heirs of Louis Malveau, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5519) for the relief of heirs of H. T. Burges, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5520) for the relief of the heirs of Jabez Tanner, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5521) for the relief of heirs or estate of Andre N. Robin, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5522) for the relief of heirs or estate of Louis Lalonde, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5523) for the relief of heirs or estates of Stephen W. Quirk and Anne L. Quirk, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5524) for the relief of heirs or estate of Martha L. Wells, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5525) for the relief of the heirs or legal representatives of Eugene Senette, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5526) for the relief of the heirs or legal representatives of Joseph Ezernack, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5527) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Bernard Curley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5528) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Zephania Squyres; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5529) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of the estate of Alexander Lemelle, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5530) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of Alphonse Meuillon; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5531) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of the estate of Euphemie Lemelle, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5532) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of Sarah Bushnell and others; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5533) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of the estate of Clarisse Donato, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5534) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of the estate of Rigobert Lemelle, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5535) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of the estate of Bellot A. Donato, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5536) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of the estate of Jean Baptiste Lazare, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5537) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Alfred C. Parham, administrator; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5538) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of the estate of Lucien Meuillon, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5539) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of the heirs of Matthew J. Jones, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5540) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Matthew J. Jones, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5541) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in case of Emile E. Zimmer, administrator of estate of George Neck, sr., deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5542) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Marie Josephine Le Sassier,

administratrix of estate of François Meuillon, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RAUCH: A bill (H. R. 5543) granting an increase of pension to David M. Kinsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5544) granting an increase of pension to George Cantner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5545) granting an increase of pension to James Mullins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5546) granting an increase of pension to William A. Rusie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5547) granting a pension to William Swift Wright; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5548) granting a pension to Thomas J. Colfer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5549) granting a pension to Clarinda H. Armstrong; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5550) granting a pension to Annetta B. Finch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5551) granting a pension to Roy Bruner; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5552) for the relief of William H. Carroll; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5553) for the relief of John Lynch; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 5554) granting an increase of pension to John Wood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5555) granting an increase of pension to John Chaney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5556) granting a pension to R. D. Fleming; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5557) granting a pension to John Hodges; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 5558) for the relief of Xantippe Jackson; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5559) for the relief of the estates of Stephen Cordell and Elizabeth Cordell, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SHARP: A bill (H. R. 5560) granting an increase of pension to Milford James; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5561) granting an increase of pension to George W. Cushman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5562) granting an increase of pension to John Galloway; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5563) granting an increase of pension to Fidel Saile; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5564) granting an increase of pension to Zenus Funk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5565) granting an increase of pension to John McPhern; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5566) granting an increase of pension to Michael R. Godfrey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5567) granting an increase of pension to Joseph C. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5568) granting an increase of pension to Clark S. Berry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5569) granting an increase of pension to James Fitch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5570) granting an increase of pension to Thomas C. Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5571) granting a pension to Fanny I. Burt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SIMMONS: A bill (H. R. 5572) for the relief of Robert Coggan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SPEER: A bill (H. R. 5573) granting an increase of pension to James M. Wonders; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5574) granting an increase of pension to James M. Tabor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5575) granting an increase of pension to Seymour Wheelock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5576) granting an increase of pension to George C. Richards; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5577) granting an increase of pension to Sidney J. Crocker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STANLEY: A bill (H. R. 5578) granting a pension to Escar Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 5579) granting an increase of pension to John R. Hurd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5580) granting an increase of pension to David H. Daywalt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5581) granting an increase of pension to John W. Foot; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5582) granting an increase of pension to Smith M. Demeree; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5583) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Foote; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5584) granting an increase of pension to James A. Gooch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5585) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Seger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5586) granting a pension to Elizabeth Merlett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VREELAND: A bill (H. R. 5587) granting an increase of pension to Joel Wright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5588) granting an increase of pension to Almon B. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5589) granting an increase of pension to Levi E. Morey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIS: A bill (H. R. 5590) granting an increase of pension to George L. Byers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 5591) granting an increase of pension to Clinton S. Palmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 5592) granting an increase of pension to George R. Shebbeard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 5593) granting a pension to Alma D. Farley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5594) for the relief of Daniel Swisher; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. AKIN of New York: Petitions of Auresville Grange, Mapletown Grange, Gansevoort Grange, Saratoga Grange, Glens Falls Grange, Mayfield Grange, Montgomery County Agricultural Society, George L. Cary, and Leebers' Lane Grange, all of the State of New York, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio: Petition of Clyde Kraut Co., of Clyde, Ohio, asking for amendment to pure-food law indorsing "name on label"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BARTLETT: Resolutions of the Georgia-Florida Sawmill Association, relating to the tariff on lumber, iron, steel, and sawmill machinery; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESCH: Petitions of Emil H. Lorenz and others, of La Crosse, Wis., in favor, and of the Manufacturers and Jobbers' Club of La Crosse, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Casberg Camp, No. 11, United Spanish War Veterans, Department of Wisconsin, for the repeal of the anti-canteen law; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Resolutions adopted at a mass meeting held by the Irish-American and German-American societies of New York, opposing under any guise the establishment of closer relations with Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of International Brotherhood of Papermakers, in opposition to Canadian reciprocity bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Atlanta Builders' Exchange for the repeal of the eight-hour law as to Government contracts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANNA: Petition of citizens of Walsh County, N. Dak., against the pending reciprocity treaty with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of C. W. Hammilton, of Lisbon, N. Dak., against extension of the parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of North Dakota, favoring additional compensation for rural free delivery carriers of mail; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HENRY of Texas: Petition of various citizens of McLennan County, Tex., asking for the withdrawal of United States troops from the Mexican border; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LOUD: Petition of H. H. Stickfort and 8 others, residents of Lewiston, Mich., urging the establishing of a parcels-post system; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of W. C. Shepard and other residents of Mikado, Mich., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McKINNEY: Resolutions of Tri-City Federation of Labor, of Rock Island and Moline, Ill., and Davenport, Iowa, opposed to the concentration of troops on the Mexican border; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER: Resolution of Tri-City Federation of Labor at Davenport, Iowa, and Rock Island and Moline, Ill., protesting the concentration of United States military forces on borders of Mexico and against any intervention of the United States forces in the affairs of Mexico; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of White Prairie Grange No. 2039, Wilton Junction, Iowa, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of G. W. Kiess, of De Witt; W. E. Spencer and others, of Davenport; N. K. Ross and others, of Victor, and Joseph F. Holub, of Iowa City, against rural parcels-post service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada: Protest of members of local Fallon Socialist Party, against the mobilization of troops on the Mexican border; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), protest of citizens of Sheffield, Pa., against the mobilization of troops on the Mexican border; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SIMMONS: Petitions of Scottsburg Grange, No. 1220; Bethany Grange, No. 748; Transit Grange, No. 1092; North Java Grange, No. 1158; Lyndonville Grange, No. 1146; Stafford Grange, No. 418; Perry Grange, No. 1163; Grange No. 1086, of Hermitage, Wyoming County; Kent Grange, No. 1145; Warsaw Grange, No. 1088; Wyoming County Pomona Grange; Dale Grange, No. 1171; Darien Grange, No. 1063; Hermitage Grange, No. 1086; Corfu Grange; Medina Grange, No. 1160; Gaines Grange, No. 1147; Clarendon Grange, No. 1083; Knowlesville Grange, No. 1124; Attica Grange, No. 1058; Bergen Grange, No. 163; Waterport Grange, No. 1039; Byron Grange, No. 395; Gasport Grange, No. 1151; Pomona Grange of Genesee County; and Pomona Grange of Livingston County, Patrons of Husbandry, all in the State of New York; and of Maple Ridge Culture Club, of Medina, and the Chamber of Commerce of Watertown, protesting against the Canadian reciprocity treaty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. J. M. C. SMITH: Petitions of Advance Pump & Compressor Co. and Progressive Republicans' League, of Battle Creek, Mich., in favor of Canadian reciprocity treaty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions and protests of Brady Grange, No. 61; Fred. M. Warner, ex-governor of Michigan; Bert Smith; National Lincoln Sheep Breeders' Association; Calhoon Bros., Oak Grove Farms; certain members American Ramboiullet Sheep Breeders' Association; Isbell Bean Co.; Kalamazoo Paper Co. and Standard Paper Co., of Kalamazoo, Mich., in opposition to Canadian reciprocity treaty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIS: Petitions of W. F. Strahm and other members of Friendship Grange, No. 670, Kenton, Ohio, and F. J. Burner and other members of Benton Ridge Grange, No. 942, Benton Ridge, Ohio, against the passage of the Canadian reciprocity agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOOD of New Jersey: Papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to George R. Shebbeard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolutions of Lawrenceville Grange, No. 170, Patrons of Husbandry, of Lawrenceville, N. J., protesting against the enactment of proposed reciprocal tariff legislation between the United States and Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

Monday, *April 17, 1911.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday last was read and approved.

SENATOR FROM WASHINGTON.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, my colleague [Mr. POINDEXTER] is present and ready to take the oath.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator elect from Washington will present himself at the desk.

Mr. POINDEXTER was escorted to the Vice President's desk by Mr. JONES, and the oath prescribed by law having been administered to him, he took his seat in the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by W. J. Browning, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2058. An act to amend an act entitled "An act providing for publicity of contributions made for the purpose of influencing elections at which Representatives in Congress are elected"; and

H. J. Res. 39. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing that Senators shall be elected by the people of the several States.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a petition of the United States Extra Customs Laborers' Association of the port of New York, praying for the enactment of legislation to ameliorate the present condition of certain employees serving as extra customs laborers in the customs service of New York, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Church of the Brethren of Beatrice, Nebr., and a petition of the congregation of the Verdigris Church, of Madison, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation for the suppression of the opium evil, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the national committee of the Unemployed and the Brotherhood Welfare Association, praying for the enactment of legislation to ameliorate the condition of the wage earners of the country, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. McCUMBER presented memorials of sundry citizens of Hatton, Grafton, Walsh County, Adams County, Richland County, Washburn, Gardner, Williams County, Harvey, Stark County, Steele County, Ransom County, Bottineau County, McLean County, and Sargent County, all in the State of North Dakota, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Waterbury, Conn., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented memorials of Local Grange of Hillstown; Indian River Grange, of Milford; Local Grange of West Hartford; and of Local Grange of Clinton, of the Patrons of Husbandry, and of the Business Men's and Civic Association of Wethersfield, all in the State of Connecticut, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GALLINGER presented memorials of the International Brotherhood of Paper Makers; of Local Grange of Pembroke; Local Grange of Union; Local Grange of Bedford; Local Grange of Westmoreland; Local Grange No. 167, of Candia; and of Local Grange No. 208, of Franconia, of the Patrons of Husbandry; and of sundry citizens of Lee, Surry, Westmoreland, Manchester, and Mount Vernon, all in the State of New Hampshire, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of Charles Gordon and 36 other citizens of Nashua, N. H., praying for the establishment of a national department of public health, which were referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

Mr. BRISTOW presented a petition of Post No. 73, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kansas, of Neosho Falls, Kans., and a petition of D. M. Vance Post, No. 2, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kansas, praying for the passage of the so-called old-age pension bill, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Church of the Brethren of McPherson, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors into prohibition districts, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. OLIVER presented a memorial of Local Grange No. 806, Patrons of Husbandry, of Elk Lake, Pa., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. McLEAN presented memorials of Central Pomona Grange, No. 1, of Berlin; Plainville Grange, No. 54, of Plainville; West Hartford Grange, of West Hartford; and Mad River Grange, of Waterbury, of the Patrons of Husbandry, and of the Busi-