MASSACHUSETTS.

Elmer W. Hallett, Yarmouth Port.

MICHIGAN.

Samuel Fuller, Lewiston.

MINNESOTA.

L. O. Haugen, Harmony.
George M. Kaupp, Blue Earth.
Oscar Krook, Marshall.
Martin L. Murphy, Browerville.
N. C. Nelson, Two Harbors.
Emma C. Taylor, Chaska.

MISSOURI.

Joseph H. Harris, Kansas City.

OHIO.

John W. Beckett, North Baltimore.
Elmer C. Jesse, Mineral City.
Homer S. Kent, Chagrin Falls.
Earl W. Mauck, Gallipolis.
Joel P. De Wolfe, Fostoria.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

Charles S. Harter, Elk Point.
May A. Knappen, Sisseton.
Hiram A. Mason, Bowdle.
William A. Schwichtenberg, Kadoka.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *April 17, 1911.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., as follows:

Our Father in Heaven, we thank Thee that the English-speaking people all over the world are pausing at this time from the busy whirl and turmoil of life's activities to celebrate the tricentennial of the King James version of the Bible, a light which shone out of the darkness, the basis of our civilization, food for the hungry, water for the thirsty, strength for the weak, rest for the weary, comfort for the sorrowing, and hope for the dying, a very present help in every trouble.

Grant, O most merciful Father, that it may bind us so closely together that war between us will be forever impossible; that we may march forward shoulder to shoulder in the peaceful pursuits of life to the higher civilization which waits on those who serve the Lord. And Thine be the praise forever, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, April 15, 1911, was read and approved.

THE PRAYER.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe there are any words uttered within this Chamber that are more worthy of preservation or of more benefit to those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD than those which fall from the lips of our Chaplain every morning. It will take but a stickful of space in the RECORD to print the invocation of our beloved blind Chaplain, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that hereafter during the Sixty-second Congress the morning prayer be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The Chair agrees with the gentleman and directs that the prayers be published in the RECORD.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS.

Mr. GALLAGHER and Mr. STACK, of Illinois, appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

SMOKING.

The SPEAKER. Several Members have requested the Chair to have read the last sentence of subdivision 7 of Rule XIV, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Neither shall any person be allowed to smoke upon the floor of the House at any time.

The SPEAKER. The Chair directs the officers of the House to see that that rule is enforced.

CANADIAN RECIPROCITY.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the 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 motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of Canadian reciprocity, with Mr. SHERLEY in the chair.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY]. [Applause.]

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I am somewhat reluctant in attempting to make any remarks at this time on this measure. This bill is in the same form, with the exception of an added amendment, as it was when before the House only a few weeks ago, and at that time I expressed myself somewhat fully as to my opinion of the merits or demerits of the measure. The bill in its present form provides further than was provided for in the original bill introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCALL], that the President of the United States shall have the power to further consider and, if possible, arrange further trade treaties with Canada with a view to placing other articles upon the free list than those mentioned in the proposed bill or treaty. It will be remembered that in the Dingley tariff law there was a provision, section 3, of that law, which gave the power to the President of the United States to make trade agreements with France and other nations when, in his judgment, he thought it might be wise to lower certain rates of duty on certain imports mentioned in that law. It will be well remembered by every gentleman present that the treaties were put upon our statute books. Such treaties were arranged between Germany, France, and other nations of the world by the President, the provisions of which were disastrous to the people of the United States. All of those treaties were repealed when the present Payne tariff law was enacted. All those treaties were abrogated; that is to say, the President of the United States was directed to give notice to all those nations which had entered into treaties with the United States that at a certain time those treaties should be discontinued.

I want to call the attention of some gentlemen present, because it applies to this bill, that in these trade treaties it was provided that goods coming into this country should pay a rate of duty based upon the foreign value of such goods when imported, and great frauds under those treaties were perpetrated upon our Government by undervaluation, and it is, perhaps, a matter of common knowledge to all gentlemen present that under existing laws that practice has been carried on, and only recently some great sugar-refining companies of this country were convicted by the Government for frauds upon the United States Treasury, and some New York firm was prosecuted (and I am not certain but that case is now in court) for undervaluations on valuable works of art. The matter was called to the attention of the Committee on Ways and Means when they were preparing the tariff law that on one article alone, a certain kind of china cups and saucers, it had been found by the manufacturers of that class of goods in this country that there had been a very large importation of that kind of chinaware from Europe, which was being sold at a lower price than that class of goods could be made for by Americans, and upon investigation a gentleman before our committee stated that he had been sent abroad by the china manufacturers of this country and, after long effort, located the manufacturers of these goods in Belgium. It was found that the manufacturers of these goods in Belgium had a house in Paris, France, which was really a branch house, or a part of the institution, although under another name. It was found that the concern in Paris was shipping those goods to some one in America, really a member of the firm that manufactured the goods, and at the time the investigation was made it was found that the actual cost value of the importation of cups and saucers alone, as I now remember, was eight and a half million dollars, yet the import value, as given by the importer, was $5,000,000; and, therefore, this Government had been robbed of its fair rate of duty on three and a half million dollars' worth of goods out of a total value of eight and a half million dollars.

Therefore, gentlemen, I wish to warn you against voting for further continuance of such practice, against placing in the hands of any one individual in this country the power to make our trade treaties. But I must add that in this bill that section provides, however, that before those treaties can become effective they must be approved by Congress. That is a saving clause. But, gentlemen, when you deal with treaties of that kind it is like a child playing with fire. I want to caution you against it. I would vote against the Canadian trade agreement because of that provision alone, even if I had no other objection to the treaty.

I want to say in the beginning that I am an admirer of our President, William H. Taft. He will be the Republican candidate for reelection, if he lives until that time. [Applause on the Republican side.] If I am alive at that time, I will give

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

him my most hearty support, as I have in the past. I am frank to say, gentlemen, that I disagree with his views on Canadian reciprocity. I have a right to disagree with him on that proposition, or with any other, or all men. I am exercising my judgment as my conscience dictates as to what is right and best for the American people; and upon that platform I am going to stand.

There is no question in the mind of any man within the sound of my voice, or beyond the sound of my voice, but that conditions in Canada to-day are as good, if not better, than ever before in the history of that country. Before I conclude my remarks I will try to give you some of what, in my judgment, I consider good reasons why the people of Canada are prosperous to-day. I may say in the beginning, however, that they are a protective nation. They believe in protection, not only for Canadian labor but Canadian capital as well. And they are carrying that out to a greater extent than the people of the United States are to-day carrying out that policy so long cherished by the Republican Party in this country. In order to preserve to Canadian labor the right to produce the things in that country that under their protective-tariff system they claim would be most beneficial to their laboring people and to their capital, let me say to you that they are protecting to the extreme all their raw materials.

In the enactment of the Dingley law of 1897 a clause was inserted providing that an additional duty on lumber should be added to any country that put an export duty on logs, the raw forest material. Canada was quick to find a way to get around that feature of our law, because at that time we were importing into this country from Canada large quantities of saw logs and the sawmills around the Great Lakes were manufacturing annually 400,000,000 feet of lumber cut from Canadian saw logs imported from Canada. Canada quickly saw the wisdom, as I have said, in the policy of retaining for Canadian capital and Canadian labor the manufacturing of that 400,000,000 feet of lumber in Canada. And what did they do? Instead of placing an export duty upon logs, they put an embargo upon them. They put a provision in their license, a license to cut timber from public lands, and all lands, practically, in Canada are owned by the Provinces, which license expires the 1st of May every year, that provided that the holder of the license when cutting timber from those lands should manufacture that product in Canada, preserving thereby to the labor of Canada the right to put from five to eight dollars of labor upon every thousand feet of lumber taken from their woods—a very wise provision, indeed. And from that day to this, my friends, practically no logs have been imported into the United States from Canada, except in the great Northwest, on Puget Sound, under a law which permits the officer in charge to remove that embargo at will by giving 30 days' notice in certain papers. From time to time, when their log market in the Northwest has become congested by an oversupply of logs, that embargo has been removed and they have dumped their surplus of logs at times upon our markets and then immediately put back the embargo. But no American, no owner of a sawmill in the United States, under any law, is warranted in beginning a logging operation in Canada with the view of bringing his logs to a sawmill in the United States. It is prohibited in every Province in Canada. But I say in that respect, my friends, Canada has been exceedingly wise in protecting her home industry and home labor.

Some gentleman on the floor of the House made some remarks about barbed fencing wire. That article is mentioned in this trade treaty. Upon an examination of the records I find that no barbed wire has come into this country from Canada at all.

You are not honest with the farmers of this country when you say to them, "We are going to give you free barbed wire from Canada."

Now, my friends, the farmer is no young bird to be fooled on chaff. You can not flimflam the farmer by any such provision in this or any other law.

I find, on the other hand, that we shipped into Canada last year seven hundred and some odd thousand dollars' worth of barbed-wire fencing. The factories of this country produced that much of wire fencing and shipped it into Canada. I am delighted indeed to know that an institution in this country can send its product to Canada and sell it at a profit.

It is proposed in the farmers' free-trade bill, introduced by our Democratic friends, to put barbed wire for fencing from the whole world on the free list and bring it into this country. Look up the records and find out how much has been brought in under existing law. Practically none. But it is true, in order to protect that industry in this country, in existing law there is a duty of three-quarters of a cent per pound on that class of wire.

I am one of the committee who voted for that law. I am ready at all times to preserve not only the American market for American manufactures, but I am ready at all times to protect every institution, every mill, every factory, every forge in this land, whether it be in the Southland or in the Northland, against the cheap labor of the world. I want to see all the barbed wire or any other wire fencing that is consumed in this country produced from the iron mines of the United States and converted into finished product by American capital and American labor. [Applause on the Republican side.]

But let me go further and say that there is no change in the existing law on wire in this trade agreement. Our wire went into Canada free of duty before this treaty was ever thought of. Why, then, is it put into the law at all? Perhaps upon the assumption that hereafter Canada is going to produce barbed wire cheaper than we can produce it. Then some day in the far-off future our farmers can buy from Canada barbed wire cheaper than they can buy it from the manufacturers in this country.

You are focusing your range at a very long distance when you throw out a sop of that kind to the American farmer.

Now, there is a document known as Senate document No. 862, introduced in the Senate by ex-Senator Carter, of Montana, a gentleman for whom I have the highest admiration. He is an estimable gentleman, an intelligent man. I regret exceedingly on seeing him go out of the Congress of the United States. He was one of the great legislators of this country. But upon an examination of that document which I have here—and I am sincere in that statement—it would appear that instead of Senator Carter having prepared that document, he never read it; never read its contents. It says, "Mr. Carter presented the following." That is the only place in the document that you can find the slightest semblance of Mr. Carter's name, or his intellect or his politics in it. It was undoubtedly prepared by somebody who is a gatherer of statistics.

In that article, which I have not the time to analyze fully, you will find that the writer says by opening up our markets to Canada's wheat and removing our duty of 25 cents per bushel, the flour mills of the United States can control the market of flour for the world; that by giving the flouring mills of this country free trade in wheat from Canada they can monopolize the flour market of Europe; that we have the milling capacity at the present time to supply all Europe with flour.

The average man to-day is preaching against monopoly, but here is a man who would monopolize the flour market of the world by our giving free trade in wheat. I know some stories that would work in well here, but I am too busy trying to quote to you actual facts to inject any nonsense into my remarks. The gentleman argues that if the duties on wheat are removed, the mills in the United States can purchase Canada's wheat and then supply England and all Europe with flour.

How weak and flimsy is such an argument! The writer evidently does not know the terms of existing law. I presume every man here knows the existing law on wheat as well as I do, but fearing someone might not know the terms of existing law will say there is no bar to-day against mills in the United States supplying Europe with flour under practically free trade conditions. There are two provisions in our tariff law. One provides that the manufacturers of flour in this country can import wheat from any foreign country, and when exporting the finished product of that wheat can go to the Treasury of the United States and draw back 99 per cent of the duty paid.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. FORDNEY. Certainly.

Mr. STANLEY. Where the Canadian wheat and the American wheat are mixed, as I understand they are in these large mills, is it practicable then to get this drawback?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes. I thank the gentleman for the question. It is as practicable to get that drawback on the imported wheat in that barrel of flour as it is to get the drawback on the imported lumber in a door made partly out of Canadian lumber and partly out of American lumber, because all that is necessary is for the miller to furnish satisfactory affidavits to the Treasury of the United States as to the amount of foreign imported wheat that a barrel of flour contains, and that is very easy. Now, let me go just a little further on that, and say to you that I was engaged in the manufacture of flour at one time just long enough to lose all the money I put into the industry, but to get some education in the business. I was interested for five years in the manufacture of flour. I found that by economical methods and modern machinery and the proper kind of bolting cloths a barrel of flour, 196 pounds, can be produced from 4 bushels and 40 pounds of wheat. There are

280 pounds of wheat in 4 bushels and 40 pounds. That leaves 84 pounds of offal, bran, and middlings, or shorts, as some people call it. In the manufacture of foreign imported wheat that is exported, on which the miller is entitled to a drawback, he must either export the offal or pay duty on it. But I contend, gentlemen, that when he sends abroad only the flour and markets the bran and middlings in this country, which come in competition with the same article manufactured from American grain, he ought to pay duty on that which he markets in the United States. On 4 bushels and 40 pounds of wheat the duty at 25 cents a bushel is $1.16⅔, or nearly that fraction. With a drawback of 99 per cent of that it leaves the duty cost to the American manufacturer 1⅓ cents per barrel. Is that going to prevent any miller in this country from importing wheat from Canada and then exporting the manufactured product? If so, I would like to have some man figure it out to me.

Again, there is another provision in our law that permits the American miller to import wheat in bond and take it to his mill sealed in the car. The Government will either break the seal or authorize the miller to break it and take that wheat into his mill and convert it into the finished product, put it back into the car, and send it abroad, without the payment of any duty at all. If the statements I have made are true, can you tell me any bar to the American miller right now bringing in all the Canadian wheat his mill can grind, converting it into the finished product, and then sending it abroad?

But, my friends, when our present tariff law was being prepared by the committee, mill men appeared before that committee and demanded free trade on Canadian wheat, because they said they are so handicapped by red tape in getting back this 99 per cent of duty. Ah, my friends, the "nigger in the fence" is that they want the offal put upon the free list, because they want to market it in the United States. Now, on the other hand, I have told you what the existing law is. Do you believe it is possible to take down our tariff wall, invite competition from the whole world on competitive products, and under that system raise the price of our products in this country? I never knew but one man who claimed to be a great man who used such an argument. As to his being a great man, he and I differ. He is an ex-Senator from Indiana. He said he was in favor of a law that would increase the wages of American laboring men and also decrease the price of the product of such labor. He reminds me of a man who once said he could do anything on God's green earth that any other man could do. Some one who doubted him said, "There was a gentleman here yesterday who lifted himself by the ears of his boots. Let us see you do it." He spent the balance of the summer in trying and finally failed.

Mr. Carter introduced this bill. He is a great man, but evidently introduced it without due consideration.

He reminds me of a piece of attempted legislation introduced by a member of the legislature of one of our States. He, too, evidently introduced a bill which had been sent to him by a friend and without his reading it at all. When read, it was found that it provided for the improvement by deepening and widening the alimentary canal. [Laughter.] There is just about as much sense in this proposition as there was in that.

That wheat is cheaper in Canada than it is in the United States no intelligent man will dispute. Some argument has been made here that the price of wheat on both sides of the line does not vary much, if any. But the gentleman making that argument forgets that the grade of wheat mentioned or the price of wheat in the various markets is based upon the value and the grade of the wheat. All grades of wheat are not of the same value. So when the price of wheat is stated to be the same in Canada as in the Dakotas and Minnesota or at Minneapolis and St. Paul markets, you may mark down in your memorandum books that it is not the same grade of wheat, because there is a difference in the value in our markets for the various grades of wheat.

Mr. SIMS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Certainly.

Mr. SIMS. Is it the gentleman's contention that the higher price of wheat in the United States, conceding that it is higher, is due to the protective tariff on wheat?

Mr. FORDNEY. It is, and I will try to give the gentleman my reason. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee, with all courtesy. I will answer all questions asked me to the best of my ability.

Mr. SIMS. I know the gentleman will, and that is the reason I asked the question.

Mr. FORDNEY. I will give you some figures that will explain that which I have taken from the records. During the four years prior to the last Democratic, and the only Democratic, administration we have had since the Republican Party was born, the years 1890, 1891, 1892, and 1893, we produced in this country per year 480,000,000 bushels, in round numbers. The price of that wheat for those four years averaged the farmers of the country 71 cents per bushel, or $1,383,000,000. For the four years during the life of the Wilson bill, or its anticipation rather, it was only on the statute books 36 months, as I remember—for the four years during the agitation of that question and the life of the law, we produced in this country 471,000,000 bushels of wheat per year. The value of the wheat in this country at that time was 63.4 cents per bushel. The value of the wheat in this country, based upon the price for those four years compared with the previous four years, brought a loss to our farmers of $180,000,000.

I have gone further, my friends, and have followed the statistics for four years following the repeal of the Wilson bill—and, by the way, the Wilson bill did not admit wheat free of duty; the rate of duty in that law was 20 per cent ad valorem—and during the life of that bill was the time I had my experience in the milling business. I purchased wheat in the State of Michigan at my mill for 48 cents a bushel delivered at the mill. During the four years succeeding the life of that bill, which placed wheat upon the protected list at 20 per cent ad valorem, the production of wheat in this country amounted to 625,000,000 bushels per year and the price 69.9 cents, a difference to the farmer, as compared with the four years of Democratic tariff laws, of $200,180,000.

Now, my friends, let us go further. It is contended by the friends of this treaty that by placing wheat on the free list our exports will increase. How much truth or fact is there in that argument? I believe a fair comparison with our exports during the life of the Wilson bill would be a good test. Let me state what our exports were under that bill and for four years prior and the succeeding four years.

Our total exports for the four years prior to the adoption of that bill were 417,000,000 bushels. And during these four long, lean, lank years, when the duty had been lowered on wheat to 20 per cent ad valorem, we exported only 364,000,000 bushels.

Now, for the next four years, with an increased rate of duty to 25 cents a bushel, there were 582,000,000 bushels exported. Is there anything in that argument that will lead any man of fair mind to contend that by lowering the duty on wheat we are going to increase our exports? If so, furnish me with the proof. While I am not from Missouri, I am a protectionist.

Mr. SIMS. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. FORDNEY. Certainly.

Mr. SIMS. If increasing the tariff increases the exports, how does it increase the price of wheat in this country?

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, by protecting American institutions and American capital the wheels of industry in this country run full time. The people are encouraged under prosperity [applause on the Republican side] and they languish under free trade. We produced less wheat in the country then than we did before or since. Because of the price the farmer was depressed and he resorted to the production of some other article upon his farm from which he made some profit, and I contend that under a protective system when our institutions are running full blast we can produce at a lower cost than when running on half-time, as I will try to show in another line of industry which I can, perhaps, make a little clearer than I can the question of wheat. But all know that the farmer of this country at that time was in poverty—not in good standing, but in poverty—during those four years; and again during those four lean years the statistics show that we consumed in this country but 3½ bushels of wheat per capita per annum, where, under existing law—and this condition has existed now for 12 years—the American people are consuming to-day nearly 6½ bushels per capita per annum. A great orator once said upon the floor of this House in arguing for a protective tariff—

> Give work to the laboring man and you furnish him employment for his teeth.

We consume more to-day than we did then, and that is reasonable, because our purchasing power is greater to-day than it was then. It is perfectly reasonable when a man's wages are $2 per day, as compared with $1 per day, that his purchasing power is just double, but his purchasing power is measured to a large extent by the prices paid for the articles that he consumes. Lower prices prevail to-day for all farm products in this country than have prevailed now for several years.

All will admit that for the last few years prices of farm products have been abnormal, but during all that time manufactured products have gone on only at a reasonable price in this country. Labor has been advanced further than has the price of the manufactured product, but not quite in line with the advance

in the prices of agricultural products; but with declining prices in all agricultural products to-day, we do not hear of any reduction of wages in any institution in the country, or at least but very few.

My friend Mr. McCALL, a gentleman for whom I have the very highest regard, in an article in the Independent, published as of April 6, said that the way to increase or aid our markets is to aid the customer; that if you increase the purchasing power of the customer you will increase the markets for your own products. I agree with the gentleman fully in every respect in that statement, but when the gentleman from Massachusetts made that statement he was talking about Canada, about increasing the purchasing power of the Canadian, and therefore, he said, giving to our farmers in this country a better market for their products. The gentleman evidently overlooked the fact that when he was talking about increasing the purchasing power of seven and a half or eight million people in Canada, he was striking a deathblow at 35,000,000 farmers in the United States. The gentleman is overlooking the important fact that when you are aiding the Canadian in his purchasing power by opening up our markets to him for his products, the farmers of the United States are the greatest purchasers of all products, both manufactured and agricultural, on the face of the globe.

The gentleman from Massachusetts would cast aside the 35,000,000 men, women, and children on farms in this country and look solely to the interest of the Canadian in order that we might sell a little more barbed wire over there. Again, the gentleman from Massachusetts states in that article that on wheat and flour we are sending to Canada more than we purchase from Canada. The gentleman is absolutely wrong in his figures. It is true that a great deal of exports of wheat and flour from this country enter Canada and leave Canada on their way to Europe, and I think the gentleman obtains his figures from such exportations, giving credit for all of that to Canada. But let me call his attention to the figures set forth in this trade treaty, in which he will find that last year we exported to Canada in round numbers less than 55,000 bushels of wheat. We imported from Canada during that same time nearly 153,000 bushels of wheat. At the same time we exported to Canada, in round numbers, 31,000 barrels of flour and imported from Canada 144,000 barrels of flour. Where does the gentleman from Massachusetts get his figures? When I was in the flour-mill business, like Mr. CARTER with his argument that he introduced, I went into the business because I had more money than brains, and very little of either, perhaps. I purchased a mill in my home town, and after getting into the business I found that we had in that city a milling capacity for 700 barrels of flour a day in a town with but 45,000 people, and the consuming capacity of the people of that town was less than 200 barrels per day, so that in order to run our mill for 10 hours a day we were obliged to export from the city 500 barrels of flour per day, and we had to go out into the world to find a market for that much surplus flour manufactured in my home town.

The question of exporting flour came up, and I examined the rates of freight abroad. We were at that time exporting a fair share of our product to Providence, R. I., on which we paid 73 cents per barrel freight from Saginaw, Mich., to Providence, R. I. I found that the great flour mills of Duluth, Minn., and Minneapolis and St. Paul were at the same time sending flour to London, England, for 50 cents a barrel, and as soon as my supply of money ran out I went out of the flour business; and I would advise all of my friends to keep out of the business unless you have very cheap fuel, such as water power, for you can not succeed beyond the limits of the county in which your flour mill is located unless you have very cheap power or cheap fuel.

Mr. SIMS. Would it annoy the gentleman if I interrupted him?

Mr. FORDNEY. No; the gentleman would not annoy me.

Mr. SIMS. Is it a fact, then, that we do lose on the wheat and flour we ship abroad?

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, no; I do not say that; I do not think so.

Mr. SIMS. If flour is higher and wheat is higher here than abroad, how can we sell abroad at a profit?

Mr. FORDNEY. I will tell you this much, my friend. It is an old argument, but I believe it is a correct one on the question of selling our stuff abroad cheaper than we sell at home. For illustration, my friend, I am in the lumber business, and during the period of low prices which prevailed in 1907 we found we could not run our mill for 10 hours a day without piling up a very large amount of lumber on hand, with a large amount of capital invested, at a great risk of fire, and with no market for your lumber.

In addition to that you will understand that in that business a man insuring his lumber is a coinsurer to the extent of 20 per cent of the value of the lumber, so you can not get the full rate of insurance in this country on the value of your lumber and it is a great risk to pile up unlimited quantities. The important thing is where does your money come from. We found that we could perhaps market what lumber we could produce in an 8 hours' run instead of 10 hours. We reduced our hours from 10 to 8 per day and for 3 months we proceeded to try out that plan. We could not dispose of a superintendent, we could not dispose of a bookkeeper, we could not lessen our taxes, we could not lessen our insurance, we could not lessen the depreciation of our property. In other words the overhead or dead expense goes on just the same whether you run 8 hours or 10 hours or 12 hours per day, and we found after running for 3 months under the best management we could have that it cost $1 per thousand feet more to manufacture our lumber running 8 hours than it did to run 10 hours and we were obliged to abandon that plan. Therefore I say, my friends, if you are engaged in an industry, be it farming or any other industry, by running to the fullest capacity is when you produce at the lowest possible cost and by running your institution, be it a farm or factory, and selling at a reasonable profit to the home consumption you can afford to export your surplus at cost, and still employ American labor and make more money than one could by closing down.

Therefore, when we learn of goods being exported at a lower price than they are sold at home for, it is my candid opinion it is under such conditions, because when you are piling up a surplus and your warehouse is filled to the roof there is but one of two things to do—you must either unload that surplus or you must close the institution. And I ask you, in all spirit of fairness, whether under such circumstances it would be best for the proprietor to send abroad that surplus, emptying his warehouse and continue running, employing American labor and American capital, or to close down until the surplus is worked off? My business schooling, which has not been a short one, has taught me to believe that it is best to keep the wheels of the industries of this country running and employ American labor, because that labor is the best purchaser for our goods in the world. It furnishes us the greatest market for all our manufactured and agricultural products. As an illustration—and I am not making a political speech, but I believe the argument fits in on this treaty—we sold abroad last year $1,800,000,000 worth of American farm and manufactured products. The whole world consumed less than $14,000,000,000 worth of imported products, while here at home, Americans, citizens of the United States, consumed nearly $30,000,000,000 worth, or more than twice the total imports of the whole world outside of the United States. By opening up our tariff gates and letting into this country the cheaper products of all foreign countries, are you going to curtail that production at home and supply the citizens of the United States with articles made abroad rather than made at home? If so, you and I differ in our opinions, because I contend that any article, no matter what it may be, consumed in this country, that is imported from abroad—that is, a competitive article—is exceedingly high priced to the American people, because it displaces just that much capital and just that much labor at home.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. FORDNEY. I will.

Mr. LANGLEY. Is the gentleman going to discuss the lumber question before he takes his seat?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. LANGLEY. I want to ask you one or two questions in regard to it.

Mr. FORDNEY. I will be glad to answer you.

Mr. KENDALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. KENDALL. Has the gentleman concluded as to one of his propositions there?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. KENDALL. Of course the gentleman understands, as all Republicans do, that our last platform declared for a tariff measuring the difference in productive cost in America and abroad. I want to inquire of the gentleman, who is a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, whether in the preparation of the pending measure any report of the Tariff Commission, which has been created to ascertain those facts, was in possession of the committee?

Mr. FORDNEY. I thank the gentleman for the question. There was absolutely none at all. If so, it was in the hands of the majority. That is the first time I have had the pleasure

of using that term on the floor for 12 years. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. KENDALL. I want to inquire further of the gentleman if the Committee on Ways and Means undertook to revise the tariff on all the agricultural products of the country without availing itself of the information as to productive cost at home and abroad, which we supposed would be furnished by this Tariff Commission?

Mr. FORDNEY. Does the gentleman now refer to the proposed free-trade bill?

Mr. KENDALL. I refer to this bill and the companion measure, popularly designated as the "farmers' free-trade bill."

Mr. FORDNEY. So far as I am informed, not one word of information came from the Tariff Board or anywhere else to the Committee on Ways and Means in the preparation of this or the other or any other bills.

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan has always been opposed to constituting a Tariff Board, I believe, has he not?

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, no. The gentleman misunderstands me. I have always been opposed to the creation of a tariff commission, because I could see a difference between a tariff commission and a tariff board, and while I have not been very enthusiastic for a tariff board, I have contended that if there is any information that Representatives of this great people could have that they do not have in the preparation of those great laws, we should have it, no matter what channel it came through. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DALZELL. Would the gentleman like to have more time?

Mr. FORDNEY. I would like to. Do not limit me. I will try to get through as quickly as I can.

Mr. DALZELL. Then, Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman without limit for the present.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Now, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. I will yield.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. It so happens that the subject of the cost of production of farm products in Canada and the United States is one of the subjects on which this so-called Tariff Board has made a report, as is evidenced in Senate Document No. 849, printed on March 1, 1911; and if the gentleman desired to obtain any information on that subject he could have consulted that report.

Mr. FORDNEY. I thank the gentleman. I did not know that there was such a report. If so, it was not brought to the attention of the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. KENDALL. Is it possible that the Committee on Ways and Means in preparing this important bill has utterly ignored that official report?

Mr. FORDNEY. Let me say to the gentleman that I asked the question when the committee was reporting this bill, and some other gentleman asked the question, if some one were not going to call upon the Tariff Board for information on this subject, and it was said by some one of the gentlemen of the majority that they would have no hearings unless someone should have additional information to present; that they thought they had a sufficient amount of evidence and information on file during the hearings that was presented to the Ways and Means Committee when the committee were preparing the Payne tariff law.

Mr. BUCHANAN rose.

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

Mr. FORDNEY. I will in a moment. I then said to the gentleman that I understood that the Democratic Party were very anxious to have a tariff commission appointed in order that they might have better and more information on the subject of our tariff laws than had been obtained under present conditions.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I would like to ask the gentleman why it is that the representatives of the steel interests and the lumber interests claim they are interested in the American workingmen when tens of thousands of foreign workingmen are working in the mills, while tens of thousands of American workingmen are walking the highways seeking employment?

Mr. FORDNEY. I will say to my friend that I know of no law that discriminates against any man seeking employment and getting a fair day's wages for a fair day's work.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The gentleman, then, is not informed.

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, there are a lot of things that the gentleman from Michigan does not know. I admit that. [Laughter.] The things that I do not know would make a great deal larger book than the things that I do know. But then there are a few things that I do claim to know, and those are the things that I am trying to express myself on here. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CONNELL rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. FORDNEY. Wait just one minute, if you please, sir. I will say now to the gentleman [Mr. BUCHANAN], who has mentioned the steel company, that I infer he has reference to the United States Steel Corporation. Let me say to my friend that I had occasion to ascertain not long ago the number of men employed by that one concern—the great United States Steel Co. I had occasion to make inquiry, and learned the amount of money paid out by that one company to their labor last year, and I will give to you the astounding figures. I find that while it was stated by the president of that company—Mr. Gary, president of the United States Steel Co.—that they could produce steel cheaper than any other company in this country, because nearly all other manufacturers of steel purchase more or less pig iron from them, on which the United States Steel Co. make a profit, yet they did not want to crush out competition; they could run their institution without any protection at all, but in doing so their smaller competitors would be obliged to go out of business and they themselves would be compelled to reduce the wages paid to their labor. I found that last year that company had in their employ, in round numbers, 225,000 men, and their pay roll reached nearly $175,000,000, or an average of about $2.70 per man per day. I do not want to see any law upon our statute books that will lower the price paid for labor in this country, whether that law is intended to protect a corporation, a copartnership, a farmer, or a laboring man, because when you lower the price paid to labor, as I have said, you are curtailing the purchasing power of your best customer in the land. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. FORDNEY. I do.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Can the gentleman give us the amount of dividends declared by that United States Steel Corporation for that same year?

Mr. FORDNEY. I never owned a share of stock in the United States Steel Corporation, or in any other steel company, in my life. I know nothing about it, and I care less. I want to be courteous to the gentleman, but I do not know anything about it. I presume they pay good profits. If they do not, they are the biggest fools on earth. You and I would not be long in their shoes until we would try to make a reasonable profit upon our investment. If not, we would soon go out of business.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Would we kick if the profits were more than reasonable?

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not know. I have never seen profits too high to suit me.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Is not that also true of the Steel Trust?

Mr. FORDNEY. I want to ask the gentleman, or any other man within the sound of my voice, was there ever a time in your life, or do you ever expect to see the time, when your profits will be so high that you object?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. That being true, ought the law to give to me or any other person a right to gratify cupidity, and collect more than a fair profit through the instrumentality of a law that was created to enable that to be done?

Mr. FORDNEY. My good friend, if you believe that the United States Steel Corporation, or any other corporation in this land, is exacting from the people a greater profit than it is entitled to, we have antitrust laws upon our statute books to stop it immediately by proper proceedings, by the proper authority, and not through a revision of our tariff laws, in my opinion.

Mr. CONNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. I will yield to the gentleman; but I will ask the gentleman to make his question brief, as I am consuming too much time.

Mr. CONNELL. I understood the gentleman to say that he went into the flour business at the time of the Wilson law, lost all his money, and made a failure of it. I want to ask him if he would have succeeded in that business except for the Wilson law, and if that was the reason why failure came to him in his experiment in the flour business.

Mr. FORDNEY. My friend, I have learned long ago never to cry over spilt milk. I am not crying because I lost my money. The experience was well worth it, and I have been a died-in-the-wool protectionist ever since. [Applause on the Republican side.] I am going to stick to it. I believe, sir, our tariff laws at that time had much to do with low prices, because as a result of that law our industries were depressed in this country at that time. We were in poverty, sir.

Mr. CULLOP. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. FORDNEY. No; if the gentleman will pardon me, let me go on just a little while.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. FORDNEY. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] frequently referred to me in his speech on Saturday. I did not interrupt him, because I seldom interrupt anyone who is making a speech on the floor of this House. I knew I would have an opportunity to answer him. I never saw or heard such a physical effort from any man in my life as he made on Saturday. I will say to him that if the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] will go in the Northern States and repeat that speech word for word, so that all the people north of the Mason and Dixon line may hear him in that great exhibition, I will guarantee him that there will not be a Democratic Member of Congress returned to this House from that part of the country in the next two years. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The gentleman said that with lower prices we are more prosperous. He is in favor of free trade. I never heard of anything that had the word "free" attached to it that I did not believe the gentleman from North Carolina would be in favor of. But let me call his attention to this fact: We had a Democratic administration in 1894, 1895, and 1896 and up to March 4, 1897. What were the prevailing conditions at that time? We had lower prices then. We had lower prices on everything produced and consumed in this country. Were we in a more prosperous condition then than we are to-day? Let me call the gentleman's attention to this fact. He tried to taunt the Republicans for failing to pass certain legislation, and said that a Republican President had called the Democrats together to undo that which a Republican Congress had done. I ask the gentleman from North Carolina, who called Congress together in 1897 to undo what the Democratic Party had done the only time they had an opportunity to enact our laws for over 50 years?

Let me tell you what you did. You bankrupted the Nation, or nearly so. Horses never were so cheap in this country as they were in 1894, 1895, and 1896, and yet every poor devil in the land had to go on foot. [Laughter.]

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. In just a minute. Beefsteak never was so cheap since Adam came on earth. I happened to be an alderman in the town in which I lived, and during those lean years laboring men came to me in numbers and asked me to vote for a higher rate of wages for street laborers in our city because they said they could not afford meat but twice a week. Gentlemen, you never knew a time in your life, and I hope you never will know a time, when liver was in such great demand. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. FORDNEY. Let me finish this paragraph first. I am dealing with an answer to the gentleman from North Carolina. Clothing never was so cheap since the Republic was created, and our laboring men and their wives and their children went in tatters and rags, and you know it. We never were in need of clothing so much in our lives as we were during the four years when everything was so cheap. Can you deny it? If so, furnish your proof. Every laboring man in the land went about the country, and there were 3,000,000 unemployed laboring men, every one wearing a Democratic badge, a patch 8 by 10 inches on the seat of his pants. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

You never knew a time when there were as many farm mortgages spread on our records in this country as there were during the life of that bill. What caused it? Low prices and poverty to the farmer. The farmer is just exactly like a great nation. When his bank account runs low and he does not produce the farm articles that he can convert into money for his necessary running expenses, he must (just like this Nation did when your party was in power) put a mortgage on his farm.

But there is a day of reckoning when the mortgage must be paid. We are paying the interest, my friends, on the mortgage that your party put upon the Federal farm during your last administration. You will remember that you issued through your Executive $262,400,000 worth of Government bonds and sold them in Europe to get gold to put into the Treasury of the United States to pay the running expenses of this Government, upon which there was a premium of $30,000,000, or thereabouts, received, a total of $290,000,000 or more.

That money was put in the Treasury not for any improvements in the land, because the President had vetoed a river and harbor bill carrying an appropriation of $80,000,000, and when the people called Congress together to undo what your party had done, that money was gone and but a little of it left in the Treasury of the United States.

We undid the things that you had done during your administration. We brought prosperity back to the country again, and the wheels of industry have rolled all over the land from that day to this, and if you will let us alone they will continue to roll. During these four years, in addition to the farm mortgages that I have referred to, there was railroad property in this country in the hands of receivers to the tune of $1,800,000,000. The like has never been found in the history of the world before or since, when all industries languished as they did then.

Mr. HOBSON. Does the gentleman care to yield for a question?

Mr. FORDNEY. With pleasure.

Mr. HOBSON. It is merely in connection with the gentleman's reference to the issue of bonds by the Democratic administration. I merely wish to ask the gentleman if that was not the result of the Sherman silver-purchase bill, a Republican measure, and if relief did not finally come with the repeal of that bill by a Democratic Congress?

Mr. FORDNEY. Perhaps the gentleman is right. Whether he is or not I do not know, but I do know this, Mr. Chairman, that the Democratic Party issued the bonds to get the money, and it was all expended before our party again come into control.

Mr. POU. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Certainly.

Mr. POU. Is the gentleman talking about those same bonds for which the plates were made and ready when Mr. Cleveland came into office?

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not know when the plates were made. I know when they were put into execution. [Laughter.]

Mr. POU. Mr. Cleveland has stated in his book, over his own signature, that, as a matter of fact, those plates were all prepared before his predecessor went out of office.

Mr. FORDNEY. I believe that statement has been denied time and time again; but I admired Mr. Cleveland, I believe, more than the average man in his party did.

Mr. POU. Then the gentleman is willing, I imagine, to accept the late President's statement as to the proof of that fact.

Mr. FORDNEY. My friend, let me tell you this much. You know, and so do I, that the Wilson tariff bill did not bring sufficient revenue to this Government to pay our running expenses, and the present tariff law does. There are no such conditions existing to-day warranting the calling of Congress together in an extra session to undo something that the Republican Party has done, as existed then, and I will leave it to the world to decide. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, I must get along a little faster. I want to call the attention of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL] and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] to one thing. They are very earnest in their efforts to bring about the adoption of Canadian reciprocity. They are both protectionists. Just whether they can see beyond the limits of the State of Connecticut and the State of Massachusetts at this time I am not going to say. [Laughter.]

Mr. HILL rose.

Mr. FORDNEY. Just one moment. Let me say to you, you wanted free trade in leather, and you voted for protection on shoes. I have repeatedly said, and I repeat now, that any step toward a reduction of our duties was only a step toward free trade. You are in favor of Canadian reciprocity, and here comes a full-born child of free trade, a bill that puts shoes on the free list and leather on the free list, and I do wish it also put other things produced in New England on the free list. [Applause and laughter.] I am going to ask you if you are going to vote for that bill. I am going to introduce a bill, and I give notice now, and no better protectionist has ever lived than is found in me—and I hope my Democratic friends will support it—to put ships on the free list, so that American goods may be carried between two American ports by any foreign ship, and we will see how New England will like that.

Mr. HILL. New England men have fully as good eyesight as the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not doubt that.

Mr. HILL. And can see precisely as far into the tariff system, and I challenge him now to vote with me in accordance with the principles laid down in the Republican national platform, that the true measure of protection is the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad, and if he does it once, it will be the first time he ever did it in his life. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, my friend is an elegant gentleman; he is a splendid fellow, no better lived—though some people do not know it—but let me ask him to reason out this. I happened to be a member of the committee on resolutions at the last Republican national convention——

Mr. HILL. Then the gentleman ought to be bound by the declaration.

Mr. FORDNEY. Are you?

Mr. HILL. I am. On manufactures from New England and lumber from Michigan, and on wheat also and every other product that we have in the United States.

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, now, do not get excited, because you are in error. That platform says that the Republican Party proposes to give protection to American industry a tariff wall sufficiently high to offset the difference in the cost of production here and abroad and in addition thereto a fair profit.

Mr. HILL. Oh, yes.

Mr. FORDNEY. Where in the name of God is there any protection for a profit in the free trade for which you vote?

Mr. HILL. Does the gentleman wish an answer now?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes; come on, I am not afraid.

Mr. HILL. I will ask the gentleman whether the figures on the other side do not also include a fair profit for them?

Mr. FORDNEY. Suppose the cost there was identical with the cost here?

Mr. HILL. Then I would have no duty. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FORDNEY. Wait a minute. Where is your profit? Figure it out if you can.

Mr. HILL. Where is their profit? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FORDNEY. Let them keep their own market and we will keep ours. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HILL. We would with the addition of from $3 to $5 a ton in our favor across the ocean.

Mr. FORDNEY. My friend, you wanted to reduce the duty on wool, did you not? I had some wrestling with you, and one day you got angry—— [Laughter.]

Mr. HILL. I think we were both a little excited.

Mr. FORDNEY. You excited everybody in your presence. [Laughter.] You said that you had paid $12,000 losses on an industry in the last 90 days. You said that much to me.

Mr. HILL. That is small.

Mr. FORDNEY. And you wanted the duty changed so you might not incur further loss.

Mr. HILL. Not at all.

Mr. FORDNEY. What the devil did you want it changed for, then? [Laughter and applause.] Now, let me go further; let me show you the lack of wisdom in that resolution in the Republican platform adopted at Chicago, which I as a member of the committee protested against. I have always tried to be fair, just, and equitable, and have stood by the majority of my party, and I will continue to do so except on some measures which I protest against and refuse to go in caucus to be bound upon.

Mr. HILL. I will stand——

Mr. FORDNEY. Wait until I finish this sentence. That resolution provided for a duty sufficiently high to offset the difference in cost here and abroad, and in addition thereto a fair profit to our producers. Let me call the gentleman's attention to this fact: There is an abundance of evidence on file, sir, that labor in Germany, France, and England receives about one-half the pay the same class of labor receives in this country. We will say when labor receives $1.50 a day in our factories such labor receives but 75 cents in England, Germany, and France for the same class of labor.

Mr. HOBSON. Will the gentleman yield——

Mr. FORDNEY. In a minute; and I have in my possession a consular report where the American consul in Belgium had gone to the cotton mills in that country and found that the average laborer receives an average pay of but 18 cents a day. Now, then, going across the water the other way, what do you find? You find Japanese labor working for from 6 to 15 cents a day and Chinese labor from 3 to 10 cents a day in gold. Tell me, sir, how you are going to fix a tariff wall the same for all the nations of the world to offset the difference of cost here and abroad, unless you legislate against the cheapest paid labor in the world and under such circumstances then, sir, your tariff wall is prohibitive to England, France, and Germany. It is an impossibility. It sounds well to the ear of a man who does not give consideration to these facts. I protested against it as being unwise legislation, and I would like to have the gentleman in his time in his speech, and he will have all the time he wants, to answer that question.

Mr. HOBSON. I do not wish——

Mr. FORDNEY. I will answer a question. When I get through with my remarks I will answer any questions that may be asked me.

Mr. HOBSON. I merely desired to ask the gentleman in connection with that much-discussed proposition of the relative cost of labor in America and abroad, whether it is not a fact that the American laborer produces more than the laborer abroad, and for what he produces to-day receives less, broadly speaking, in most of the wage-earning departments of labor, receives less per unit of product, than the laborer abroad does, and is therefore the poorest paid laborer in the world?

Mr. FORDNEY. I think the gentleman is away off in his conclusions. I have not the time to furnish you statistics here to that effect, but if you will give me time I think that I can convince the gentleman absolutely that he is incorrect. If he will pardon me, I will go on.

Now, then, upon the question of hay I wish to say a few words. Let me take up a few of the items mentioned in this bill. There is a duty at the present time of $4 a ton on hay. The State in which I live is a great producer of that product. Some $15,000,000 to $20,000,000 worth of hay was produced in the State of Michigan last year. I have here a hay trade journal, published at Canajoharie, N. Y., April 7, and I have several copies as well, and the prices given in each copy are practically the same, varying not more than 25 or 30 cents per ton on hay in our markets for several weeks. But I want to call the attention of the gentleman here to the fact that on April 7 the price of hay in Boston was $22 per ton; in New York, $21.50 per ton; in Jersey City, $21.50 per ton; in Brooklyn, $21 per ton; in Philadelphia, $20.50 per ton; in Pittsburg, Pa., $19.25 per ton; and in Montreal, Canada, mind you, the same grade of hay is quoted at $11 a ton. The duty is $4 per ton, and the freight on hay from Montreal, Canada, to Pittsburg is 23 cents per 100 pounds in carload lots of 10 tons, making $4.60 freight, and freight and duty together are $8.60. This deducted from $19.25, the price of hay in Pittsburg, left the Canadian farmer $10.65 a ton for his hay f. o. b. Montreal.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Will the gentleman now yield for a question?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes; if the gentleman will make it short.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Is the gentleman aware that upon hay No. 1 the price on January 2 at Toronto was $18 and in New York $16?

Mr. FORDNEY. No; I am not.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. That is a fact.

Mr. FORDNEY. Well, there were some conditions of the roads or scarcity of the article in the market that caused it, and it must have been due to some abnormal condition, because the price here in this trade journal runs about the same, running along week after week, just as I have given it to you, and any man will find by searching the record that the price of hay in Montreal is always below our price in this country just about the amount of the duty and the freight. Then will any man in favor of this measure contend that by removing the duty of $4 per ton upon hay it will not reduce the price of hay in our market or increase it in Canada?

It has been stated time and time again, and by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN], I believe, on Saturday, that this bill will not cause a reduction of prices in this country on farm products; that it will not injure the farmers. There is only one way, in my opinion, that this bill could injure the farmers, and that is by lowering the price of his farm products, and if the importation of Canadian products into this country does not lower the price of the products of the farmer, it certainly will not lower it to the consumer. And then, who is benefited? And if the friends of this measure who stand here and contend that it is not in any way going to injure the farmer, I ask who are you legislating for? You are legislating for the Canadian absolutely.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. COOPER. I am much interested in the gentleman's speech, and if he will permit me I desire to ask him a question on the topic which he discussed a moment ago—the question of reasonable profits guaranteed by the platform of the Republican Party. I am a protectionist, and always have been, and the

gentleman is a very strong protectionist. I believe that the first time that principle ever was enunciated in the platform of the Republican Party was in the Chicago convention of 1908—that is, the provision for a reasonable profit. It never was in our national platform until 1908. Is not that true?

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not know, sir; I presume that is right.

Mr. COOPER. Yes. I think the previous platforms simply provided for an equalization of competitive conditions by the imposition of a tariff.

Mr. FORDNEY. I will say to the gentleman, please make your question as short as you can. I will appreciate it.

Mr. COOPER. Now, then, after we have established the cost price abroad and the cost price here, and imposed the tariff to equalize conditions, how much of a tariff is to be imposed in order to yield a reasonable profit? And is the reasonable profit to be 5 per cent, or is it to be 6 per cent, or is it to be 8 per cent, or is it to be 10 per cent upon a particular business? Is it to be the same on all businesses? How is that to be adjusted?

Mr. FORDNEY. My idea is this: That since 1897 we have had a tariff law upon our statute books under which the American people, both labor and capital, have been prosperous. I am old enough to remember back—my memory is not so short that it does not run back to 1894, 1895, and 1896—when conditions were different, and when we operated under a different tariff law, when we all suffered financial loss, while labor was the greatest sufferer in the land. I believe that our tariff laws which have been on our statute books since August, 1897, are sufficient to warrant a fair profit to the American people. I contend and insist that we should continue under that policy until we have been fully convinced that other conditions are necessary.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman permit just another question right there?

Mr. FORDNEY. In just a minute. I had not finished on hay. I want to complete my answer to the gentleman. Under the Wilson bill the duty on hay was $2 a ton. Under existing law and under the law known as the Dingley tariff law the duty has been $4 a ton. Under previous laws the duty was, as I remember it now, $4 a ton, which was the rate under the McKinley law.

Some gentlemen say that if this tariff law is abrogated it will not injure the farmer or his products. For three years during the life of the Wilson bill—four years, including a year of suspense—we imported 625,000 tons of hay from Canada, and for the last three years we have imported only 113,000 tons. The rate is $4 per ton. It was $2 per ton then. There was a great increase of importations under free trade—no; not under free trade, but under a lower rate of duty—a much greater importation then than now. Do not those figures show that by reducing the duty we shall certainly have increased importations? And if Canada does not expect to send more of her goods to our market in consequence of the reduction of these duties, why is she in favor of this reduction? She can change her tariff laws on our goods going into Canada at any time without our having anything to say about it at all, as we can change the rate of duty on her goods coming into this country.

Now, my friends, another great and important industry in our State is the production of beans. We produced some $15,000,000 worth of beans in the State of Michigan last year. Under the Wilson bill the duty on beans was 20 per cent ad valorem. That is my recollection now. Under existing law the rate of duty is 45 cents per bushel. For the first year under the Wilson bill we imported 1,160,000 bushels of beans from Canada. How much was it last year? For the last three or four years we imported less than 150,000 bushels a year. Will any man, then, contend that by lowering the duty on beans Canadian beans will not be brought into competition with American-grown beans—that great and magnificent crop grown in this country?

England produces beans for export for almost the whole world, and she has a preferential rate of duty into Canada below that which is given to us. I ask you, my friends, what will prevent Canada from purchasing for home consumption English-grown beans and dumping into our market her whole bean crop? Oh, it is absolute nonsense, it seems to me, to say that a reduction of the duty on beans will not increase the importation of beans from Canada, and thus lower our prices.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes; I will.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Does the gentleman know that the Massachusetts Cost of Living Commission found that beans brought a higher price in the markets of Canada than in the United States?

Mr. FORDNEY. No; I do not know it.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. It is a fact.

Mr. FORDNEY. If so, how, then, can Canadians send to our markets 150,000 bushels a year and pay a duty of 45 cents a bushel? Explain that, if you will. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] spoke about cotton. Somebody on this side of the House said to him, "If you will vote for free lumber, I will vote for free sugar." He said, "Why, I will vote for both of them." Did you ever see anything that had the word "free" attached to it that he would not vote for?

Let me call his attention to cotton. Although it is not in this bill, it is discussed in this Senate Document 862. Let me say to the gentleman from North Carolina that I know this much about the cotton industry in the South, that before there were any cotton mills in the Southern States raw cotton sold down there at 5 cents a pound. I was there and I know what I am talking about. In 1892 and 1893 there were practically no cotton mills in the South, and the southern farmers, for a normal crop of 10,000,000 bales, received 5 cents per pound, or $300,000,000. What is the price to-day and what are the conditions down there? There are in the South to-day nearly 11,000,000 spindles at work in the cotton mills, employing American capital and American labor. In speaking of the New England States the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] said they were going to transfer the cotton mills from New England to the South, or words to that effect. There are 15,000,000 spindles at work in the cotton mills of New England, a total of 26,000,000 spindles in the United States. The price of cotton to-day is high, largely, I contend, the result of competition between American cotton mills and the foreign demand for cotton. Ten million bales, a normal crop in the South to-day, instead of bringing $300,000,000 to southern farmers as it did when the price was 5 cents per pound, now bring to those farmers $900,000,000. [Applause.]

There is a cotton mill in a little town in Mississippi that I am familiar with. I went through that mill and saw every part of it to familiarize myself with it. There are 20,000 spindles at work in that mill. Based on that number of spindles, there are more than 500 cotton mills in the South to-day working on raw cotton raised in this country, employing American labor, that was not employed in the South 20 years ago or 17 years ago.

In the face of the fact that there are 26,000,000 spindles working in the cotton mills of the United States to-day, we exported from this country directly to Europe and to Japan a large quantity of raw cotton and purchased back from those countries last year $86,000,000 worth of cotton fabrics. Do you believe it is a good plan for a farmer in Jones County, Miss., who raises cotton on a farm adjoining the city limits of a town where there is a cotton factory, to send his raw cotton abroad and employ Belgian labor that receives 18 cents a day, and then purchase a pair of overalls when they come back to this country, made by that cheaper labor in Belgium, instead of encouraging the production of cotton or the building of another factory in this country and keeping the money at home? Oh, my friends, if you will go down South and preach to the southern cotton growers what you preached here on Saturday, and give them the facts and figures, you will make a Republican of every southern white man.

The gentleman from North Carolina said he would vote for free sugar. Sugar is not in the bill, but it bears upon this subject. We have but one trade treaty upon our statute books to-day, and God forbid that there ever be another like it. That is Cuban reciprocity. I have talked so much about that subject that I am called a crank on sugar, but let me call your attention briefly to a few facts and figures. I was in Congress at the time that bill became a law. I protested against it and voted against it then. Thank heaven it never became a law by my vote. The balance of trade between this country and Cuba at that time was $8,000,000 a year in favor of Cuba. Last year it had grown to the enormous sum of $70,043,000. Let me tell the gentlemen on this side and on that side of the House what you did when you voted for Cuban reciprocity. You lowered the duty on sugar coming from Cuba 20 per cent below the rate paid on sugar coming from all other countries, which are all countries except our insular possessions. You reduced it 20 per cent. We have imported from Cuba during the life of that treaty 11,500,000 tons of sugar. This reduction of 20 per cent below the Dingley rate on that sugar sums up $77,510,000 the 1st day of January last lost to the United States Treasury.

Have the consumers of sugar in this country purchased their sugar for any less money than they did before? No; notwithstanding the fact that the world's supply of sugar before and

after the adoption of that treaty has been plenty, notwithstanding we have never had a famine on sugar or a short crop, so that the country's supplies would be advanced on that account, we have not bought sugar for a fraction of a cent less.

This is a step in the same direction. Do not forget when you voted for a reduction of the duty on sugar coming from Cuba, and when you vote for the reduction of the duty on goods coming from any country in the world, instead of voting in the interest of the consumers of this country you are voting money into the pockets of foreigners or some one other than our consumers.

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

Mr. FORDNEY. I will yield, yes.

Mr. KAHN. I want to call the gentleman's attention to this fact, that under the reciprocity treaty with the Hawaiian Islands, which was entered into during the seventies, sugar was brought in free from those islands. The duty was removed entirely. The result was that the sugar was not reduced in price to the consumer a fraction of a cent, but a number of men who did the importing became multimillionaires as a consequence.

Mr. FORDNEY. I thank the gentleman for the suggestion. In this country we have produced from cane and beets sugar as follows: Taking the same value for the total of all the crops mentioned from 1879 to date, about $4.70 per hundred pounds, we produced $8,535,000 worth. Ten years later, in 1889, we produced $14,000,000 worth. In 1899 we produced $20,000,000 worth. Just then the great beet-sugar industry took hold under protection guaranteed in the Republican platform adopted at the St. Louis convention in 1896, and the next four years, 1904, our crops had grown from $20,000,000 worth to $63,000,000 worth, and in 1909 to $76,655,000. It costs, in round numbers, to produce sugar from beets $3.90 a hundred pounds. It costs more in the Northern States than in the arid-land district to produce a pound of sugar from beets. In Michigan it costs about 4 cents to produce a pound. I have figures that will show what, under free trade, if the gentleman from North Carolina could have his way, the Sugar Trust could produce refined sugar for per pound if made from foreign imported raw sugar.

On the 13th of April, according to Willett & Gray's Trade Sugar Journal, sugar in bond in New York is quoted at $1.91 a hundred pounds. The duty on that imported sugar from duty paying countries, except Cuba, is $1.68½, and it costs 40 cents per hundred pounds to refine this sugar, or a total cost of $3.99½, practically 4 cents per pound. But, my friends, our imported sugar from duty paying countries comes principally from Cuba. We imported about 1,750,000 tons last year, while three-quarters of it came from Cuba. Deducting 20 per cent of this duty from the Dingley law, which rate we give to Cuba, and the Sugar Trust can produce a pound of refined sugar and put it on the market in the United States for $3.65 per hundred pounds, or about one-third of a cent below what it can be produced for in this country. Remove the duty on sugar altogether and the great American Sugar Refining Co. and the Arbuckles and others in the refining business can import from foreign countries all the sugar we consume, reduce the price below what sugar can be produced for in this country, and refine enough to wipe out of existence their competitors, and up will go the price again as of old.

And so when the gentleman from North Carolina says that he will vote for free trade on sugar, I am safe in saying that the sugar-refining companies in this country would pay a million dollars a head for men of the same opinion, until sugar is put on the free list. I impute no dishonest motives to him or any other man at all. Do not so misunderstand me, but men who will vote for free sugar are misguided. That is the point. It is well known that the Sugar Trusts of this country have been recently prosecuted for dishonest methods, and I say anything that will give them an advantage over the domestic industry they would move heaven and earth to bring about. So I criticize my friend from North Carolina for being a free trader on sugar. I am not.

Now, I am going to close. I have detained the House altogether too long, much longer than I had intended, but I have tried in my plain way to express to you my judgment about the enactment of this law, to show that if it is put upon our statute books it means the death knell to the farmers of this country.

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

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. LANGLEY. The gentleman stated awhile ago in answer to an inquiry of mine that he would touch upon the lumber question before he concluded.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I had forgotten. I will do that briefly. Let me say that in this treaty it is proposed to put rough lumber coming from Canada upon the free list, and, again, the treaty reduces the duty on dressed lumber, according to the amount of work done upon it, below the prices fixed in the Payne tariff law. If you will take last year's prices of the imports of lumber from Canada, you will find that the rates fixed in this treaty are about 5 per cent ad valorem, while our lumber of the same grade going into Canada, with the same amount of work put upon it, must pay 25 per cent ad valorem. Canadians do not change their rate on lumber at all by the crossing of a "t" or the dotting of an "i." Gentlemen, I say that it is absolutely unfair to put the product of that great, magnificent industry, the product of the mills, upon the free list unless you are going to help the consumer, and I ask you whether or not the reductions recently made inured to the benefit of the consumers?

I have information in my possession from a gentleman in Pittsburg whom I know well, a lumber dealer, who recently went into Canada and contracted for 10,000,000 feet of lumber, white pine, to be brought to this country, and before the parties in Canada would close their contract with him for this lumber they insisted upon and did write into that contract a provision that if this treaty becomes a law he shall pay $1.25 per thousand feet more for his lumber. I can produce a copy of that contract if necessary.

Mr. LANGLEY. I have heard it frequently contended that the kinds of lumber produced in Canada and shipped into the United States, or that would be under free lumber with Canada, will not compete with the grades of lumber produced in this country.

Mr. FORDNEY. There is not a grade of lumber made from any tree cut in the forests of Canada that does not come directly into competition with the same grade of lumber produced in this country and in nearly every State in the Union where lumber is produced.

Mr. LANGLEY. Does the gentleman not think, then, that if this treaty goes into operation it will necessarily depress the price of lumber in the United States?

Mr. FORDNEY. It will do one of two things, as I have contended all along in my argument. It will either lower the price of the article to the consumer in this country or it will not. If it does lower the price to the consumer in this country, then it injures the industry and the twelve hundred thousand men employed in the sawmills of this country. If it does not lower the price to the consumer, no one will be benefited but the Canadian.

Mr. LANGLEY. Just one more question. Was that not the effect upon the lumber industry in the United States under the free-lumber provision of the Wilson bill?

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, whether that bill was responsible for it or not I will not now attempt to argue, but it is my belief that it was. Prices were low, and the lumber industry was in bad shape. A great many concerns in the country went into bankruptcy or into the hands of a receiver. Labor employed in the camps received $16 per month and board, whereas labor now receives $40 and $45 per month and board. It was the same in every other industry in the country.

Let me go a step further. In this bill it is proposed to put print paper and pulp on the free list. At the same time every Province in Canada has placed an embargo upon her pulp wood. There are 824 paper mills in this country with $400,000,000 capital invested. There are thousands of men employed in those paper and pulp mills. They produced last year nearly $300,000,000 worth of product. Many of those mills largely depend now for their supply of wood upon Canada, yet in this treaty Canada absolutely refuses to permit the changing of her laws in a single Province to let us have her raw material for our paper mills in this country, but at the same time this bill proposes to put print paper on the free list.

Take out that provision of the law which puts print paper on the free list and there is not a Republican newspaper or magazine in the broad land that will not oppose it. Every one of them would rise up in arms against the treaty. I have been reliably informed that William R. Hearst, of New York, a prominent newspaper publisher, purchases 300 tons of paper daily. If he believed that the removal of the duty on print paper, which is about $4.90 per ton—say, for easy figuring, $5 per ton—if he believes that he can buy his print paper for just that much less money, the amount of the duty, which would be $1,500 per day on his raw material, do you expect him, Mr. Hearst, to oppose Canadian reciprocity? No; he is no such philanthropist. Every newspaper in the land has a selfish interest. They are striking a blow at the agriculturist to get their print paper free and discriminating against one of the most important industries in the land.

Gentlemen, I thank you, and I have detained you already too long. [Loud applause.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, how much time has the gentleman occupied?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has occupied 2 hours and 2 minutes, making a total for that side of 3 hours and 27 minutes occupied.

Mr. DALZELL. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER].

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of asking unanimous consent to print in the RECORD an act passed by the parliament of New Brunswick and approved by the governor of that Province on Thursday last. It goes into effect on October 1 next. The title of this measure is as follows:

An act respecting the manufacture of spruce and other pulp wood cut on Crown lands.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may print this act in the RECORD in connection with the few remarks that I may make.

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

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

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. The gentleman from Florida forces me to read the act.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. All right; read it.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I shall first take the opportunity of commenting upon it.

As you all know, the New Brunswick forests are principally owned by that Province, and all rights to cut timber are leased from time to time to private parties. By the terms of the new act every license to cut spruce or other soft wood, trees or timber, except pine and poplar, "shall contain and be subject to the condition that all such timber cut under the authority or permission of such license or permit shall be manufactured in Canada; that is to say, into merchantable pulp or paper or into sawn lumber, woodenware utensils, or other articles of commerce or merchandise as distinguished from the said spruce or other timber in its raw or unmanufactured state."

In other words, at the very moment when our political necessity is forcing us to make one-sided concessions to Canada, at the very moment when we are engaged in reducing our agricultural and other tariff schedules under the specious pretense of reciprocal agreement, that is the time chosen by a great Province of Canada for striking a blow at our manufacturers. After October 1 next we shall no longer be able to import our wooden raw material from New Brunswick. What a comment this is on the doctrine that this reciprocity agreement will give us cheaper raw materials! Its first result is to forbid us raw materials altogether.

No one knows better than I that these remarks are falling on deaf ears. No one knows better than I that New Brunswick lumber is not manufactured in the South, whose relentless grip has been fastened on this branch of the Government. History, however, has an unpleasant way of repeating itself. Already at least one great Province of the Dominion has adopted the Canadian policy which existed during the continuance of our reciprocity treaty of 1854. To those of you who heard the debate in this House two months ago I need not recall the fact that by unfriendly legislation throughout the continuance of the Elgin treaty Canada contrived to render valueless the concessions which she made us.

Now, I shall read the act:

An act respecting the manufacture of spruce and other pulp wood cut on Crown lands.

Be it enacted by the lieutenant governor and legislative assembly as follows:

1. All sales of timber licenses by the surveyor general, which shall hereafter be made and which shall convey the right to cut and remove spruce or other soft wood trees, or timber, other than pine and poplar suitable for manufacturing pulp or paper, and all licenses or permits to cut such timber on the limits and berths so sold, and all claims entered into, or other authority conferred by the said surveyor general, by virtue of which such timber may be cut upon lands of the Crown, shall be so made, issued, or granted subject to the condition set forth in the first regulation of schedule A of this act, and it shall be sufficient if such condition be cited as "the manufacturing condition" in all such licenses, permits, agreement, or other writing.

2. The resolutions set out in schedule A of this act are hereby approved and confirmed and declared to be legal and valid to all intents and purposes, and the sale shall apply to all licenses or permits hereafter issued, whether for the first time or in renewal of licenses or permits heretofore issued or granted.

3. The lieutenant governor in council may make any further or additional regulations necessary to enable the surveyor general to carry into effect the object and intent of the regulations contained in schedule A.

4. No licensee of any timber license or permit shall hereafter sell, assign, or in any way transfer to any other person or company the interest of such licensee therein under such license until such licensee shall have paid to the Province the sum of $4 per mile.

5. The first three sections of this act and the regulations thereby approved shall not come into force until the 1st day of October, A. D. 1911.

SCHEDULE A.

1. Every timber license or permit conferring authority to cut spruce or other soft wood trees, or timber, not being pine or poplar suitable for manufacturing pulp or paper, on the ungranted lands of the Crown shall contain and be subject to the condition that all such timber cut under the authority or permission of such license or permit shall be manufactured in Canada; that is to say, into merchantable pulp or paper, or into sawn lumber, woodenware utensils, or other articles of commerce or merchandise, as distinguished from the said spruce or other timber in its raw or unmanufactured state; and such condition shall be kept and observed by the holder or holders of any such timber licenses or permit who shall cut or cause to be cut spruce or other soft wood trees, or timber, not being pine or poplar, suitable for manufacturing pulp or paper under the authority thereof, and by any other person or persons who shall cut or cause to be cut any of such wood trees or timber, under the authority thereof, and all such wood, trees or timber, cut into logs or lengths or otherwise shall be manufactured in Canada as aforesaid. It is hereby declared that the cutting of spruce or other soft wood trees, or timber, not being pine or poplar suitable for manufacturing pulp or paper, into cord wood or other lengths, is not manufacturing same within the meaning of this regulation.

2. Should any holder of a timber license or permit, or any servant or agent of such holder, or any person acting for him or under his authority or permission, violate or refuse to keep and observe the condition named in the preceding regulation, then, and in such case, the license or permit to cut spruce or other softwood trees or timber not being pine or poplar on the limit or berth, territory, lot or lots included in the license or permit, and on which or on any part of which there was a breach of such regulation, or a refusal to observe or keep the same, shall be suspended and held in abeyance and shall not be reissued, nor shall a new license or permit issue unless and until so directed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council and then only upon such terms and conditions as the Lieutenant Governor in Council may impose.

3. The surveyor general, his officers, servants, and agents may do all things necessary to prevent a breach of the aforesaid condition and to secure compliance therewith and may for such purpose take, seize, hold, and detain all logs, timber, or wood so cut as aforesaid, and which it is made to appear to the surveyor general it is not the intention of the licensee, owner or holder, or person in possession of, to manufacture or cause to be manufactured as aforesaid in Canada, or to dispose of to others who will have the same so manufactured in Canada until security shall be given to His Majesty satisfactory to the surveyor general that the said condition will be kept and observed and that such logs, timber, or wood will be manufactured in Canada as aforesaid; and in the event of the refusal on the part of the licensee, owner, or holder, or person in possession of such logs, timber, or wood to give such security, within four weeks after notice of such seizure and demand of security by or on behalf of the surveyor general, then the surveyor general may sell or cause to be sold such logs, timber, or wood by public auction after due advertisement to some person or persons who will give such security to His Majesty as the surveyor general may require that such logs, timber, or wood shall be manufactured in Canada. The proceeds of such logs, timber, or wood shall, after such seizure and sale, and any sum due and owing to His Majesty for or in respect of any timber dues, ground rent, or on account of the purchase of any timber or timber berths by the owner, licensee, or holder of a permit, or other person who has cut or caused to be cut such logs, timber, or wood, or who is the owner or holder of the same, to be paid over to the person entitled to the same.

4. *Provided, nevertheless,* That nothing in the preceding regulations which requires spruce or other timber, not being pine, suitable for manufacturing pulp or paper, to be manufactured in Canada as aforesaid shall apply to logs, timber, or wood cut and in use in Canada for fuel, building, or other purposes for which logs, timber, or wood, in the unmanufactured state are or may be used.

5. After seizure the burden of proving that the timber is to be manufactured in Canada shall be on the owners of such timber.

6. Where the timber to be seized is mixed up with other timber, the whole of the timber may be attached and dealt with accordingly until satisfactorily separated.

During the reading of the above the following colloquy occurred:

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I can not understand the gentleman. We do not know what he is reading. I will make the point of order the gentleman must read so that we must understand it.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, is the point of order sustained?

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I am going to insist that this House do not degenerate into a circus, even if the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] is playing the chief rôle.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. It is the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] who has issued tickets for admission to that circus. [Laughter.]

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I insist that I have a right to hear what is going on.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has already ruled that there is no rule by which the Chair can compel a Member of the House to read in any other manner than he himself sees fit. Therefore the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Does the Chair mean to hold that Members can get up on this floor and read a document or make a speech in some jargon that is absolutely unintelligible, under the rules of the House?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair means to hold what the Chair has already stated, that there is no rule by which the Chair can control the manner in which a gentleman reads a paper in his own time.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Whether it is intelligible or not?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I do not suppose that the gentleman from Florida means to be annoying in objecting to printing this telegram in the RECORD, but I maintain it is an important thing that the House should have in its possession to-morrow a full statement of that act, passed by the New Brunswick Legislature on Thursday. For that reason, inasmuch as I am allowed only five minutes, I am reading rapidly, so as to get the matter into the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, as a matter of fact, was not my time taken up in the discussion of the parliamentary inquiry?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chairman had that in mind, and permitted the gentleman to go beyond the strict five minutes.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes more.

After the reading:

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DALZELL. How much time has the gentleman occupied?

The CHAIRMAN. Ten minutes.

Mr. DALZELL. Will the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] now yield some time?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON]. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, two months ago the Canadian reciprocity agreement went through this House with an overwhelming majority, only to meet an untimely end in the august body at the other end of this Capitol, done to death by the standpatters, and by them unwept, unhonored, and unsung.

When I voted for this bill, as a member of the minority, I did so because I believed it was the most that we could hope to obtain from a Republican administration. But now that we are members of the majority, I shall vote for it because it is the first step in the Democratic plan of tariff reform. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I am glad of an opportunity to follow my friend from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY]. From sitting two years on the Ways and Means Committee with him I have learned that whenever I am on the opposite side of an economic question from the gentleman from Michigan I am bound to be in the right, so that when I follow him upon this floor, taking the opposite side of this question, I know that I am standing upon solid and substantial ground. The gentleman from Michigan is the highest protectionist of them all. He is the author of the now historic phrase that for him "the best tariff revision would be to make the Dingley rates the bottom and the blue vault of heaven the top." Now, after the Napoleon of the standpatters, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], shall have fled from the field with his broken and disheartened cohorts, the gentleman from Michigan, playing the part of Cambronne, will stand there with the last remnants of the Old Guard, ready to die, but never to surrender.

He has favored us to-day with a rehash of all the old protection arguments to which we have listened for now these 10 years past—arguments which the country repudiated at the last congressional election.

Chief among his arguments was the threadbare, time-worn Republican claim as to the effect of the Wilson tariff law upon the articles protected by the present tariff. He says that the price of wheat went down under the Wilson law all on account of the tariff protection being taken off, but he neglects to state that in those days the price of cotton was down to 6 cents, and cotton had no tariff tax upon it. He neglects to state, what so often has been stated from this side of the Chamber, and much better than I can formulate it, that the financial depression of those days, in so far as it was due to any legislation whatever, was due entirely to the conduct of affairs by the preceding Republican administration. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And he fails to call attention to the oft-stated fact that the issue of bonds debited against President Cleveland was an inheritance that fell to President Cleveland from the preceding Republican Secretary of the Treasury, who left a bankrupt Treasury and had the plates already engraved from which those bonds were to be printed and issued.

Now, the gentleman from Michigan, in coming down to a discussion of the present tariff act in comparison with the Wilson tariff law, states the Wilson tariff law did not bring in enough revenue to run the Government. The reason why that is so is because an integral part of the Wilson tariff law was the income-tax provision, passed at the same time, but the income-tax law was then declared unconstitutional. At the present moment the movement throughout the United States to enable us to amend the Constitution so as to place an income-tax law upon the statute books is pressing to a triumphant conclusion, and in my belief it will be the best means of accomplishing a genuine tariff reform that this country has ever seen.

But the gentleman from Michigan went further and made the bold statement, by way of contrast, that the present tariff law, the Payne-Aldrich Act, does produce enough revenue to run the Government. If the gentleman would look over the most recent receipts at the Treasury, he would find that the present tariff law is running some $12,000,000 behind what was expected, and that there would be a present deficit in the Treasury if it were not for the increase in receipts from internal-revenue taxation, amounting to about $16,000,000 in round figures.

On Saturday afternoon we had the pleasure of listening to the maiden speech of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HINDS], and I think that every Member of the House wishes him well in his new position in this House. But it struck me, in listening to the academic discussion of the history of farm protection by the gentleman from Maine, that he has served so long at the right hand of the Speaker that he has grown a little bit out of touch with the farmers of the United States. The gentleman from Maine rehearsed for our benefit the experiences of Germany and England, which he says we should follow. He recited for our benefit the tariff law of Germany, which he says protects the agricultural products of that nation, and he represented to us the benefits that that had brought to the German farmer.

But the gentleman from Maine, in describing the dramatic manner in which Bismarck gave up his free-trade position and gave himself over hand and foot to the agragrians, failed to say that he did so, not at the demand of the farmers of Germany, but at the demand of the agragrians, as they are called—the great noblemen of Prussia, the great landed proprietors who control all the farming lands of the Prussian kingdom, and who, while retaining all the profit that they can make out of the tariff law or other restrictive measures for themselves, grind down their tenant farmers in sweat into the soil of that land. And I will tell the gentleman from Maine that the restrictions placed upon Germany by the agragrians are the chief cause of the present economic discontent in the German Empire.

Now, as to England. The gentleman from Maine advanced an argument, recently prepared and presented by the tariff commission of England, in favor of placing a tax upon agricultural products. Why, the gentleman from Maine is evidently not aware of the fact that protection is as dead as a doornail in England to-day, and has never been more so through the whole history of the British Empire.

He seems to make use of the recommendations of the British tariff board in very much the same way that standpatters in this country hope to make use of the recommendations of our so-called Tariff Board. Our Tariff Board is devised to continue the reign of protection. Let me show you what I believe would be the effect of the application by the Tariff Board of the principle announced in the last Republican platform of the proper method of establishing tariff rates. This says that it should be the difference in the cost of production here and abroad plus a reasonable profit for the manufacturer. Now, I will tell you exactly where that would lead you. If you applied that strictly, if you ascertained exactly the difference in the cost of production here and abroad, and then added a reasonable profit for the American manufacturer, what you would bring about would be an absolutely prohibitive protection; because if you have eliminated the difference in cost of production here and abroad you have destroyed the ability of anybody outside of the United States to send anything in here, and then you have driven the thing home by adding a reasonable profit for the American manufacturer.

Now, certainly if this so-called Tariff Board of ours, which is operating at enormous expense, with great delay and with complete secrecy, is to carry out the dictates of that principle, we will not be able to collect any tariff revenues whatever, because everything manufactured here will be nourished behind a prohibitive protection in the United States.

Now, to return just a moment to the argument of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HINDS]. Coming down from general statements of policy he selected two industries which he was particularly interested in seeing retained under what he believes to be proper protection. One of them was cheese and the other one was potatoes. Now, as a matter of fact, in the year 1910 we exported to Canada over $45,000 worth of cheese, and the same year we only imported from Canada $27,000 worth of cheese. Now, why do you suppose Americans sent their cheese

to Canada? Because they got a better market there. That is why they sent it there. They did not send it there for fun, or to amuse themselves, but to make more profit, and the movement of cheese toward Canada was three times as big as the movement of cheese from Canada toward the United States.

Here is what has been happening in cheese. In 1850 the cheese produced on farms and ranges in the United States amounted to 105,000,000 pounds; in 1860, 103,000,000 pounds; in 1870, 53,000,000 pounds; in 1880, 27,000,000 pounds; in 1890, 18,000,000 pounds; and in 1900, 16,000,000 pounds. The fact is that so far as the farmer is concerned cheese making is going out of existence.

Mr. MADDEN. Does that include the so-called cheese factories?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. No; I am just about to come to that. The production of cheese in the United States is passing out of the hands of the farmers and into the hands of the factories. In 1905, which was the last year for which we have the statistics, the cheese factories in the United States produced 317,000,000 pounds, of which we exported 10,000,000 pounds. Under that system will you tell me how the farmer of Maine or New England is going to be injured by free trade in cheese with Canada?

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for one more question?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. FINLEY). Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Certainly, with pleasure.

Mr. MADDEN. As a matter of fact, the factory gets the product from which the cheese is made from the farmer, does it not?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Certainly.

Mr. MADDEN. And the profit is divided between the farmer and the factory in the cost of the manufacture?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. The farmer can not both eat his cake and have it, too. When he comes to complain about the difference in duties between cattle and meat, then the farmer says the meat is the product of the manufacturer and not the farmer's product. And so it is with cheese. As a matter of fact, free trade in cheese with Canada is not going to hurt the New England farmer one cent.

Mr. MALBY. Will my colleague give way for a question on that?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Certainly.

Mr. MALBY. Is the gentleman able to state to the House the difference of the market price in the United States, for instance, New York and Canada, during the last few years?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I will be glad to have the gentleman furnish the figures with which he is evidently brimming. It is difficult to obtain comparative prices, because the two countries make different kinds of cheese.

Mr. MALBY. I mean the great bulk of cheese, the usual American cheese. It is that to which I refer, and it is that to which the figures refer. Is it not a well-known fact that the difference in price between Canada and the United States is substantially the amount of the tariff?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. If that were the case, the consumers would benefit very much in the United States by taking off the tariff, but I believe the gentleman is mistaken. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PETERS] has kindly handed me the report of the cost of living by the Massachusetts commission, in which the prices of cheese are given, as between Detroit and Windsor, Boston and Montreal, Bangor and St. John. It is 18 cents in Detroit and 18 cents in Windsor.

Mr. MALBY. Will the gentleman give way for another inquiry?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I will.

Mr. MALBY. For what year is that?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Nineteen hundred and ten.

Mr. MALBY. Is that the price that the farmers held it for?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. That is the price to the producer.

Mr. MALBY. That is a higher price than it is ever sold for——

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I beg the gentleman's pardon; I see it is the price to the consumer.

Mr. MALBY. Oh, well, I know nothing about that; I am talking about what the farmer gets.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman from New York yield to me on this proposition?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Certainly.

Mr. LENROOT. The gentleman has given the prices between Detroit and Windsor.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Yes; I would have quoted the other prices, but the gentleman from New York [Mr. MALBY] said that he had no interest whatever in the prices to the consumer.

Mr. LENROOT. I wish the gentleman would quote the prices of the Tariff Board on cheese between Detroit and Windsor.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I would be glad to, but I have not looked it up. The gentleman can put them in the RECORD.

Mr. LENROOT. I will read them. The wholesale price in Detroit was 15½ cents and at Windsor 10 cents. At Detroit the price was 17½, but at Windsor it was 12½.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. That illustrates the difficulty in depending on these statistics, because any man going from Toronto to Quebec and from Chicago to Bangor to ascertain the price of farm products will find about 25 or 30 different prices of the same commodity at the same time on either side of the line. The Massachusetts cost-of-living statistics directly controvert statistics produced by the Tariff Board.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. The gentleman has been referring to the retail prices, and these statistics refer to the wholesale farmers' prices. They make no contradiction, one of the other.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Now, to resume the argument which I was making against the statement of the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey. Before the gentleman leaves this matter, I would like to ask one question.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Very well.

Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey. The gentleman stated that the manufacture of cheese has passed from the farmer to the factory; that the farmer was no longer interested in the effect of this treaty.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Oh, no; the gentleman from New Jersey is mistaken; I did not make any such broad statement as that.

Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey. Since the farmer has found it more profitable to sell the material from which the cheese is made to the factory than to make it himself, is he any the less affected by free trade in cheese than if he used his own materials to make the cheese?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I will say to the gentleman, I did not attempt to make the distinction between the time when he made it himself and between the time when the factories made it, but I said the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HINDS] in making his plea for the cheese farmer probably forgot the industry was now in the hands of the manufacturer of cheese, who makes it in factories.

Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey. How does that affect the farmer less than when he made it himself, since he supplies the factory with the raw material? If free trade in cheese destroys the business of that factory, then what is the farmer to do with his raw material? And if the answer be to make cheese with it, the question is, where will he sell it?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, I agree neither with the gentleman's premise nor with his conclusion, and if he had listened to my figures he would not have made that argument, because I stated a few moments ago that the cheese factories of the United States were making 317,000,000 pounds of cheese and exporting 10,000,000 pounds of cheese.

Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey. True, but the simple point I wanted to make——

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Oh, Mr. Chairman, I regret to seem discourteous, but I think I have yielded long enough on this subject.

Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey. I do not want to take the gentleman's time——

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I beg the gentleman will now allow me to proceed.

Mr. MALBY. Will the gentleman give way for one question?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further on this point. Now, as to the question of potatoes, about which the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HINDS] seemed so much concerned, he evidently had not investigated the figures or he would have discovered that in 1910 we imported from Canada $36,000 worth of potatoes, and in the same year we exported to Canada $213,000 worth of potatoes. Now, if we have a surplus of potatoes from this country to export into Canada, how are the potato growers of the United States to be injured by free trade between Canada and the United States in potatoes? The fact of this thing, in my judgment, is that the farmer is being made the cat's-paw in this matter. Gentlemen on either side of the Canadian border line are making use of the farmer to pull their chestnuts out of

their fire. The farmer is not going to be injured. The American farmer is not going to be injured when there are 12 American farmers to 1 Canadian farmer. The American farmer is not going to be injured when the productions of our principal crops are in such overwhelming proportions in favor of the American.

Crop production in 1909.

WHEAT.		
United States	bushels	664, 602, 000
Canada	do	166, 744, 000
OATS.		
United States	bushels	1, 007, 353, 000
Canada	do	353, 466, 000
BARLEY.		
United States	bushels	170, 284, 000
Canada	do	55, 398, 000
RYE.		
United States	bushels	32, 239, 000
Canada	do	1, 715, 000
HAY.		
United States	tons	64, 938, 000
Canada	do	11, 877, 100
CORN.		
United States	bushels	3, 125, 713, 000
Canada	do	18, 726, 000
POTATOES.		
United States	bushels	376, 537, 000
Canada	do	99, 087, 200
BUCKWHEAT.		
United States	bushels	17, 438, 000
Canada	do	7, 806, 000

Crops exported in 1910.

Wheat	bushels	46, 679, 876
Oats	do	1, 685, 474
Barley	do	3, 052, 527
Rye	do	219, 756
Hay	tons	55, 007
Corn (of which 6,000,000 bushels went to Canada), bushels		44, 072, 209
Potatoes	bushels	1, 001, 476
Buckwheat	do	158, 160

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. In saying that the American farmer will not be injured by this proposed agreement, if it becomes operative, does the gentleman mean to say that he will not be injured because he will receive as much for his products as he now does?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I firmly believe he will receive fully as much for all his products.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Then the gentleman, I take it, does not subscribe to the doctrine that the passage of this bill will reduce the cost of living.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I will answer the gentleman in two ways. First, by stating what I stated before, that he who deludes himself into the belief that this is going to produce an immediate reduction in the cost of food is very much mistaken. I do not see how any gentleman can successfully maintain that proposition on this floor.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Then the gentleman does not subscribe to that idea, but rather to the other, that this will not reduce the cost of living.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Eventually it will, but now it can not.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Eventually, when it does, will it also lower the cost of the farmer's product?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. It will not, as I stated, and as I will state again, for in my judgment the effect of increasing the sources of food supply will be to prevent the corner of any product on any produce exchange in any city of the United States, and will prevent the middle man from raising the prices to the consumer.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. This bill does not reduce the price to any considerable extent upon what the middle man has, the completed product, dressed beef and flour.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Oh, yes, it does. The gentleman is mistaken. He evidently has not examined the bill. If he will permit me, I will come to that in a few moments.

Mr. Chairman, I would not read these figures, excepting for the fear I have that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] may be present in the room. I would like to print them in the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent to print these and other tables in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to print certain tables in the RECORD. Is there objection?

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

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, in order thoroughly to understand the extraordinary campaign which has been waged against the reciprocity agreement on both sides of the border line it is necessary to look no further than the thirty-fifth page of the Canadian reciprocity agreement as printed for the use of the Ways and Means Committee.

Read down at the bottom of page 35 and it will appear that the present rate is $1.25 per thousand feet on lumber, which duty is to be removed and that article is to be made free. The whole source of the agitation on the American side of the line comes right from the United States Lumber Trust. It has been urging the farmer into the belief that this reciprocity is going to hurt the farmer, whereas the sole interest that the lumberman has is not for the farmer of the United States, but for himself. A few years ago I was down at Jacksonville, Fla. I was driving along that magnificent drive there, the water front, and I asked the old negro driver who it was who owned a fine house we were passing. "Why," he said, "that is Mr. Jones's house, the lumber king." We drove about another hundred yards and there was another magnificent dwelling on the St. Johns River. I said, "Who owns that house?" "Why," he said, "that is Mr. Smith's, the great lumber king." And then we went a little farther and there was a palace of another lumber king, and you could take all over the United States wherever there is any timber and you will find out that that is the case in each one of those cities. Now, these gentlemen are important, they are powerful, they are rich, and they have come into the arena to do battle with this measure of tariff reform. If they can, they will do it to the death, but so far as the Members of this House are concerned, the Democratic Party is ready to do battle with the Lumber Trust for the rights of the American people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

On the Canadian side of the line the opposition has been just as bitter as it has been on ours, and on their side of the line it proceeds from exactly the same kind of people, the highly protected interests. Now, I have here a few copies from some of the Canadian newspapers showing the frame of mind of the Canadian, whom the farmer of the United States supposes to be chortling in his glee at the prospect of the magnificent advantage that Canada is to derive over the Yankee from this agreement. One man says that "reciprocity is going to split Canada in two." Another speaker says that it is "the worst possible distortion of democracy." Another member of Parliament announces that this is an "outrageous thing." A Canadian newspaper says that Canada is about to "turn aside from her high destiny and become the lumber camp and dumping ground of the proud and prosperous American Republic." Another Canadian newspaper has an editorial which says, "Reciprocity scotched, but not killed. The snake is scotched, but not killed. Congress has expired without passing the reciprocity resolutions, but an extraordinary session has been called for April 4." Now, here is what one of the leading members of Parliament said in the House of Commons there. He said, "Everybody is really laughing at the Canadian commissioners, they being such fools as to go over to the United States and bring back what is in reality a pinchbeck, an imitation treaty," and here he says in the presence of the prime minister:

> Let me tell the minister exactly all about all that. If you look through this treaty you will find that a long, lean, dark——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield the gentleman 30 minutes additional.

Mr. HARRISON of New York (reading)—

> A long, lean, dark, hairy hand has manipulated every part of it. I wonder whose it is?

Mr. MALBY. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague give way for an inquiry?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. With pleasure.

Mr. MALBY. I notice the gentleman is reading a great many extracts from Canadian papers against the so-called treaty. Assuming he has concluded his reading, I wanted to inquire whether he had found any of them who are in favor of it?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Why, I have not any here handy to quote, but I will assure the gentleman that the Canadian protectionist on his side of the line is much more terrified at the prospect of reciprocity even than the American farmer on his side of the line.

I have here a letter which was written by my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD], in which he addresses his constituents with some very edifying information about the balance of trade in agricultural commodities between the United States and Canada, and in the absence of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK], I am going to announce that I shall also print this in the RECORD. Briefly, he says that of horses during the last five fiscal years we sold to Canada $14,000,000 worth and Canada sold to us $2,500,000 worth, being a balance in our favor of $11,600,000

worth. Of cattle, we sold to Canada $1,500,000 worth and Canada sold to us $1,100,000 worth.

The balance in our favor is $384,000. Of meat and dairy products, we sold in Canada $17,000,000 worth and Canada sold to us $904,000 worth, being a difference in our favor of $16,000,000. Of breadstuffs, we sold to Canada $31,500,000 worth and Canada sold to us $6,600,000 worth, being a difference in our favor of $24,916,000.

Now, from these figures the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD] argues to his constituents:

Of these items, which are largely produced in Missouri, we sold to Canada $53,030,755 more than Canada sold to us. Upon these articles we had to pay the Canadian tariff. But for this Canadian tariff our balance on these items would have been still larger. Reciprocity would relieve us from that hindrance to our trade. How, then, could reciprocity hurt the Missouri farmer?

Again, here is another newspaper statement of a Canadian reason for opposing reciprocity, and it sounds exactly like the same argument on behalf of the same kind of people on our side of the line. This is Sir Edmund Walker, of Toronto, president of the Canadian Bank of Commerce. He said:

I am opposed to this proposition, because Canada has nothing to gain by it and everything to lose. We are the largest purchasers of goods from the United States, and we sell comparatively little. What can we gain by free trading with this country when we have little of our raw products to sell? Canada consumes 80 per cent of her food products, and this home consumption is growing at a rapid rate. A few years ago we sold to Great Britain $25,000,000 worth of cheese and $7,000,000 worth of butter annually. To-day our cheese exports to Great Britain have fallen off to $17,000,000 and we export no butter. Canada is building up an independent nation, and we have a struggle before us. We do not want to create a market for our agricultural products in their raw state, for we have all the customers we need at our own doors, who pay the farmers prices as high as those of the United States.

Now, I will very cheerfully corroborate his statement about the prices by reading here a table of prices of standard cattle, both in Toronto and Chicago, from 1901 to 1910:

Table of prices, 1901 to 1910.

	Toronto.	Chicago.
May 4, 1901	$4.25	$3.95
May 14, 1902	5.25	5.00
May 13, 1903	4.90	4.06
May 12, 1904	5.20	4.90
May 9, 1905	5.70	5.50
May 10, 1906	5.10	4.00
May 17, 1907	5.12½	4.00
May 15, 1908	5.50	5.00
May 23, 1909	5.75	5.10
May 13, 1910	7.00	6.25

And also a table of prices of various commodities in Toronto and New York, January 2 of this year, as follows:

	Toronto.	New York.
Bran, per ton	$24.00	$24.00
Hay, No. 1	18.00	16.00
Dressed hogs	10.00	11.72½
No. 1 dairy butter, per pound	.30	.22
Eggs, new laid, per dozen	.50	35
Ducks, per pound	.17	.10
Chickens, per pound	.16	.12½
Turkeys, per pound	.22	18½
Geese, per pound	.14	.14
Apples, Spy, per barrel	4.50	3.50
Onions, per bushel	1.00	.75
Potatoes, per bag	.90	.73

In view of that statement it is hardly surprising that on March 18 the resolution introduced by Premier Whitney in the Ontario Legislature protesting against the ratification of the agreement for reciprocity with the United States was carried last evening by a vote of 75 to 17.

Again, the Toronto Mail and Empire of February 15, 1911, says:

The markets of Britain and Germany swallow up United States farm produce, and as for the Dominion, it is a pretty good customer for Uncle Sam, even though duties are collectible upon what he has to sell. Last year—that is to say, the year ending on March 31, 1910—we bought from the United States of agricultural products the following:

Animals	$681,000
Grains	268,000
Hay	141,000
Potatoes	179,000
Tomatoes	165,000
Other vegetables	486,000
Fruit	1,120,000
Butter	16,000
Cheese	45,000
Eggs	177,000
Honey	20,000
Clover seed and timothy	748,000
Fruit and other seeds	250,000
Fresh meats	106,000
Bacon and hams	$816,000
Beef, salted	75,000
Pork, barreled in brine	930,000
Meats, dried or smoked	85,000
Meats, salted	50,000
Canned meats	45,000
Lard	1,347,000
Lard compounds	62,000
Canned vegetables	69,000
Wheat flour	156,000
Prepared cereal foods	240,000

If the United States is the paradise for farmers, how does it happen that all these products from the United States come to us despite the adverse duties? While the reciprocity scheme is represented to be a great concession by the United States Government to the Canadian farmers, for whom that Government has suddenly developed an affection, the truth is that it is really a plan for the improvement of the condition of the United States farmers, and for the thwarting of the British preference for Canada which the Unionists in Britain are advocating. The United States farmer will get under reciprocity a larger share of the Canadian fruit market, the Canadian meat market, and the Canadian market for early vegetables. He will also be assured of the continuation of free trade in Britain for his surplus. But the Canadian farmer can not derive a corresponding advantage from the bargain. Everything we can produce is also produced in the States, and in quantities that are far in excess of the consumption.

Mr. KENDALL rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Yes, sir.

Mr. KENDALL. Is it the tendency of the gentleman's argument to establish that agricultural products are really cheaper in America than they are in Canada?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. In many cases they are. There is no general rule which can be observed.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] submitted some figures upon the price of hay in the United States and the price of hay in Canada, and he evidently had not examined the report of the Tariff Board on this subject, because instead of being able to tell me that my figures on hay were isolated examples, he would find that all along the line and in almost every instance hay is more expensive in the Canadian market than it is in the markets of the United States. If he will go further and examine this report, and the report of the Massachusetts commission to investigate the cost of living, he will find that beans, peas, beets, and onions, as well as other vegetables, are uniformly or almost uniformly, higher in the Canadian markets than they are in the markets of the United States. I will submit to the Committee, and print in the RECORD, the prices of eggs, which along the Canadian border line are more expensive in Canada than they are in the United States, causing a natural export from our country to Canada of 750,000 dozen last year, while we imported from Canada only 39,000 dozen:

Wholesale prices January, 1911, in Buffalo, 36 cents a dozen; Toronto, 40 cents a dozen; retail prices, Buffalo, 36 cents a dozen; Toronto, 50 cents a dozen. In Bangor, Eastport, and Calais, Me., wholesale prices, 26–30 cents a dozen; in St. Stephens, New Brunswick, 33 cents. In Manchester, N. H., wholesale, 27 cents; retail, 30 cents. In Sherbrooke, Quebec, wholesale, 35 cents; retail, 35 cents. In Ogdensburg, N. Y., wholesale, 30 cents; retail, 35 cents. In Prescott, Canada, wholesale, 32 cents; retail, 36 cents. In Burlington, Vt., wholesale, 27 cents; retail, 30 cents. In Montreal, wholesale, 35 cents; retail, 40 cents.

Now, there is one great exception to my belief that the cost of food products will not be immediately lowered by the passage of this act, and I refer to the question of fish.

Undoubtedly the admission of fish free from Canada will be a great boon to the eastern cities along the Atlantic seaboard. At the present time we import $13,800,000 worth of fish altogether, of which 35 per cent comes from Canada. Now Canada exported $16,000,000 worth of fish last year, and I hope and believe a considerable proportion of the Canadian export of fish will henceforth come to the people of the cities on the Atlantic seaboard, where the high prices of meat have made it all the more desirable for the people of those cities to have cheaper fish.

The United States Bureau of Fisheries has estimated that Canada can supply us, if given a chance, with twice as great a supply of cod, haddock, and hake as she does now, and with an immensely increased supply of halibut, mackerel, salmon, and smelts. According to their estimates, Canada could supply us with 20,000,000 pounds fresh cod, 10,000,000 to 15,000,000 pounds fresh haddock, 5,000,000 pounds fresh hake, and 12,000,000 pounds of fresh halibut.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Yes.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I would like to know where the gentleman gets his figures on the fish products.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Those were the figures given out by the United States Bureau of Fisheries about three weeks ago.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I simply wish to say that in this book, which is put out for our credence on reciprocity, it is shown that Canada shipped into the United States, all told, fish to the value of $73,000,000, as against less than $4,000,000 worth shipped into Canada by the United States.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. The gentleman is talking about salted fish. I was not talking about salted fish. I was talking about fresh fish entirely.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I was talking about all kinds of fish.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Now, to take up one other point in this argument; the farmers of the United States have been made to believe that while their products have gone on the free list the products of manufacturers have been left at the former high rates. In other words, the farmers have been made to believe that they are not getting a square deal, and in that belief they are encouraged to assert that the negotiators of this treaty have betrayed the farmer for the sake of getting free food from Canada; that they put his products on the free list and keep high taxes upon manufactured articles. Now, the most brief and cursory examination of the provisions of this agreement will show that manufactured articles have been immensely reduced in duties, not all along the line, but in many articles in which the farmer himself is interested. I will print these in the RECORD instead of detaining the committee at this time by reading them:

RECIPROCITY CONTAINS REDUCTIONS ON MANUFACTURED GOODS.

Many agricultural implements, 45 per cent to 20 per cent: Hay loaders, potato diggers, fodder or feed cutters, grain crushers, fanning mills, hay tedders, farm or field rollers, manure spreaders, windmills, parts for repair.

Portable engines and traction engines, 30 per cent to 20 per cent.

Pocketknives, scissors, shears, and cutlery, 40–60 per cent to 27½ per cent.

Clocks, watches, etc., 40 per cent to 27½ per cent.

Farm wagons, 35 per cent to 22½ per cent.

Also, flour from 25 per cent to 50 cents per barrel. Canned vegetables, 40 per cent to 1¼ cents a pound. Oatmeal, 1 cent per pound to 50 cents per 100 pounds. Prepared cereal foods, 20 per cent to 17½ per cent. Mutton, lamb, and fresh meats, 1½ cents per pound to 1¼ cents per pound. Bacon and hams, 4 cents per pound to 1¼ cents per pound.

Also, carbon electrodes, 30 per cent to free. Brass in bars and rods, 45 per cent to free. Cream separators, 45 per cent to free. Tinplates, 1.2 cents per pound to free. Crucible cast-steel wire, 35 per cent to free. Galvanized iron and steel wire, 1.2 cents per pound to free. Typecasting and typesetting machines, 30 per cent to free. Barbed fencing wire, ¾ cent per pound to free. Rolled round wire rods, 0.6 cent per pound to free.

But it is a fair question to ask why there were not more manufactured articles either reduced in duty or put on the free list. The farmer thinks that the people who negotiated this treaty did it because they meant to make a drive at him, and as one of those who is in favor of the treaty, I feel some concern that he should entertain such a supposition. I will therefore read, for the benefit of the committee, a brief explanation made by the Canadian premier, Sir Wilfred Laurier, as to exactly why the treaty was drawn up in the shape it is now in. Speaking in the Canadian House of Commons on March 7, 1911, he said:

This agreement is concerned chiefly with natural products. There are no manufactured products dealt with in it, except agricultural implements. In negotiating this agreement we have adhered strictly to the terms of the resolution which was adopted at the Liberal convention of 1893, in which the Liberal Party declared for a treaty of reciprocity in natural products and a carefully considered list of manufactured products. Why did we put this restriction in our resolution? Why did we state in so many words that the reciprocity which we would negotiate, if it ever became our lot to do so, would be general for natural products, and would be confined to a carefully prepared list of manufactured products? Because, sir, there is a vast difference between reciprocity in natural products and reciprocity in manufactured goods. This is the reason we have acted with this prudence. I do not know who was present at the conference which took place between our two friends besides me and Mr. Knox; but it is not a great effort of imagination to suppose that the Americans were far more concerned about obtaining reciprocity in manufactured products than in natural products; but our negotiators would not consent to any reciprocity in manufactured products, but insisted on limiting the agreement simply to such manufactured products as agricultural implements.

So that gentlemen can plainly see, from the statement of the Canadian premier himself, that the Americans were not trying to keep all manufactured products on the dutiable list; that it was the Canadians themselves who were doing that; that they were unwilling to have our manufactured products come into Canada at greatly reduced rates.

Now. so far as Democrats are able to correct this inequality, we propose to do so by a bill which will come treading fast upon the heels of this one, for the moment that the reciprocity agreement has passed the House the Democrats will offer the House a bill placing upon the free list a great many manufactured products which the plain people and the farmer folks of the United States have to purchase. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

But the farmers should understand that the treaty drawn in the form in which it is, which is substantially the form of the Democratic reciprocity treaty of 1854, was not drawn with any dark or cunning design on the part of privileged interests in this country pulling the strings behind the scenes, but was the result of the refusal of the Canadians themselves to let more of our manufactured products come into their country.

But, as the gentleman from North Carolina well said the other day, it is impossible to measure the benefits of this treaty by any figures of dollars and cents. There is a bigger question here than any question as to whether a peck of onions costs more in Canada or in the United States. It is a question of principle that goes to the very roots of our economic policy. It is a principle which, I am glad to say, the Democratic Party is standing almost solidly behind. I believe it is the entrance to a new era of economic prosperity. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY], in boasting about the effects of his protective system, entirely overlooked the panic of 1907–1909. He had a singularly agile memory when he transported us back to the days of 1894–1896 and entirely neglected to call our attention to the Roosevelt panic, under high protection, which struck hardest of all in the highly protected district of Pittsburg, where most men were thrown out of employment. Overlooking that panic, the gentleman from Michigan believes that the protective system has built up the prosperity of the United States. Gentlemen on this side of the Chamber believe that our prosperity has gone forward by leaps and bounds in spite of that prohibitive protection, and they believe that this reciprocity agreement will produce the greatest prosperity that this country has ever known. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

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

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I will ask the gentleman not to interrupt me. I am about to conclude. I believe our economic prosperity will advance by the greatest strides this country has ever seen as soon as this treaty with Canada goes into effect, and that it will lead inevitably and with unerring aim to absolute free trade between the Dominion of Canada and the United States. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, the immediate effect upon our business affairs of striking down these unnatural barriers between our sister country and ourselves will be magical. By the treaty of 1854 half of the Canadian carrying trade was immediately transferred, the very next year, into the hands of the United States, and as soon as this treaty goes into effect every line of industry and every occupation in the United States will at once reap the benefit of a sound, healthy, and sane economic administration of affairs between ourselves and the Dominion of Canada. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I yield back the balance of my time and ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SHERLEY). Is there objection?

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

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, how much time did the gentleman from New York consume?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York consumed 47 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PETERS].

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, I spoke on the subject of Canadian reciprocity last February and I now wish to urge again its consideration.

This is the identical measure which at the last session of Congress passed this House by an overwhelming majority. The opposition in the Senate prevented its consideration in that body and now the House is preparing to again pass the measure, and by their action and the renewed urgency of our President force the consideration of the reciprocity bill on the Senate.

Since the days of the Revolution the subject of closer commercial relations with Canada, a country situated on our same continent and populated by people of similar tastes and standards, has ever been before our people, but at no time has the popular demand for an extension of our trade relations with our neighbor on the north been so universal as it is to-day.

With the ever-increasing cost of living and the hindrance of our industries by a tariff policy which raises the cost of production of American goods, the manufactories of our country are demanding wider markets and the people of our cities are demanding cheaper goods. Our industries, unequaled in power and production by any in the world, can no longer demand the entire surrender to them of the American market, and a reduction of the price of necessities can be accomplished only by an extension and widening of our commercial relations. The first step to check the increasing cost of living is offered by reciprocity with Canada. Further steps will be taken as rapidly

as possible, for the Democratic Party, elected on pledges for a lower tariff, proposes to keep those pledges by revising the tariff in the consumer's interest. Mr. Chairman, had the Nation listened with more patience to those who a century ago urged closer commercial relations with the Provinces to our north, both countries would have developed along natural lines of commerce, and to-day we would not hear the complaints of that small proportion of our population who believe that this agreement will prove injurious to them. We have also, Mr. Chairman, the illustration before us of the workings of a previous treaty of a similar nature with our neighbor.

THE ELGIN TREATY, 1854–1866.

Although the reciprocity sentiment has always been felt in the councils of this Nation, but one really comprehensive reciprocity agreement with Canada has become a law. This agreement—the Elgin treaty—was in force from 1854 to 1866. It dealt with three subjects—navigation of the St. Lawrence, trade relations, and the fisheries question. Of these the subject of trade relations is alone germane to the present discussion. The question of the fisheries, recently settled by The Hague, now interests us only in its commercial aspect, and the navigation question is a thing of the past.

The sentiment toward establishing a reciprocity agreement with Canada was very strong in the late forties. In 1848 such an agreement passed the House, but went no further and failed to become a law, because of complications as to the St. Lawrence which were of such a nature that they could never have been unraveled by legislative action alone.

In 1850 another bill to establish Canadian reciprocity passed the House, but was again halted by the complexities and doubts as to the attitude of Canada, and this attempt also failed.

In 1853, therefore, Congress passed a resolution authorizing the President to arrange reciprocity by means of a treaty, and under this authorization the treaty was drawn and was later passed by the House and ratified by the Senate. The Elgin treaty thus enacted provided a much more complete free list than that here presented. It provided for free interchange of natural products from farm and sea, forest and mine. The free list contained wood, cotton, coal, wool, raw tobacco, meats, and manufactured lumber. This extensive free list met with almost universal approval, and although it put on the free list many more products of the farm than are included in the list before us now, yet it was not considered to have injured the agricultural interests. No complaint was heard from the American farmers as to the workings of the Canadian agreement, and, in fact, their only criticism was that more products were not placed on the free list.

The feeling against the Elgin treaty, which resulted in its repeal in 1866, can not be attributed to its economic failure, and a study of its effect on our commercial relations with Canada is the strongest argument in support of the Canadian reciprocity agreement of to-day.

SUCCESS OF ELGIN TREATY.

In answer to a resolution of the House the Secretary of the Treasury communicated to the House of Representatives February 21, 1864, a letter which gave tables which furnish us with information as to the working of this treaty. The total imports into Canada from the United States in 1850 are shown by this table to be $6,594,860, on which we paid in duties the sum of $1,069,814. The exports from the United States into Canada were at this time gradually increasing each year, though at a very slow rate; but in 1855, the year after the ratification of the treaty, our exports to Canada alone amounted to $20,828,676, and increased yearly until in 1862 they amounted to $25,173,157. So under the operation of this treaty the exports from the United States to Canada increased from $6,000,000 to $25,000,000 annually, more than quadrupled.

At the same time the value of the free goods which we sent into Canada from the United States increased from $791,128 in 1850 until they reached $19,444,374 in 1862, the last year in which there was return, or from considerably less than one million up to nearly twenty millions.

It can not be claimed that the Canadian duties were unfairly raised, because during all this time the Canadian rate of import duty, which in 1850 was 18.43 per cent, increased in 1861 to 19 per cent, which was only a small fraction larger than when the treaty was commenced. To Canada and its Provinces the total exports from the United States increased to $28,629,110 in 1863 and the imports from Canada and the Provinces from $490,704 to $19,299,995. The total trade between the United States and Canada increased from $24,182,103 in 1854 to $40,908,887 in 1862, and shows the marked success of the treaty. The figures for the last few years of the treaty are misleading, because the war between the States created an unnatural demand for Canadian goods. The minority in their report protest against the measure because "it renews a trade agreement with Canada similar to one which heretofore existed, from 1854 to 1866, and the operation of which proved disastrous to the United States." The effect of that treaty is one of the strongest reasons for the enactment of this present measure, and the figures I have just given indicate that commercially the previous treaty was successful, and we are confident this treaty will prove so as well. All the conditions which made that treaty successful exist to-day in greater force. The fact that the total trade with Canada almost doubled in less than 10 years may show to those opposed to the measure that it was a failure, but I am confident that the people of this country will regard such a fact as the best evidence of its success.

TRADE RELATIONS WITH CANADA.

Since 1892 the United States has sent each year to Canada an amount constantly increasing in excess of our imports from the north, until in the fiscal year of 1910 our Canadian exports were more than double our imports—$206,611,517 to $96,357,998.

WHERE CANADA TRADES TO-DAY.

In proportion to her population Canada is the best market for our products, and her purchases from this country of $223,521,809 are over twice what she purchased from Great Britain and compose half of the entire imports of the Dominion. Her exports to us amount to $104,199,675 as against exports of $139,482,945 which she sends to England. Hence, while supplying half her imports, we only purchase from her 37.3 per cent of her exports. Our exports to the German Empire are but $258,000,000, or but little in excess of those to Canada. Without the item of cotton our exports to Germany amount to $120,000,000. Enormous as is this trade with Canada, with the artificial barriers of the tariff removed it would undoubtedly, if we may judge by our previous experience with Canadian reciprocity, greatly increase our commercial relations with the Dominion. Since the unwise termination of reciprocity in 1866 Canada's exports to England have increased 527 per cent, but her exports to this country only 62 per cent. Here at a glance is the result of high protection—an invisible, unnatural, political border line made nearly nine times as obstructive as 2,000 miles of salt water.

THE EFFECT OF OTHER RECIPROCITY TREATIES.

We have seen that the effect of the previous reciprocity treaty was to immensely enlarge the business and commerce between the United States and Canada. That such enlargement was to the mutual profit of the people of both countries no one can deny. Commercially and politically it served a most important purpose. In considering the effect which this proposed treaty with Canada may have, it will be particularly important to see the effect on our trade relations which other reciprocity treaties which are at present in existence have produced.

Trade with the Philippine Islands shows tremendous growth under the stimulus of the reciprocity agreement, as is shown by the following tables:

Exports from United States to Philippine Islands, 1909	$11,189,441
Imports from Philippine Islands	9,433,986
Total trade for year 1909, before free trade	20,623,427
Exports from United States to Philippine Islands, 1910	16,832,645
Imports from Philippine Islands to United States	17,317,897
Total trade for year 1910, after free trade	34,150,542

An increase of 70 per cent during a single year.

Porto Rico, with which we have free trade, shows by its imports and exports an equally strong argument for reciprocity:

Exports from United States to Porto Rico, 1898	$1,505,946
Imports from Porto Rico to United States, same year	2,414,356
Total trade for year ending June 30, 1898	3,920,302
Shipments of merchandise from United States to Porto Rico, 1910	27,097,654
Imports from Porto Rico to United States	32,095,897
Total trade for year 1910	59,193,551

Cuba, with which we have a reciprocity agreement, shows the advantages of this trade, as follows:

Imports from Cuba to United States, 1903	$62,942,790
Exports from United States to Cuba, 1903	21,761,638
Total trade for 1903, before treaty	84,704,428
Imports from Cuba to United States, 1910	122,528,037
Exports from United States to Cuba, 1910	52,858,758
	175,386,795

The arrangements above show absolutely that in all three instances both countries have profited immensely by their trade,

and can anyone doubt that in obtaining for the people of the United States the food products from these islands we have made a distinct advance in retarding the ever-increasing cost of living? To the people of these islands themselves we have given the power to purchase our manufactured articles, which purchases have stimulated our manufactures and increased the demand for labor in this country.

COST OF LIVING.

The increased cost of living is one of the principal problems faced by the people of to-day. The purchasing power of the workingman's wages has grown constantly less. The United States Senate has made an investigation of the cost of living. Many States have done the same thing, and it is a problem which we are making every effort to solve. My own State of Massachusetts appointed a commission on this subject, and I quote from its report (Mass. House, 1910, Doc. 1750, p. 384):

But the tariff was never meant to apply seriously to the food of the people, save for the development of such industries as the growing of fruit in Florida or beets for sugar in the West. From the first it was designed to create and preserve manufacturing industries. The odium of the corn laws need but be suggested to show how obnoxious would be a serious tax on food. If we have reached the point where it is of real importance to us to have the product of the farms of the North, as well as that of the farms of the West, no tariff hindrance can be endured.

As this country approaches the point where it will cease to export many of its food products, the tariff on food will force up the prices, and, in addition, will enable speculators, by cornering the market on food products, to engage in the worst form of speculations on the daily demands of the necessaries of the people.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERS. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I take it from the gentleman's argument that his belief is that this agreement will tend to reduce the cost of food.

Mr. PETERS. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Does the gentleman believe also that it will reduce the price of materials from which food is made, which will be received by the farmer?

Mr. PETERS. I will say, if the gentleman will allow me, that the consumption of food in this country is increasing faster than its production and that we are closely reaching the point where we will cease to produce in America sufficient food products for the American consumption. When that point is reached, then I believe that we must have some food imported from other countries. I do not think to-day in many food products they will be affected one way or the other by the passage of this agreement.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Then, if the food products are not affected, I suppose the prices of the products to the consumer will not be affected by this bill?

Mr. PETERS. I think the food prices to the consumer will be somewhat affected, because it will allow an interchange of food products from points in Canada to the United States where they can be exchanged with a less cost of transportation and that the expense of the middle man in placing the food in the hands of the consumer will be reduced; and I do think that in certain articles of food there will be a reduction, and a material one in certain cities. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. To what commodities does the gentleman refer, may I inquire for information?

Mr. PETERS. I am coming to it, and I have tables to show the difference in prices of food between American cities and those in Canada.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Can we have from the gentleman what particular food commodities he claims will be reduced in price in cities as a result of this legislation?

Mr. PETERS. I was about to present the statistics on this when the gentleman interrupted me. In proof of the general proposition that the consumption of food products in this country is outstripping the production of the country I want to quote to the House certain statistics of imports of food for the last few years. I invite the consideration of the House to some facts in the conclusion of the Cost of Living Report I referred to, on page 530, and ask them to bear in mind that this food report was made by a commission the majority of whose members are believers in a protective tariff. The report says:

It is not probable that the removal of the duty on farm products would diminish by a penny the wage rate of farm laborers anywhere in the United States. That rate is determined by the competition of the mill and the attractiveness of the city. * * *

It is not our belief that removal of the tariff on the staple articles of food would speedily and greatly reduce the cost of living. The same causes are making food high in all the civilized world, and the difference between wholesale prices is not enough to warrant the expectation that a policy of what, for brevity's sake, would doubtless be called "free food" could change international transactions greatly and at once. Its importance comes from the fact that we are soon going to buy a material part of our food outside our own limits. It would further have the very beneficial consequence of removing what chance may now exist to "corner" food products—a chance that puts the public at the mercy of the speculator and the trust. To some extent, also, it would lessen our dependence on the seasons and the weather. Bad harvests rarely occur over all the world.

We submit, therefore, that it is a wise economic policy to give the people free access to those articles of food that call for the bulk of the expenditure of the masses. For purposes of revenue, it may be wise to tax somewhat the comforts, and the heaviest duties should be levied on the luxuries, but the food necessities of life should be "free."

Now turn to statistics in support of the above statements. First consider wheat.

WHEAT.

Wheat is the most important product of the Dominion of Canada, of which product Canada exported 57,000,000 bushels, out of a total crop of 166,744,000. This bill removes the duty of 25 cents a bushel on wheat. At the present we export 144,000,000 bushels of wheat, but our amount is constantly diminishing, while that of Canada is rapidly increasing, and at no distant day our exportations from this country will probably cease. The price of wheat is largely determined, not by local conditions, but by the markets of the world in Liverpool, where the wheat grown in Russia, Asia, Canada, and the United States compete.

In 1910 the United States exported into Canada $55,139, or 54,964 bushels, and there was imported from Canada $135,441, or 152,441 bushels.

THE AMERICAN FARMER.

If the American farmer could stand the whole Canadian output in the fifties, surely he can stand the portion that would be diverted from England by the operation of the agreement now before us, an agreement not nearly so comprehensive as that of 1854.

CONSUMPTION IS INCREASING FASTER THAN PRODUCTION.

In proof of the proposition that consumption is increasing faster than production let me first quote from the Report on the Cost of Living (p. 265) of the Massachusetts commission:

The home demand for the products of the soil is outstripping the home supply.

Imports for consumption.	1899	1909
Breadstuffs	$940,361	$5,190,354
Meat and dairy products	1,950,835	6,503,773
Vegetables	2,170,959	8,029,748
Wood, and manufactures of wood	8,241,250	30,642,780

Not only do we import more for consumption—we export less of food products and produce, in the main, less per capita from year to year. In proof of this statement, let us consider a few statistics. First in regard to wheat:

	Per cent.
Since 1880 population of the United States has increased	80
Since 1880 production of wheat in United States increased but	50
For the decade ending 1890 United States exported of its wheat (average)	27
For the decade ending 1900 United States exported of its wheat	35
For the last 6 years United States exported of its wheat	17
For the year 1909 United States exported of its wheat	12

	Bushels.
In 1880 United States produced per capita	9.9
In 1909 United States produced per capita but	8.3

Contrast this rate with that of Canada:

In 1909 Canada produced per capita	23.7

Nor has the United States cut down its rate of consumption:

	Bushels.
In 1900 per capita consumption of United States	4.74
In 1909 per capita consumption of United States	6.22

The report of the Massachusetts commission, page 367, draws the obvious conclusion:

Eliminating the factor of the variations of crop, it looks as if we were lessening our exports by about 2 per cent a year, so that it is not at all impossible that we shall be in the world's market for wheat in the course of a dozen years. Of course when we begin buying wheat it will be from Canada.

Other examples beside wheat.

CORN.

	Per cent.
Since 1880 population of the United States has increased	80
Since 1880 production of corn has increased but	66
In 1900 United States exported of corn and corn meal	10.3
In 1909 United States exported of corn and corn meal	1.4

	Bushels.
In 1900 United States per capita consumption	24.4
In 1909 United States per capita consumption	20.7
In 1880 United States produced per capita	34.2
In 1909 United States produced per capita	31.4

Cereal crops that have been practically constant for the last decade.

	Bushels each year.
Rye (about)	30,000,000
Buckwheat (about)	15,000,000
Oats (about)	900,000,000

Over this same period population has increased 25 per cent, which means that in 1900 there were 5 bushels of these grains per capita, now but 4 bushels. Barley alone of the great cereal crops has kept pace with growing population.

Two other interesting examples of actual and comparative decline in production.

LUMBER.	Thousand feet.
1900	34,780,513
1907	40,256,154
1908	33,224,369

COTTON.

(Production practically stable since 1897.)

	Bales.
1897	10,897,857
1909	10,386,209
1904 (the bumper year)	13,697,301

Drain of population from the land.

(Percentage increase of urban and rural population.)

Years.	Total population.	Urban.	Rural.
1870-1880	30.08	40.0	27
1880-1890	24.6	61.0	15
1890-1900	26.7	36.8	13

The Massachusetts commission, in its report on the cost of living (p. 529), mentions the drain of the population from the land as one of the main factors in restricting supply and enhancing the cost of commodities.

The percentage of increase of our urban to our suburban population shows also the fact that we are having fewer and fewer people producing the products and we are having more and more people desiring to consume them in our cities. With demand constantly outstripping supply, it will not be long before we cease exporting food products altogether. The ever-increasing growth of our cities is hastening that end.

Mr. ANDERSON of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. PETERS. Certainly.

Mr. ANDERSON of Minnesota. I would like to ask the gentleman if he thinks this is a desirable condition, and if he thinks that subjecting the farmers' products to the competition of Canada will tend to decrease it?

Mr. PETERS. I fail to see what effect the competition of the Canadians would have on either increasing or decreasing the tendency toward the concentration of the population in our cities. I believe that that is caused by other circumstances which are entirely beyond and outside of those to be affected by the agreement which is before us.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Will the gentleman permit a question right there?

Mr. PETERS. Certainly.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Does the gentleman think that this relative rapid increase of population in the cities is due to the fact that we have not the agricultural land on which to raise the products, or does he think that the inducements of manufactures and other industries are so large and so much greater that the farmers are turning to them? It must be one way or the other.

Mr. PETERS. Why, as I replied before, the general social conditions, the general circumstances of life in the country, the general opportunities that are offered in the cities all tend to affect it. It is too large a question, if the gentleman will excuse me, for me to take up and make a reply to in the few remaining minutes which I have granted to me at the present time.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. It seems to me it is a most important question at this point.

Mr. PETERS. To the same report I will refer you in regard to this effect of the concentration of population in our cities.

OBJECTION OF THE MINORITY TO RECIPROCITY.

It appears from the views of the minority set forth in the report (H. Rept. 2150), and from the speech made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] on February 15, that those opposed to reciprocity with Canada have three main objections to the proposed treaty.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], who signs the report, calls attention to the objections to this agreement and sums them up in three heads. The first objection is that we should vote against this agreement because it is un-Republican. Gentlemen, I am afraid the Members of this body will to-day place the welfare of the American people above the force which the gentleman from Pennsylvania gives to that argument. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The second point: It is class legislation. It discriminates against the farmer. In Mr. DALZELL's words:

His corn, his wheat, his potatoes, his hay, his oats, his live stock are all put on the free list. His reaper, his harrow, his plow, his farm implements are all taxed.

In the first place, I have just shown you that the production of all our great cereal crops, except barley, is not increasing at a rate anything like population.

Secondly, farming implements, together with a number of other things, are going to be put on a free list which is already reported by the Ways and Means Committee to the House, against the objection of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, but there is the danger, of course, that when this matter comes up for discussion the minority will find it convenient to use farm implements to support a different argument, namely, that to put these articles on the free list would be "class discrimination of the most obnoxious character"—it would give the farmer an unfair advantage over the protected manufacturer. It is in this manner that the protectionists hold themselves out as the savior of all classes.

The third point made by the minority: It involves a trade agreement with Canada similar to the one that existed from 1854 to 1866, and the operation of which proved disastrous to the United States.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania in his speech in the House on February 15, 1911, makes much of the point that this is the reciprocity agreement of 1854 over again, with comparatively little change. He then attempts to establish the fact that the 1854 treaty was disastrous to the United States, and he then concludes that the proposed treaty will be accompanied with the same bad results as that of 1854.

In the opening sentence of his speech Mr. DALZELL declared it was not his intention to go into details, nor would I attempt to estimate exactly what will be the actual amount of trade in each or any articles upon the passage of this reciprocity treaty, but like Mr. DALZELL I will attempt to draw some conclusions from our previous experience with reciprocity. I have already given you some statistics which pointed out the growth of trade between Canada and the United States. Mr. DALZELL in his speech of February 15 admits this growth of trade between the two countries, but greatly laments the effect it had on the balance of trade and, with Mr. Blaine as his authority, states that in the last year and three-quarters of its (the treaty's) life the balance of trade was against us in the sum of over twenty-eight millions.

The last year and three-quarters of this treaty were coincident with the closing years of the war between the States, a period when we were producing an abnormally small amount both on the farm and in the shop. We had to buy abroad, and I would ask if it was not a matter of good fortune rather than otherwise that we had a source so near at hand—where could we have obtained food and other supplies more quickly or cheaply?

To-day the balance of trade is not the "bugbear" it was in the middle of the last century; but if a point is to be made of it in judging the success of the 1854 reciprocity treaty, would it not be more to the point to take the statistics of trade other than those which show the trade of this country with Canada when we were in the most unnatural condition imaginable?

Mr. DALZELL. The gentleman does not contend that those figures are not correct, does he?

Mr. PETERS. I do not, but I do contend that the inference should be drawn only from the time the Elgin treaty started, in 1854, up to the time the abnormal conditions began to affect our trade with Canada, in 1862 and 1863. And the figures of that time will show such a condition that the gentleman himself will come to a very different conclusion from that which he seeks to present to this House in his argument in February last.

Now, on page 117 of Extracts from Congressional Debates on the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854, House Document 1350, you will find a table showing our imports to and exports from Canada from 1854 to 1862, and inasmuch as the gentleman asked me a question, I will ask him if he considers these figures show the Elgin treaty to be a failure?

	1854	1862
Total exports to Canada	$15,533,101	$25,173,157
Total imports from Canada	8,649,002	15,063,703
Balance in favor of the United States	6,884,099	10,109,454

A gain of over $3,000,000, or of 50 per cent, in our excess export balance.

The only year down to 1862 in which we did not have a favorable balance of trade with Canada was in 1860, when Canada exported more than she imported by the insignificant sum of $250,000—and it will be recalled that 1860 was a year of commercial and financial instability in the United States.

As late as May 24, 1864, Mr. Sweat said in the House:

By a report of the Secretary of the Treasury recently made it appears that our exports to the British Provinces were $26,445,683 more than the amount imported from them by the United States.

He also states that with all the defects of the present treaty the balance of trade for the last 10 years has been in favor of the United States.

It would seem, then, that Mr. DALZELL's argument against the success of the treaty of 1854 was unfortunately based on figures that were really not representative. It therefore follows that that gentleman's gloomy predictions, which are based entirely upon results which seem to be misleading, can have little weight in the consideration of what will result from the proposed treaty.

Mr. DALZELL frankly says that we "have everything coming our way"—that is to say, the balance of trade with Canada to-day is decidedly in our favor; in fact, it is abnormally in our favor. Judged from the statistics given by Mr. DALZELL, it would seem that we would lose this balance. I have shown you that such a conclusion is unwarranted. Also, Mr. DALZELL seems to entirely overlook the fact that if Canada can buy our goods to-day in great quantity she would be able to do so to a much larger extent if she could pay for them with her products instead of with gold.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, may I have a moment more?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, as this seems to me an opportune moment, and as I have some tables which I wish to present to the House, I will ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

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

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

Mr. PETERS. I am evidently mistaken as to the opportunity. [Laughter.]

Mr. KENDALL. The gentleman should not have asked for unanimous consent in so loud a voice. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman want to insert some figures in the RECORD?

Mr. PETERS. Yes; tables of figures covering prices.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. PETERS. I do.

Mr. MANN. I wish to inquire, without taking it out of the gentleman's time, whether the objection of the gentleman from Florida goes to the extension of remarks, or to the ordinary insertion of figures and tables, such as are not ordinarily included in a speech as it is delivered on the floor, and whether there is any objection to the request that that privilege be granted to the gentleman?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I do not hear the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. I ask whether the objection of the gentleman from Florida to the extension of remarks goes simply to the extension of remarks, or to the right to insert tables of figures and papers that are correlated with the argument?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I would like to state, for the benefit of the committee and to answer the gentleman from Illinois, that I do not care. My object is to try to force, if it can be done, an amendment to the rules—such an amendment as I introduced this morning—to stop this indiscriminate printing of prepared speeches in the RECORD that were never delivered.

I do not intend to object, and I want to put the committee upon notice now that I do not intend to object to the request of any gentleman during this tariff debate, to print in the RECORD statistical information, but I do intend to object whenever I am here—I can not be here every minute—to the extension of remarks by which some gentlemen write out long-winded arguments that were never delivered, because I regard that practice as a fraud upon the public and an unnecessary tax upon the Treasury. That is my position.

Mr. MANN. In the main I fully agree with the gentleman, and I thought the gentleman would not wish to object to inserting tables of figures, and such things.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I do not, and shall not object to that during this debate.

Mr. PETERS. Then, I will submit the request again, that I may print in the RECORD, in connection with my speech, certain tables which are taken from the report that I hold in my hand, and which are pertinent to the subject before the House at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to include with his remarks certain statistical reports just referred to. Is there objection?

Mr. PETERS. And the words of explanation which naturally precede them.

Mr. MANN. Oh, certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

Mr. PETERS. Gentlemen, we are not claiming that this reciprocity agreement is going to revolutionize the cost of living, but I have tried to show you here to-day, and the import and export figures do show conclusively, that, in the first place, the Elgin treaty, to which this is similar, was financially and commercially a success for this country. Trade increased under it to a tremendous extent. I have shown here, also, that the consumption of agricultural products is increasing in America far beyond the increase in their production. It is admitted that the cost of living is going to be an ever-quickening problem that must be faced, that all the people of our country are facing. We do not come before the people to favor one class of consumers as against another, and you will have the best of evidence before this session is over that the Democratic Party, which has been placed in control of this House, proposes to carry out to the people of the country to the letter the pledges that it made before election. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I believe that we are getting dangerously near the point where the duty on food products will raise the price or render easy a corner in the market. To carry out this agreement this body will act in accordance with an overwhelming public sentiment, and will show that it is actually what it is in name—the House of Representatives of the American people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. HARDWICK having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

RECIPROCITY WITH CANADA.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD with my remarks the statistical tables to which I referred in the course of those remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] asks unanimous consent to print with his remarks certain statistical tables. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DALZELL. How much time did the last gentleman consume?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] has used 4 hours and 12 minutes in all, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] 3 hours and 37 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I desire to state that I will yield five hours to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCALL], to be consumed on that side by gentlemen favoring the bill. I will arrange with him as to the time when that shall come in. I will say that we should like to have the debate run this evening until 6 o'clock.

Mr. DALZELL. I yield one hour to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT].

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, on Saturday last this debate was opened by one of the greatest orators and perhaps the readiest debater in this House—my friend the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN]. In his opening remarks he congratulated the Democratic majority upon the auspicious beginning which they had made in the carrying out of their platform promises. He did well so to congratulate them, for that was the first time within the memory of any man within the sound of my voice when anyone could congratulate the Democratic Party upon carrying out any promise.

He referred to two measures which have already passed this House: First, the resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution for the election of Senators by a direct vote, and I join with him in congratulating the Democratic majority upon

the passage of that resolution. [Applause.] I congratulate this side of the House upon the fact that that resolution received almost the unanimous support of the Members on this side of the Chamber. The second measure that he referred to was the measure that passed this House last Friday with reference to publicity of campaign contributions, and the gentleman said that that, too, was a fulfillment of the pledge of the Democratic Party in that regard.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to read the promise of the Democratic Party made in its national convention in 1908 with reference to campaign contributions, and consider for a moment how near that bill complies with the promise of his party. That plank reads as follows:

We pledge the Democratic Party to the enactment of a law preventing any corporation contributing to a campaign fund.

Was there any line in that bill on prohibiting corporations from contributing to campaign funds? No; but the Democratic Party is not chargeable with any neglect for that reason, because at the time this platform was written there had been written into the statute books of the United States, 12 months before by the Republican Party, a law prohibiting corporations from contributing to campaign funds. [Applause on the Republican side.] And therefore the Democratic majority should be acquitted from any charge of violation of their platform in that regard.

As I listened to the gentleman from North Carolina Saturday, listened to the wealth of misinformation that flowed from his lips—not intentionally misleading, of course, because the gentleman would not do that—but as I listened to him and his carelessness, not to say recklessness of statement, I wondered if the gentleman from North Carolina, perhaps, had not written this plank in the Democratic platform pledging the Democratic Party to the enactment of a law that had already been enacted by the Republican Party. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Perhaps the gentleman from North Carolina had not had the time for a serious study of the question which he discussed Saturday, and perhaps he may be excused for the same reason for writing, if he did write, this promise into the platform of his party.

But that is not all. The pledge goes further:

We demand the enactment of a law preventing any corporation contributing to campaign funds and any individual from contributing an amount above a reasonable minimum.

Mr. Chairman, was there anything of that kind in the bill which passed this House last Friday? Was that pledge of the platform carried out?

But there is more of this:

And providing for the publication before election of all such contributions above a reasonable minimum.

Was there anything in the bill that passed this House last Friday carrying out that pledge of the Democratic Party? There was such an amendment offered to that bill upon this side of the House, and you remember that it was adopted and placed in the bill through the courage and independence of a sufficient number of Democrats voting with the minority upon this side to place it there. And then we remember how the party lash flew across that side of the Chamber, and inside of 15 minutes, without any intervening debate or any discussion, a sufficient number of Democrats reversed themselves to defeat that amendment. Upon that amendment, offered by this side of the House, squarely carrying out the pledge of your own party, 165 of the Democrats upon that side of the Chamber voted "no."

Mr. CULLOP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. Certainly.

Mr. CULLOP. The gentleman does not mean to be understood to say that there was not a publicity plank in the law that we passed last Friday?

Mr. LENROOT. A publicity plank; yes.

Mr. CULLOP. To publish the contributions 15 days before election and every 3 days thereafter until election day, of all sums over and above $10.

Mr. LENROOT. To whom?

Mr. CULLOP. To the world.

Mr. LENROOT. Contributions to the political committees.

Mr. CULLOP. No; it must be filed with the Clerk of this House and then published. It then becomes public property.

Mr. LENROOT. Contributions only to the national political committees, and not contributions to individuals, while your platform promised publicity of all contributions. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CULLOP. This new law gives publicity of all contributions.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take the time to ask the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CULLOP] one question. If contributions are made to you, as a candidate for Congress, and not to the national committee, where is your law requiring publicity?

Mr. CULLOP. I have no contributions made to me as a candidate; I do not need them. The Democrats can run their campaigns without contributions from special interests, and State laws regulate this matter. [Laughter.]

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote against this bill in the form reported by the committee, because it is unjustly discriminatory against the farmers of this country, and favors the great trusts and monopolies. It will not reduce the cost of living to the consumer, because a high tariff remains on practically all food products that he uses. This bill can not be defended from a Republican standpoint, from the declarations of the last Republican platform, and I say further, Mr. Chairman—and I shall have something to say about it a little later on if I have the time—this bill can not be defended from a Democratic standpoint, from the last platform of the Democratic Party. But I propose in my discussion of this bill to discuss it from the standpoint of a Republican, believing in the doctrine of protection, the principle that duties should cover, and cover only, the difference in cost of production at home and abroad. The Republican Party in 1908 made a solemn pledge to revise the tariff in accordance with that principle. We all know what happened, and because the Payne-Aldrich law failed to fulfill that promise, progressive Republicans all over this country, with voice and pen, condemned that law and insisted that the pledge of the Republican Party, that duties should cover only the difference in cost of production at home and abroad, should be kept, and that there should be further reductions of tariff until that promise should be fulfilled to the letter.

Mr. BARTLETT. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. LENROOT. Certainly.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman does not state all the platform, does he, with reference to the tariff? Did it not also provide that there should be a reasonable return to the manufacturer upon the money invested?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. That was a new departure.

Mr. LENROOT. It was; and it did not comply with the pledge with that clause put upon it.

Mr. BARTLETT. I will admit that it was recreant in all of its pledges, if the gentleman desires.

Mr. LENROOT. It is now sought in many quarters to show that progressive Republicans are inconsistent in opposing this bill while at the same time demanding lower tariffs upon manufactured articles. They are not inconsistent, but, on the contrary, it is the advocates of this measure who are inconsistent. Progressive Republicans have never been free traders. [Applause on the Republican side.] I challenge anyone to point to any speech made by a progressive Republican in Congress or elsewhere advocating free trade. As a progressive Republican I stand to-day where I have stood in the past, for a protective tariff, measuring duties by the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad. It is true that our demand for reductions has been confined very largely to manufactured articles, and in that we have been consistent. The evils of exorbitant tariff rates, as a general rule, are felt only where the product affected is controlled by a trust or monopoly. Until comparatively recently——

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. I noticed that he stated he agreed with that part of the last Republican national platform which provides for a tariff equaling the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad. Does the gentleman indorse the remainder of that platform which provided that the tariff should also be levied sufficient to insure a reasonable profit to the manufacturer?

Mr. LENROOT. No; I do not.

Mr. CULLOP. Does the gentleman indorse his party's action in passing the Payne tariff bill?

Mr. LENROOT. No; and neither did I in the campaign.

Mr. CULLOP. The gentleman did not indorse that part of the Republican Party's procedure that passed and advocated the Payne tariff bill?

Mr. LENROOT. I did not.

Mr. CULLOP. Do you indorse the action of your party in passing the Payne-Aldrich bill?

Mr. LENROOT. I do not indorse the action of my party in passing the Payne-Aldrich bill. I thought I made that clear.

Mr. CULLOP. Does the gentleman claim that it is a violation of the party pledge?

Mr. LENROOT. I do.

Mr. CULLOP. Then, the gentleman's party has not always been keeping its pledges. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. LENROOT. No; it has not. [Applause on the floor and in the galleries.] And neither has yours.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will suspend for a moment. The galleries are admonished that they should not applaud or show any evidence of approval or disapproval.

Mr. LENROOT. I want to say if my party had kept its pledge, there would have been a minority upon that side of the Chamber to-day instead of a majority. [Applause on the Republican side.] As I was saying, Mr. Chairman, the evils of exorbitant tariff rates are, as a rule, felt only where the products are controlled by trusts and monopolies. Until comparatively recently it made little or no difference how high tariff rates were, provided they were high enough to protect the American industry from excessive competition by foreign countries. With full and free competition at home, domestic prices were not measured by the foreign price plus the duty, and prices were kept upon a reasonable level. But great economic changes have taken place in recent years. Nearly all of the great industries have combined into gigantic corporations controlling our markets. Competition is gone and prices to the consumer are arbitrarily fixed by a few men. We have the Woolen Trust, the Cotton Trust, the Steel Trust, the Beef Trust. I will not attempt to enumerate them all. These conditions are familiar to every Member of this House and the country.

Destroying competition at home, they are able to dictate the prices upon their products, and there are only two limitations upon the prices which they may fix—first, the ability of the public to buy and, second, the foreign price plus present tariff rates. When we impose a tariff rate of 100 per cent, when a rate of 25 per cent would be sufficient to cover the difference in cost of production at home and abroad, then we give these trusts a license to plunder the American people. This is what progressive Republicans have been fighting; this is what they will continue to fight until justice is done.

We stand for a consistent policy applied alike to all classes of our people. We insist that if the protective theory shall prevail, the 6,000,000 farmers of this country are just as much entitled to the application of that theory to their products as the manufacturers are to their products. [Applause on the Republican side.] If, on the other hand, the theory of free trade is to be applied to the farmers, they insist, and rightly so, that that theory shall also apply to the manufacturers. [Applause.]

The President of the United States two years ago pronounced the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill the best tariff law ever enacted and criticized but one schedule, the wool schedule. To-day he has completely reversed his position and advocates free trade in agricultural products with Canada, our only competitor, but at the same time proposes a higher protection for many manufactured products than does the Payne-Aldrich bill, which has been condemned by the American people. I think that I shall be able to demonstrate before I get through that upon certain important manufactured products the rates proposed in this bill give their manufacturers from 50 to 75 per cent higher protection than the Payne-Aldrich law.

The President in his message to Congress says this bill—

> is not a violation of the protective principle as that has been authoritatively announced by those who uphold it, because that principle does not call for a tariff between this country and one whose conditions as to production, population, and wages are so like ours, and when our common boundary line of 3,000 miles in itself must make a radical distinction between our commercial treatment of Canada and of any other country.

If free trade in agricultural products with Canada is not a violation of the protective principle for the reasons stated by the President, then the high rates upon manufactured products proposed in this bill are for the same reasons a violation of the protective principle.

If the President is correct in his statement, then every tariff rate in this bill upon every manufactured product is a violation of the pledge of the Republican Party that tariff rates should be based upon the difference in cost of production at home and abroad.

On the President's own statement, how can the rate proposed upon beef in this bill, of 1¼ cents per pound, be sustained, or 50 cents per barrel upon flour, and so with every manufactured product? If there is a difference in the cost of production between this country and Canada, the farmer is just as much entitled to protection as is the manufacturer, and this bill is a violation of the pledge of the Republican platform because it fails to give the farmer that protection. If there is no difference in the cost of production, then there should be free trade in manufactured products, and the bill is a violation of the pledge of the Republican platform because it proposes high tariffs upon those products. This country can not prosper, Mr. Chairman, and it has no right to prosper, if we adopt one policy as applying to one class of our people and a directly contrary policy as applying to another class. [Applause on the Republican side.] Let us have protection for all, or let us have free trade for all. [Applause.]

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from Connecticut?

Mr. LENROOT. I do.

Mr. HILL. If the gentleman will pardon me, I will say that I am very much interested in what the gentleman has been saying as to the equality of protection. How do you reconcile the fact of 75 per cent to 100 per cent in different farmers' products?

Mr. LENROOT. That is true to a certain extent, and it is——

Mr. HILL. If equality is to be applied to all, why should not the woolgrower and wheat grower have the same equal percentage of duty? Why should not the lemon grower of California and the potato grower of Maine be put on the same basis?

Mr. LENROOT. Because the cost of production varies.

Mr. HILL. Does not the same principle apply to the cost of production between manufactured goods and farmers' products that applies between one farmer's products and another's?

Mr. LENROOT. It does; but the principle of the difference in cost of production should apply to all. I want to say to the gentleman from Connecticut that if there is no difference in the cost of production between this country and Canada in agricultural products, I am willing to vote for free trade in them, but if there is a difference I insist that we apply the principle of protection to them, and I wish the gentleman from Connecticut would do likewise.

Mr. HILL. But the gentleman said a moment ago that the bill now pending is a violation of the Republican platform, because it levied a duty on manufactured products and took it off from the farmers' products. Would not that be governed entirely by the difference in the cost of production, and how, if there was such a difference, could the platform be violated?

Mr. LENROOT. I am glad the gentleman brought that out. I was basing that statement solely upon the President's message, stating that there was no difference in cost of production, both as to manufactured products and as to agricultural products. And what I insisted was, with that premise, that both classes should be treated alike. [Applause.] I am aware of the fact that it is claimed that upon manufactured products Canada refused to agree to any lower tariff on imports into Canada. I do not question that statement, but it was entirely feasible to provide for absolute free trade with Canada upon all imports coming into this country upon Canada's making concessions by way of lower tariff upon imports into Canada from the United States, and if that had been done the agreement thus made would have been just as free from the claim that other countries would be entitled to free trade, because of the favored-nation clause in our treaties, as is the pending bill.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman in what he says about manufactures, but I want to ask him this question: Even though it be admitted that this bill is violative of your idea of protection as to manufactured articles, that they can be manufactured in this country, as I think they can, as cheaply as in Canada, does that affect, as far as it goes, the fact that farm products can be raised as cheaply as in Canada, and are you not violating your principle of protection when you insist, on any account, that the farmer should have a duty on wheat when he can raise it here as cheaply as he can in Canada?

Mr. LENROOT. I want to say to my friend from Texas that I do not for one moment insist that a farmer should have a duty on wheat if he can raise it as cheaply as a farmer in Canada, but I shall be able to show that the contrary is true, and that he can not do so; and that is my whole contention in this debate.

Mr. HARDY. I think the gentleman was objecting to the bill because it did not give the farmer the same protection that it does the manufacturer.

Mr. LENROOT. It does not.

The President in his message based his entire contention on the assumption that conditions were so similar in Canada that there was no difference in cost of production either in manufactured articles or agricultural products. If that is so, then we should apply the same principle to both manufactures and agricultural products.

Mr. HARDY. I agree with the gentleman on that proposition; but, as I understand it, the gentleman opposes the bill on the ground that the cost of production of wheat in this country is greater than in Canada.

Mr. LENROOT. It is greater.

If we now amend this bill by providing for free trade with Canada upon imports coming into this country, if it should be found to conflict with the favored-nation clause in our treaties—and I deny that it will—then it is only because the President has seen fit to make an agreement that did not provide for free trade, and no man has been heard to say, and no man will be heard to say, that Canada would not have been as ready to make the agreement if these greater concessions had been included.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], upon Saturday, made the statement that amendments to this bill would kill the agreement, and gave as his authority a statement of one of the Canadian commissioners. Now, I am sure that upon reflection neither the gentleman from Alabama nor any other lawyer in this Chamber will undertake to claim that by so amending this bill as to provide for free trade in imports from Canada to this country will in the slightest degree affect that agreement. I do not know how many Members are familiar with the Canadian bill. I hold a copy of it in my hand, and I want to say to the Democratic majority that you can place your free list that you propose in a separate bill as an amendment to this bill, and it will not affect one line or one letter of the bill now pending in the Canadian Parliament. Let me read one paragraph:

That it is expedient to provide—

I am reading now from the Canadian bill—

that the act proposed to be founded on the foregoing resolutions shall not come into operation until a date to be named by the governor in council in a proclamation to be published in the Canada Gazette, and that such proclamation may be issued whenever it appears to the satisfaction of the governor in council that the United States Congress has enacted, or will forthwith enact, such legislation as will grant to Canada the reciprocal advantages provided for in certain correspondence dated Washington, January 21, 1911, between the Hon. P. C. Knox, Secretary of State, for the United States, and the Hon. W. S. Fielding, minister of finance, for Canada, and the Hon. William Patterson, minister of commerce, for Canada.

Now, will any gentleman claim that if we choose by amendment here to give to Canada greater concessions than she has asked Canada is going to object to that bill for that reason? No; no one will claim any such absurdity as that.

But, Mr. Chairman, if the policy of protection had been adhered to by the President, then the construction of this bill would have been radically different from what we find it. I assert, and shall be able to prove from the report of the President's own tariff board, that the cost of production of agricultural products is much less in Canada than in this country. And, on the other hand, I think I shall be able to show that the information at hand fairly establishes that the cost of manufacture of manufactured products is less in this country than in Canada.

First, as to the cost of production of agricultural products.

THE COST OF PRODUCTION OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS IS LESS IN CANADA THAN IN THE UNITED STATES.

Let me say a word here with reference to this tariff board, whose figures I shall use. It was a matter of great satisfaction to me to find in the report of this tariff board, appointed to ascertain facts, that those facts were ascertained and presented to the Congress regardless of whether they sustained the President of the United States or not. [Applause on the Republican side.]

In the debate that we had here a few months ago upon the creation of a tariff commission the sole contention upon the part of those who opposed it upon the other side of the Chamber was that the members of this Tariff Board, being appointed by a Republican President, would be the creatures of the President. But in the first report that we have from that Tariff Board we find that that report sustains the President of the United States in scarcely a single one of his contentions. And now that we have this conclusive evidence of the independence of that Tariff Board, I shall hope that during this session of the Sixty-second Congress you gentlemen upon that side will be patriotic enough to reverse your positions and favor the creation of a permanent, nonpartisan tariff commission. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The report of President Taft's Tariff Board shows that the yield per acre of spring wheat in 1910 averaged 11.7 bushels per acre in the United States and 15.53 bushels per acre in Canada. In barley the yield in Canada was 24.62 bushels per acre; in the United States, 22.4 bushels. In oats the yield in Canada was 32.79 bushels per acre; in the United States, 31.9. In flaxseed the yield was 4.8 bushels per acre in the United States, while in Canada it was 7.97 bushels. In hay the yield in the United States was 1.33 tons per acre; in Canada it was 1.82 tons.

THE VALUE OF IMPROVED FARM LAND IS LESS IN CANADA THAN IN THE UNITED STATES.

I submit the following table contained in the report of the Tariff Commission, page 84:

Comparative values of farm lands in Canada and the United States.

	Average value per acre of improved land, 1900.	Average value per acre of improved land, 1910.	Per cent of increase.
United States:			
Maine	$15	$25	67
New Hampshire	19	26	37
Vermont	18	24	33
Rhode Island	51	62	22
Connecticut	42	63	50
Pennsylvania	46	56	20
Delaware	32	51	59
Illinois	54	108	101
Indiana	39	75	92
Missouri	25	50	100
Iowa	50	109	117
Wisconsin	35	57	63
Michigan	33	46	39
Minnesota	26	46	77
Canada:			
British Columbia	55	73	33
Manitoba	13	29	123
New Brunswick	11	24	120
Nova Scotia	11	31	181
Ontario	35	50	43
Prince Edward Island	19	32	70
Quebec	24	43	80
Saskatchewan	7	22	201
Alberta	7	20	185

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Can the gentleman explain to us why it is that the Canadian farmer's land is worth so much more and sells for so much less?

A MEMBER. Produces so much more.

Mr. LENROOT. I do not quite get the gentleman's question.

Mr. CARLIN. His question is, Why, when it produces so much more, it sells for so much less?

Mr. LENROOT. Because they have not the advantage of our markets; and you propose to give them that advantage, and when you do the price of their land will be the same—ours lower and theirs higher. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Is it the gentleman's contention that they do not sell any wheat in Liverpool?

Mr. LENROOT. They sell wheat in Liverpool.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Where do we sell ours?

Mr. LENROOT. We sell some wheat in Liverpool, but we use most of it ourselves.

Mr. CULLOP. I should like to ask the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. CULLOP. The gentleman is referring to the report of the tariff experts who have been in use by the President now for about two years?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. CULLOP. The gentleman understands that the President made up his reciprocity measure from the report of that board, does he not?

Mr. LENROOT. I understand directly the contrary.

Mr. CULLOP. What was he having them for, if he was not using them for this purpose?

Mr. LENROOT. The gentleman must ask some other person than myself.

Mr. CULLOP. Can the gentleman tell anything that this board has ever done in the two years that the President has had it, with an appropriation of over $500,000 to maintain it?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes; I hold in my hand a report from this Tariff Board, full of information——

Mr. CARLIN. Republican information.

Mr. LENROOT. And if you gentlemen would read this information your action on this reciprocity bill might be different.

Mr. CULLOP. The action of the President, I understand the gentleman to say, was to run away from his own Tariff Board.

Mr. LENROOT. I can not go aside into a discussion of that question.

Mr. CULLOP. If the gentleman will yield for another question, do I understand him to say that the price of farm products in the United States is higher than in Canada?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes; I do.

Mr. CULLOP. The gentleman regards Chicago as one of the leading wheat markets of this country?

Mr. LENROOT. I regard it as the greatest.

Mr. CULLOP. Was not the quotation on wheat in Winnipeg Saturday 2½ cents per bushel higher than it was in Chicago?

Mr. LENROOT. It might have been.

Mr. CULLOP. And more than 5 cents higher than it was in St. Louis and more than 6 cents higher than it was in Kansas City?

Mr. LENROOT. I would say in answer to the gentleman that that is not true so far as the same grades are concerned.

Mr. CULLOP. Was not the quotation of No. 1 wheat in Winnipeg at 91 cents a bushel and 88 cents in Chicago?

Mr. LENROOT. No; the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. CULLOP. That was the report in yesterday's papers, and is the correct quotation of the price.

Mr. LENROOT. I should be very glad to have the report put in the RECORD. The gentleman can not find it.

Mr. CULLOP. If the gentleman will look in the Chicago papers of yesterday which came here to-day he will find that to be true, and I will only be too glad to put the report in the RECORD. Now, I want to ask the gentleman a further question.

Mr. LENROOT. I can not yield further unless I can have more time. I want to say in reply to that before I forget it, with reference to the price in Chicago of wheat and the price in Winnipeg, that they are entirely different grades of wheat. The Winnipeg price is all on Nos. 1 and 2 Northern, the best wheat grown in the wide world, while the Chicago prices are on contract grades, or No. 2 red, as a rule.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman submit to a correction, or does he prefer I should wait?

Mr. LENROOT. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, in the interest of historical accuracy alone and at the gentleman's suggestion, I want to call attention to the fact that he entirely misquoted the productions in the other country on wheat. He quoted spring wheat in the United States at 11.73 bushels yield and spring wheat in Canada at 15.53. As a matter of fact, the great bulk of wheat in the United States is winter wheat, in which we excel Canada in the production per acre, and the great quantity of wheat in Canada is spring wheat. I have the figures from the Government report. It is 11.73 bushels, as he stated, on spring wheat, but it is 15.8 on winter wheat, our larger product, and it is 15.53 in Canada, her almost exclusive product, or about three-tenths bushel per acre less than the United States.

Mr. LENROOT. I can not yield further. I wish to correct the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. HILL. I have here the Yearbooks.

Mr. LENROOT. I have the report of President Taft's Tariff Board, and I am sorry, indeed, to find that the gentleman from Connecticut, who has struggled as hard as any Member in this House to secure the creation of a tariff board, is unwilling to abide by the figures submitted by that board. I find from the figures of the Tariff Board that the production of winter wheat in Canada is very much greater per acre than the production in the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. HILL. I admit it; but I say that very little winter wheat is raised in Canada; it is spring wheat which they raise. I will give the figures to the gentleman in my own time.

Mr. LENROOT. The report shows that the yield is greater in spring wheat and winter wheat in Canada; greater in both. I have just introduced a table, Mr. Chairman, showing the values of improved farm lands in this country and Canada.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. For a question?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. On the matter of prices of farm commodities.

Mr. LENROOT. I have not got to that yet.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. The gentleman has discussed the prices of wheat.

Mr. LENROOT. I was discussing the yield, and not the prices. Mr. Chairman, immediately following this table in the report of the Tariff Board we find the following:

> In the great farming States of Iowa, Indiana, and Illinois the values of farm land are very much higher than in any of the Canadian Provinces. In Illinois and Iowa they are a little over twice as high as in Ontario.

From the table I have quoted it will be observed that in Wisconsin the value of improved farm land is given at $57 per acre, while in the great Province of Manitoba it is only $29.

THE COST OF FARM LABOR IS HIGHER IN THE UNITED STATES THAN IN CANADA.

I will submit a table taken from a report of the Tariff Board, page 85, which I ask leave to insert in my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks permission to put in his remarks certain tables which have been referred to. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Average wages of agricultural labor, with board, in specified States, eastern Canada, and British Columbia, 1909.

	By the month.		In harvest.[1]
	Hiring by the season.	Hiring by the year.	
United States:[2]			
Maine	$27.60	$23.17	$1.63
New York	26.00	22.08	1.77
Michigan	25.10	21.57	1.75
Minnesota	29.25	23.98	2.23
Wisconsin	28.57	24.39	1.79
North Dakota	33.34	27.01	2.58
Iowa	28.93	25.63	2.08
Ohio	22.11	19.19	1.67
Vermont	26.86	24.03	1.73
Montana	39.29	35.00	2.23
Washington	36.39	31.32	2.34
Missouri	21.10	18.85	1.50
Canada:[3]			
Prince Edward Island	17.25	10.87	(4)
Nova Scotia	21.20	15.90	.40 .50
New Brunswick	22.59	9.96	.....
Quebec	23.33	17.58	.30 .35
Ontario	21.52	17.63	.20 .35
British Columbia	30.50	20.69	[5].35 .50

[1] Wages by the day.
[2] Advance figures from unpublished bulletin on agricultural wages by Department of Agriculture.
[3] From Canadian Census and Statistics Monthly, Jan., 1911, p. 2.
[4] Wages by the month.
[5] Includes only lodging.

Mr. LENROOT. This table shows conclusively that farm labor is much more costly in the United States than in Canada. In Wisconsin the cost per month runs from $24.39 to $28.57, while in the neighboring Province of Ontario it is only from $17.63 to $21.52.

Mr. LOBECK. How about Saskatchewan?

Mr. LENROOT. That is much higher, but compared with the States of Washington and Montana it is higher in the United States.

Mr. LOBECK. The price of farm labor in Saskatchewan——

Mr. LENROOT. I can not yield further.

Mr. LOBECK. I would like to say something on that.

Mr. LENROOT. The gentleman will have to do it in his own time.

THE PRICE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS IS MUCH HIGHER IN THE UNITED STATES THAN IN CANADA.

According to the report of the Tariff Board, the average price of spring wheat received by the farmer in Canada in 1910 was 73.8 cents per bushel, while our farmers received 89.8 cents per bushel, or 16 cents per bushel more than the Canadian farmer received. According to the report of the Tariff Board, for his barley the Canadian farmer received 47.4 cents, while our farmers averaged 57.8 cents per bushel, or 10.4 cents more per bushel than the Canadian farmer. For his flaxseed the Canadian farmer received $2.07 per bushel, while our farmer received $2.30 per bushel, or 23 cents per bushel more than the Canadian farmer.

For his hay—and I hope the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PETERS] is in the Chamber—the Canadian farmer received $9.66 per ton, while our farmers received $12.26 per ton, or $2.60 per ton more than the Canadian farmer. It is true a few moments ago that the gentleman from Massachusetts did take certain figures out of the report of this Tariff Board with reference to a difference in favor of Canada, but if he had looked at the table showing the general averages and conclusions of the Tariff Board he would have seen that upon the average the farmer in this country received $2.60 per ton more for his hay than did the Canadian farmer.

From this report it appears, then, that in the raising of wheat the Canadian farmer has the advantage of a yield of 3.83 bushels per acre more than our farmer, in barley his yield is 2.22 bushels per acre greater, in oats 0.89 bushel per acre greater, in flaxseed 3.17 bushels per acre greater, and in hay his yield is 0.49 of a ton per acre greater. The cost of his land is from one-third to one-half less than ours, and the cost of his help is from 15 to 40 per cent less, and yet it is proposed to compel our farmers to compete with him upon a free-trade basis without giving to our farmers any compensation in substantially lower duties upon the things that they must purchase.

Upon Saturday the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] called as witnesses Senators GALLINGER and LODGE, members of the Senate committee who made the report upon the cost of living.

It will be remembered that he told us that that report conclusively showed that in prices the farmers of this country had no advantage over those of Canada, and that especially with reference to the price of wheat the price of wheat in this country was controlled by the world's market. In proof of that he read from the report, that upon a certain day or in a certain year wheat was 2 cents higher per bushel in Liverpool than it was in Chicago. That was true, but if the gentleman had turned to another page of the report he would have found that this same committee reports that the transportation rate from Chicago to Liverpool was 17 cents a bushel on wheat, so that when wheat is worth 2 cents more per bushel in Liverpool than it is in Chicago, it means that there is a difference in favor of this country, or a higher price, in other words, of 15 cents a bushel, the difference between the transportation rate of 17 cents and the higher price of 2 cents in Liverpool. The gentleman can not be allowed to impeach his own witness, but I will be fairer than he was. As a general rule I would not care to call those gentlemen as witnesses and abide by their conclusions, and I want to be entirely fair and say that the transportation rates that they give of 17 cents a bushel from Chicago to Liverpool is too high. The actual rate is about 11½ cents, and let me say this, that the transportation rate on wheat from Chicago to Liverpool is less than it is from Chicago to New York, showing conclusively that as in the case of lemons, after the Payne-Aldrich bill was passed, the railroads proposed to secure for themselves a portion of this higher price of grain in this country.

You remember how the gentleman from North Carolina drew a word picture of the insurgents and standpatters joining hands and waltzing around and singing hosannas and hallelujahs to the farmer. We remember that. I will ask you, Who is going to receive the benefit of this reciprocal agreement? I will tell you some of the people who will receive it. When this bill passes, the Beef Trust, upon the basis of their shipments into Canada last year, will save $239,213 in duties, increasing their profits to that extent when you pass this bill. The Agricultural Implement Trust will receive, from the reduction of tariff rates upon their exports into Canada, $218,488 annually. And, Mr. Chairman, I might draw another picture of the Democrats upon that side of the House joining hands with a Republican President and singing hosannas and hallelujahs to the Beef Trust and to the Agricultural Implement Trust. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, I assert that the cost of manufacturing is, as a rule, less in this country than in Canada.

As to manufactured articles we have no report from the Tariff Board, presumably because there has not been sufficient time for the board to make an investigation of this question. We have, however, information of a general nature tending strongly to show that the cost of manufacturing is less in this country than in Canada. It is a significant fact that the Canadian Government has refused to permit free trade in manufactured articles imported from the United States. If the cost of manufacturing is greater in Canada than in this country, why this refusal on the part of Canada? She favors free trade in agricultural products, because it is shown that the cost of production is less in Canada than in this country. She opposes free trade in manufactured products presumably because the cost of manufacturing is greater in Canada than in this country.

But stronger evidence is at hand than conclusions to be drawn from the action of Canada. In 1910 our manufacturers shipped into Canada agricultural implements to the value of $3,900,000, upon which they paid a duty of from 17½ to 25 per cent ad valorem.

Portable engines to the value of $1,799,000 were shipped into Canada and paid a duty of 20 per cent ad valorem.

Automobiles to the value of $1,569,000 were shipped into Canada and paid a duty of 35 per cent ad valorem.

On the other hand, there were imported into the United States from Canada of these articles, agricultural implements to the value of $84,000; portable engines, none, so far as our records show; and automobiles, none. This, Mr. Chairman, in the absence of direct evidence as to the costs of production, must, I think, convince any impartial mind that the cost of manufacturing is, generally speaking, less in the United States than in Canada. I do not wish, however, to be understood as saying that the price to the consumer is less in the United States than in Canada, for I believe the contrary is true. I believe that an investigation will show that many manufactured products are shipped to Canada, the duty paid, and the price paid by the consumer there is less than the price paid by the consumer here.

If manufactured articles were admitted free from Canada it would compel our manufacturers, when they monopolize our markets, to lower the price to the consumers in the United States to the point where Canadian manufacturers could compete with and undersell them if they did not.

Earlier in my remarks I stated that I would try to demonstrate that the degree of protection granted to American manufacturers is greater in this bill than they now enjoy under the Payne-Aldrich law. In other words, as to many manufactured articles the protective duties are actually higher in this bill than in the Payne-Aldrich law.

I will first take wheat and the product of wheat, which is flour.

The present tariff upon wheat is 25 cents per bushel. It requires 4½ bushels of wheat to produce 1 barrel of flour.

Now, it is a fact familiar to all who have studied tariff rates that we have two classes of rates, known as compensatory and protective rates. When a tariff is levied upon raw material, in considering the rate to be levied upon the manufactured product, the first question to be determined is how much of a duty shall be levied to compensate the manufacturer for the duty upon the raw material.

For instance, when we levy a rate of 25 cents a bushel on wheat, the manufacturer of flour is first entitled to a duty equal to that which would be laid if the flour was imported in the form of wheat. That duty in the case of flour is four and a half times 25 cents, or $1.12. This is only imposing a duty of 25 cents a bushel on the wheat in the flour, and thus far the manufacturer has received no protection whatever in the $1.12. This is the compensatory duty, and added to that is, or should be, a protective duty, covering the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad, if there be any such difference.

In the Payne-Aldrich law, while the duty on wheat is 25 cents per bushel, the duty on flour is 25 per cent ad valorem. The flour that we exported into Canada in 1910 was valued on the average at $5 per barrel. Twenty-five per cent of this sum is $1.25, which would be the duty upon a barrel of flour. This includes both the compensatory and the protective rate. The compensatory rate is, as I have shown, $1.12, leaving, under the Payne-Aldrich law, 13 cents per barrel as the protection to the manufacturer.

Now, what is proposed in this bill? Wheat is made free; so there is no compensatory rate to be considered. Therefore, if no higher protective rate was imposed than is contained in the Payne-Aldrich bill, the rate upon flour would be 13 cents per barrel. But what do we find? It is proposed to grant the flour manufacturer a tariff rate of 50 cents per barrel, or nearly 300 per cent more protection than he enjoys under the Payne-Aldrich law. [Applause.] I could go on and make the same demonstration as to beef, and every other manufactured article in the bill, where the raw material is admitted free, but I will not take the time to do so. Any Member can figure it out for himself, for it is merely a matter of computation.

Upon the question of flour, too, I would observe this, that this proposed rate of 50 cents a barrel is more than twice the entire cost of the manufacture of a barrel of flour. During the vacation I was at home. My own city of Superior, Wis., is a large milling center, destined, I believe, to become the largest upon the continent. I asked one of the mill experts there whether he could tell me what the cost of the manufacture of a barrel of flour was. He took his pencil and figured for a time, and replied that with a mill running fairly continuously the cost was 18 cents per barrel. I asked him if that included interest on the investment, because I wanted to get at this reasonable profit that has been spoken of. He said, "No." I asked him to figure that, and he did. He replied that it would be 3 cents a barrel. So he gave the entire cost of the manufacture of a barrel of flour, including interest on the investment, as 21 cents per barrel. And yet you are asking us to vote, and you Democrats are proposing to vote, for a tariff upon flour of 50 cents a barrel, or more than twice the entire cost of manufacture. It is just such things as these, Mr. Chairman, that endanger the whole policy of protection. Those who vote for this bill will be under the necessity of making some explanation of why they voted for free trade for one class of our people and a tariff rate of more than double the entire cost of manufacture for the manufacturer.

I understand that you gentlemen on the other side claim that you have another bill coming in here that is going to take care of that; that you propose to put those things upon the free list that we are criticizing now. Well, if you are in good faith in that, if you want to legislate for the country instead of trying to make political capital, why do you not put it as an amendment upon this bill? [Applause.] You can not be heard to say that it will endanger this agreement if you put that free list as

an amendment to this bill, because there is no intelligent man upon that side of the Chamber—and I think most of them are intelligent—who will undertake to say that that will invalidate the agreement. Now, why do you not do it? What do you propose and what is your hope? Your hope is that you can pass that free list bill through this House, and that it will be vetoed by President Taft.

If you do not want that, put it as an amendment on this bill, and if the reciprocity bill is signed, as it would be, this would go with it, and then you would be entitled to some credit for legislating for the people of the United States instead of merely playing politics with great measures. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LENROOT. I would like to have 10 minutes more.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman 10 minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 10 minutes more.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, this bill will not reduce the cost of living, and that, I think, is now admitted on both sides of the Chamber. The people do not eat cattle upon the hoof, that are admitted free. They do eat beef, which will have a tariff of 1¼ cents a pound. The price of beef to the consumer will not be reduced. The Beef Trust will have an excuse for reducing the price of cattle to our farmers because of the increased supply, but there will be no reduction of price to the consumer, and the only result will be to increase the profits of the Beef Trust.

Wheat is free; but, as I have shown, there will remain a tariff of 50 cents a barrel upon flour.

Flaxseed is free, but linseed oil, which is controlled by the Oil Trust and is a product of flaxseed, will have imposed on it a tariff of 15 cents per gallon still. What is true with respect to the articles that I have named is true also of practically every other article of manufactured food products.

Mr. Chairman, there has never been a bill proposed before Congress upon which there has been so much misrepresentation as this bill. In the cities throughout the country this bill is being urged upon the ground that it will reduce the cost of living. In the country the attempt is being made to convince the farmer that it will not reduce the price of his products. In my judgment, neither statement is true. It will not reduce the cost of living, for a high tariff remains upon practically all food products that the people use. It will reduce the price to the farmer of agricultural products by means of the increased supply, but the only beneficiaries will be the manufacturers of food products, enabling them to pay still greater dividends upon their watered stocks.

When a Republican President joins with the foes of the protective system in forcing free trade upon a large class of people, I, so far as my conduct is concerned, shall insist upon a consistent policy and shall vote for free trade upon those articles of necessity which the farmer must use. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I will have more confidence in securing that compensation to the farmer if you will submit your free list, as I have indicated, as an amendment to this bill, and I challenge any Member on the other side of the House during this debate to furnish some good reason why you should not.

When a spirit of justice and equal treatment of all of our citizens shall again prevail, and it surely will, then I shall be ready to take up all of these questions and vote to place duties upon all products, whether of soil or factory, that are naturally produced in this country, based upon the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 50 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 50 minutes.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, if the trade arrangement negotiated between the United States and Canada in 1854 had not been abrogated, in my humble judgment there would not be one man in a thousand on either side of the line to-day who would not earnestly oppose its abrogation. If the Louisiana Purchase had not been consummated and the Mississippi River had remained the western boundary of the Republic, there would have been a tariff wall along that boundary from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico; and if a proposition were to be made now to establish more liberal trade relations between the people on the east side and those on the west side of that line there would be frantic objection to it on both sides. The people on the east side would protest that they could not compete with the pauper labor and the cheap lands with fabulous producing capacity in Iowa and other sections in the West. The people west of the river would proclaim with as much vehemence that free competition meant disaster and ruin to their industries. It is safe to make these assertions, Mr. Chairman, because nobody can disprove them. I make them for the purpose of suggesting to the House the disposition of many people to protest against any change in existing conditions. Many seem to act upon the theory that the existing situation can not be improved, and they conjure up in their imaginations fears of all kinds of evil at the mere suggestion of a change. This seems to be true of some Members of this body in the consideration of the great measure that is pending before Congress at this time. They see in it all kinds of certain disaster, without a single beneficent aspect. This has been true of every great, progressive movement in the world's history. If, centuries ago, the people of the world had admitted that the earth was round, they surely would have fallen off into space when their heads were downward turned. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that some of the debates upon this question justify the criticism I have suggested. I read in the American Economist a few days ago a letter from my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], who recently paid a visit to the Dominion of Canada with a view, I presume, of investigating conditions there, so that he might vote intelligently upon this proposition. In that letter he said they were successfully raising wheat at this time as far north as 70° north latitude, about 200 miles north of the Arctic Circle, closer to the North Pole than to the boundary line between Canada and the United States. Perhaps he is right, but if I am correctly informed in relation to the geography and development of Canada, there is not a railroad within 600 miles of the seventieth degree of north latitude. It is possible that we can now find some excuse, some justification for the claim that Dr. Cook made to having discovered the North Pole. It may be that he got lost in a Canadian wheat field and what he found there was not the North Pole, but a big stack of wheat, waiting in cold storage for the reciprocity bill to go through in order that it might come down and create havoc in the wheat market at Minneapolis and Chicago. [Laughter.]

RECIPROCITY AND PROTECTION.

Mr. Chairman, this is a practical question to be determined from the standpoint of the two countries, and there are certain fundamental things that we may know as a matter of common knowledge. It is not necessary to go to the North Pole to find out whether wheat can be raised there successfully. It is not necessary to travel to the moon to understand the law that holds that luminary in its orbit. I think we know as much about that law as even the man in the moon knows. We should take a broad view of this measure and consider it from the standpoint of the whole country and not settle it altogether because of its bearing upon the production of codfish in Massachusetts or beans in Michigan or hops in Oregon. We should consider it from the standpoint of the future as well as of the present.

It is charged that this measure is un-Republican; that it is not in harmony with the Republican position upon the policy of protection. I hope I am a Republican. I think I am. I am a firm believer in the policy of protection, but my understanding of that policy is that it is designed to promote industrial development in our own country, designed to increase to the highest degree the opportunities for the employment of American capital and American labor. No person or class of persons has any vested right to protection against foreign competition. Protection can not be justly applied simply to increase the prices and profits of any class of producers. One industry has no right to claim protection simply because as a matter of public policy protection may be extended to another industry. The sole question should be the public welfare. Whenever and wherever reasonable customs discrimination in favor of a line of industries will promote the general good, that discrimination ought to be made, but when it will not promote the general good, either directly or indirectly, the discrimination should not be made. The wise application of the policy of protection will promote industrial growth and advance the public interests. While an unwise application of that policy may benefit a special class, it will retard industrial progress and operate against the common good. I believe that the best friends of the policy of protection are not those who insist upon the maintenance of

unnecessarily high duties nor those who regard it as a special favor to any class of producers, but those who contend for duties only high enough to cover the difference in cost of production here and abroad, imposed only for the advancement of the common good.

I agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], who just addressed the House, that the same policy should be applied to the products of the soil as is applied to the products of the factory; that no distinction ought to be made in favor of one class as against another class, and that protective duties are justified only from the standpoint of the common welfare. If I did not firmly believe that the farmers of the United States can produce wheat, oats, barley, hogs, cattle, and every product of the farm as cheaply as they can be produced in Canada, I would not support this measure. Agriculture is the first industry in every country, and when the farmers are prosperous that prosperity is shared by every other line of business, and when the farmers are in hard lines general prosperity is impossible. The railroads, the factories, and the merchants depend primarily upon the farmers for business.

Our Democratic friends say this bill is one of their brood. Of course their progeny, like Laban's flocks, are so motley and variegated, so "ringstraked and spotted," that it is difficult to say what they may legimately lay claim to in the way of tariff legislation. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] If I remember correctly, under the McKinley tariff law a Republican administration negotiated a number of reciprocity treaties with foreign countries, lowering the rate of duties, and when the Democrats came into control of the Government under Grover Cleveland in 1893 they enacted a law that repealed every one of those treaties and made no provision whatever for such international trade arrangements as is embodied in the pending bill.

I have never understood that reciprocity was a part of the policy of a tariff for revenue only. This bill gives up nearly $5,000,000 of revenue a year; so it would be a contradiction in terms to call it a tariff for revenue only measure. Where does the revenue come in? Reciprocity is a corollary of the policy of protection. They neatly and logically dovetail into each other.

RECIPROCITY AND THE FARMER.

A great deal has been said, and a great deal more will be said, in the course of this discussion respecting agricultural conditions in the United States and in Canada and the relative cost of farm products in the two countries. Wheat seems to be occupying the spotlight in this discussion. Farm products are controlled more by the law of supply and demand and less by the cost of production than any other commodities. I have noticed that whenever any attempt has been made to liberalize our trade relations with the people in tropical countries we have been met with the argument that the standard of living is necessarily low in the Tropics; that generous nature supplies most of the food; that no fuel, little clothing, and comparatively little shelter are required, and therefore the people of the United States can not successfully compete with tropical people because of these vital differences in conditions.

Now, on the other hand, the assertion is made that we can not successfully compete in production with those who live to the north of us, where the climate is much more rigorous, where they require warmer clothes, more expensive shelter, more food, and more fuel. Judging from the character of the debates in Congress on this class of measures, one might naturally conclude that our country is the most unfortunate spot on God's green earth; that we can not compete with anybody or anything, anywhere, at any time. [Laughter and applause.]

While I am not willing to accept any such conclusion, I do not think we can successfully compete in many lines of production with densely populated countries where wages are low, labor efficient, and the standard of living greatly below our own. But consider the fundamental conditions as they exist in Canada in relation to agriculture.

I have no doubt you can go to Manitoba or Saskatchewan or Alberta and with a pad and a pencil reckon the price of land, the cost of labor, seed, tools, and implements, and the yield of a quarter section of wheat, and by the process of mathematical reckoning ascertain the cost of production of wheat there by the bushel. By the same method the cost of production of wheat on a quarter section of land can be ascertained in Minnesota, Oklahoma, or Missouri, and it is possible that the farm cost will be slightly less in Canada. It will be discovered that the cost of living, labor, implements, and machinery is as high in the three Canadian Provinces as it is in this country, but land is cheaper there. Production, however, includes marketing and our advantage in that respect more than offsets the cheapness of Canadian land. The farmers of Kansas and Nebraska can produce and deliver wheat in Liverpool, the world's market, at a smaller cost than can the farmers of Manitoba or Saskatchewan. But the American farmer has other great advantages over the Canadian farmer aside from facilities for transportation and marketing. When I speak of the Canadian farmers in this connection I refer to the farmers in the prairie Provinces west of the Red River of the North.

BENEFITS OF DIVERSIFIED FARMING.

In this country farming is diversified. Our farmers raise wheat, oats, corn, cattle, and hogs. Crops grow in this country eight months in the year and cattle and hogs grow all the year through. Our farmers have something growing into money all the time. They find employment on the farm, more or less, 12 months in every year. On account of the climate the Canadian farmer raises only small grains. He can not raise corn and of course can not raise cattle and hogs with great success on that account. His crop is planted, harvested, and marketed within five months, and during the other seven months he has little employment on the farm. He has little, if anything, growing into money. Many Canadian farmers leave their farms during the long winter months and work for wages in the forests and the coal mines. In diversified farming each crop is raised at a smaller cost than is possible where only one kind of grain is raised. They say land is cheap in Canada. It is as compared with some land in the United States.

But there is a great difference in the value of lands in the United States. Some lands in this country can be bought for $2 an acre, while there are great areas of farm lands that are worth $200 an acre. Why is this difference? It is because of the difference in the producing capacity of the lands. Canadian lands will never be worth anything near as much as the lands in Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, and some other States in the Union.

Mr. WARBURTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I will yield for a question.

Mr. WARBURTON. Is it not a fact that in the same longitude, 5 miles on either side of the boundary, the land on the United States side is worth twice what the same quality of land is on the other side?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Well, that is possible; that is very likely. It is not altogether the difference in producing capacity that makes the difference in the value of the land in this country and in Canada. I will be frank. Western Canada is sparsely settled and poorly developed as compared with this country. Under its last census the density of population in Canada was a man and a quarter to a square mile of area. It is not organized, and there are some other reasons. It has not the market facilities that we have.

Mr. WARBURTON. Is it not just as necessary for the farmer along the boundary line in the United States to go to the mines in the winter as it is for the farmer on the Canadian side to do that?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The closer to Canada the greater is that necessity, I conceive.

Mr. WARBURTON. And the fact is this——

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I guess the gentleman is right about that.

Mr. WARBURTON. That in the Dakotas and in Montana and all along that line those same conditions prevail, and the farmers, just like the Canadian farmers, must farm to wheat and nothing else, practically.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes; and that is one reason why the lands in the United States along the Canadian border are not worth much and they will never be worth much, compared to lands better located. Take any country that can produce only small grains and experience has demonstrated that in a comparatively few years of successive cultivation the capacity of the land to successfully produce is greatly reduced. Last year the average yield of wheat in North Dakota was 5 bushels to the acre. They raised a little flint corn in that State, and the average yield was 14 bushels to the acre.

Mr. CLINE. I would like to inquire of the gentleman whether in a combination of crop raising like we have in this latitude they do not raise the crop that they raise in a one-crop country like Canada cheaper and make more money on it, though if raised alone here it would cost more than in the one-crop country?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That is exactly my contention. They raise all of the crops at a smaller cost because of the diversification. If one crop only is cultivated, its failure means distress; but if that crop is a success, much time and money are lost, because the tenant is employed only for that one crop. He and his land must be idle more than if his farming consisted of several kinds of crops and the raising of meat and dairy animals besides. Different kinds of crops permit of

rotation and the consequent keeping up of the fertility of the land. Canada is a one-crop country.

A quarter section of good prairie land in the State of Illinois will produce more, one year with another, and is worth more than two average sections in the prairie area of western Canada. Canada is poorly developed; there is much uncultivated land in its western Provinces. I read a recent history of Canada, written by an Englishman. He said that after successive cultivation of five years in small grains the producing power of the western lands begins to decline. They can not rotate with corn, they can not raise clover, and the wise farmers in Manitoba and Saskatchewan advertise and sell their improved lands after five or six years of cultivation and buy new and unimproved lands, to get the benefit of their virgin fertility.

Mr. HELGESEN. I live in North Dakota. The gentleman from Indiana has stated the yield of wheat and corn last year, and I would like to know if he wants the people to believe that is the average of North Dakota in raising wheat and corn?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I just referred to last year. I have the crop report of the Agricultural Department to support the statement.

Mr. HELGESEN. I want to tell the gentleman that I have lived there for 25 years, and there has never been a year that we did not raise more than double that quantity until last year, which was an exception.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. But you do not raise any corn.

Mr. HELGESEN. The corn crop is increasing every year.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. You only planted two or three hundred thousand acres last year, while your neighbor, South Dakota, planted between two and three million acres in corn.

Mr. HELGESEN. Twenty-five years ago they did not have any more than we have.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. It seems that the further you get away from Canada the better your lands will produce.

Mr. HELGESEN. We will discuss that later.

SCOPE OF THE MEASURE.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I would be glad if this measure were broader in its scope. I have no doubt that we can manufacture commodities as cheaply in the United States as they can in Canada along almost every line. We ought to be able to do so. Our industrial organization is infinitely better than the industrial organization of Canada. We can employ machinery in manufacturing to the very highest possible advantage and Canada can not because her market is more limited. I would be glad to have substantially all manufactured commodities on the free list between this country and Canada. But it takes two to make a bargain, and the Canadian representatives refused to make further concessions on manufactures. They looked across the line into this country and saw what wonderful progress we have made under the policy of protection; how we have built up our magnificent home markets and maintained the highest standard of wages and the highest standard of living of any people on earth, and it seemed good to them. Several years ago Canada adopted the same policy, and one result has been to cause a large number of American establishments to build branch factories in Canada to supply the market there and escape the Canadian tariff. Those branch factories employ Canadian labor and are building up the Canadian home market for the benefit of the farmers, railroads, and producers there. While the reciprocity agreement is not as comprehensive as I would like to have it, it is a large step in the right direction and doubtless will lead to a still more liberal policy.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I will yield for a question.

Mr. COOPER. Just for a question. The gentleman said he would have been glad to have seen farm implements put upon the free list. The gentleman was on the committee, I think, and he ought to remind the House of this fact, which he remembers, that the Payne tariff law put agricultural implements on the free list that come from other countries that admit them into their ports free of duty.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. And the tariff is only 15 per cent, and the reason they have not gone on the free list is that other countries will not consent to it.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That is a pertinent statement to put in my remarks at this juncture, and I thank the gentleman for it. We have now reciprocal free trade in agricultural implements with the world, and the only reason we have not been able to get into Canada with our implements free of duty is because Canada will not make the concession.

PRICES IN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA.

Much has been said about the comparative price of commodities on this side of the line and on the Canadian side, and the price of wheat has been quoted in Winnipeg, Minneapolis, and Chicago. It is true that for the last six or eight years the price of wheat in Minneapolis, for instance, has been on an average about 8 cents a bushel above the price in Winnipeg. It is about 8 cents on the average, but at times it has been as high as 14 cents, and at other times the price has been on an absolute level, with possibly a fraction of a cent in favor of Winnipeg. But what does that mean; what does it signify? How much does it cost to ship a bushel of wheat from Winnipeg, the center of the wheat market in Canada, to Minneapolis, 600 or 700 miles distant? The cost of transportation may cover the difference in the price and more.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I yield for a question.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. May I be permitted to suggest that Winnipeg has no market?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. It has the same kind of a market as Chicago, on a smaller scale.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. It is the lake ports, Port Arthur and Port William.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Winnipeg is the register; it is like Liverpool and Chicago. The price in the country, in the elevators, is the Winnipeg price plus what it would cost to get the product there, though it never goes to Winnipeg. Winnipeg is simply a barometer which registers prices; that is all.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Did I understand the gentleman to say the price is fixed, with regard to wheat, at Winnipeg?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Why, of course; if wheat is worth a certain price at Winnipeg, it means that anybody who has wheat can sell it to a Winnipeg merchant and get the Winnipeg price for it, but out of that price he must pay the cost of getting the wheat to Winnipeg. Let me give some prices in our own country. I quote from the Crop Reporter, issued by the Department of Agriculture, showing the farm price of corn, wheat, and barley in the several States on the 1st day of December, 1910. The price of corn in North Dakota was 58 cents a bushel and in South Dakota it was 40 cents a bushel, a difference of 18 cents a bushel in these two States lying side by side. Did the tariff make that difference?

On the same day the price of wheat in Nebraska was 80 cents a bushel and in Minnesota it was 94 cents a bushel. Did the cheap wheat in Nebraska demoralize the wheat market in Minneapolis?

On the same day the price of barley in Nebraska was 45 cents a bushel, while in South Dakota the price was 57 cents a bushel. These differences in prices of grain in adjoining States were as great as the difference in the price of wheat on that day between Winnipeg and Minneapolis, and yet it is claimed that the higher price in Minneapolis over Winnipeg was the result of the tariff. There are many other instances in the Crop Reporter as striking as those I have quoted. They are chiefly due to local conditions.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I might suggest that Winnipeg does not deal in wheat except the wheat that is in store at lake ports, and the price in Winnipeg is the price at the lake ports.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Locate the market, then, on the lakes. I do not care. I am using it for the purpose of illustration. I do not care where it is located. I am quoting now the Winnipeg prices, because they are the prices that are quoted in all the price lists. I believe the tariff does have something to do with it. I believe prices would be somewhat higher in Winnipeg on an average under free trade in farm products, but they would not be appreciably affected in this country. I will tell you why.

TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES.

Canada has not the transportation facilities nor the elevator advantages nor the commercial and industrial organization that this country possesses. With a larger area than the entire United States, including Alaska, Canada has only 24,000 miles of railroad, while this country has 240,000 miles. We have great trunk lines of railroads running from ocean to ocean and from the Lakes to the Gulf, with feeders going out into every fertile valley, into every good producing section all over the country, with abundant elevator facilities. The American farmer has a tremendous advantage over the Canadian farmer in these conditions, and they affect the prices of products and have a powerful bearing upon the prosperity of the farmer.

Another thing. The remarkable decrease in the cost of transportation in this country in modern years has brought the farm price of wheat and of the staple food products and the Liverpool price closer and closer together each year, until to-day wheat on the farm is worth relatively more than it ever was before in the history of the country. In 1868 it cost 42 cents a bushel to ship wheat by rail from Chicago to New York; it

cost about 50 cents to send that bushel of wheat from Chicago to Liverpool. To-day wheat can be carried from Chicago to New York by rail at 10½ cents a bushel, and to Liverpool for 2½ cents more. Yes; for less than that, because a small differential is made by the railroads in favor of the export product, and wheat can be shipped from Chicago to Liverpool for 12 cents a bushel. The average freight rate in the country is 7½ mills, or just a trifle over, per ton-mile. The railroads carry wheat from Chicago to New York for less than 3 mills per ton-mile. Why do they do it? In the early seventies there occurred that great railroad-rate war between the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., the New York Central Co., and the Baltimore & Ohio Co.—one running into Philadelphia, one into New York, and the other into Baltimore. A differential rate was finally agreed upon in favor of Philadelphia and Baltimore large enough to overcome the port advantages of New York City in the foreign trade, and the exporters in those cities were placed upon an equal footing. The contest then became a battle of enterprise and economy on the part of the merchants in New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore, and as the contest continued every unnecessary element of cost was eliminated and the western farmer received the benefit. The conditions developed by that rate war are largely entitled to the credit for the high price of lands in the Western States to-day.

COMPETITION BETWEEN SEABOARD AND GULF.

Then railroads leading to the Gulf ports were extended and ramified, and west of the Father of Waters, and even east of it, farm products secured the benefit of competition between the Gulf and the Atlantic seaboard. Some years ago the eastern and western railroads gave a rate on grain from the Mississippi River to the seaboard of 85 per cent of the Chicago rate. They had to make the concession to meet the competition to the South. And I tell you, Mr. Chairman, the competition in transportation in this country, East and South, has given us rates and other facilities that from the nature of things can never be had in Canada, except in a limited measure through the operation of free commercial intercourse between the two countries. Suppose we should abolish the tariff, what would be the effect? Would our wheat go down in price? No; our wheat would not go down; but the Canadian railroads and steamboats, that have practically no competition now in carrying the Canadian wheat from the western wheat fields to the market at Liverpool, would be compelled to meet competition by way of Duluth, Chicago, and New York, and even to the Gulf. Rates of transportation would go down in Canada or Canadian lines would lose that trade. The result would be that the Canadian wheat grower would get better prices for his wheat, without in any manner affecting the price of American wheat. He would buy more American-made products to his advantage and our benefit.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I will yield.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. In that case will the consumer get bread any cheaper?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Why, he may not get bread any cheaper. I am not advocating cheaper bread. I am advocating a policy that will increase the ability of the American consumer to buy bread and all the other necessaries and comforts of life.

I am advocating the upbuilding of our home market and the expansion of our foreign trade, and I am not worrying now about the price of bread. It does not enter into my philosophy just now.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Is not this proposition predicated upon the theory that the consumer will be benefited by cheaper prices?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. It is my privilege to arrange my own postulates.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Yes, and the gentleman is arranging his postulates to suit himself.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That is immaterial. I want to submit some figures about prices which will——

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I will yield.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. My question is pertinent to the question the gentleman is now considering. I want to ask if the railroads of this country would do a greater business by reason of the increased amount of freight that would come to them from the Canadian market?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. It would increase some. It would compel the Canadian railroads and the Canadian ship lines to reduce rates and take care of their own products or lose the business, and the result would be higher prices in Winnipeg and that part of Canada.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman spoke of a reduction of freight rates on railroads and steamboats. I was curious to find out whether in his judgment he believed the railroads and steamboats would reduce their rates under reciprocity.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. My opinion is that Canadian transportation companies would be compelled to reduce rates or lose much of their carrying trade.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I want to know if the introduction of Canadian wheat into this country would have a tendency to keep the Minneapolis price anywhere near the Liverpool price?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I do not know that it would affect the Minneapolis price appreciably.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. During the year 1910, for about three months during that year, is it not a fact that Minneapolis prices were above the Liverpool price?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That may be true, and it was probably the result of local conditions growing out of gambling operations on the boards of trade, generally after the farmers have marketed their crops. The gentleman must excuse me from yielding further. I must proceed along my own line of thought.

RELATION OF FOREIGN PRICES TO HOME PRICES.

I had the Secretary of Agriculture prepare this table, giving the price of wheat in Winnipeg, Toronto, Montreal, New York, and Liverpool for the last five years—the average price during each month of each year, beginning with 1906. In that table I find there is substantially a fixed relation between the average Liverpool price throughout the year and the prices at the cities I have mentioned. The price in this country is generally about 5 or 6 cents a bushel higher in relation to the Liverpool price than the Winnipeg price is, showing that American farmers get their wheat to Liverpool cheaper than the Canadian farmers can get theirs there, for wheat from both countries sells at the same price at Liverpool. If we open up this channel of trade, Winnipeg can get her wheat to Europe about as cheaply as we can get ours there.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I will ask the gentleman if that will do any good to our people?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. It will enable Minneapolis millers to mix Minnesota soft wheat with Canadian hard wheat, and in that way improve the quality of flour, for one thing.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I would say to the gentleman that our wheat is a hard wheat, and the gentleman is mistaken as to the character of our wheat. [Laughter.]

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Now, if the gentleman will pardon me, I promise I will not say anything more that is not polite about Minnesota or her products. [Laughter.] I have heard, however, that they do buy hard wheat in Canada to mix with soft Minnesota wheat, to improve the quality of the flour. The gentleman need not answer that aspersion, as what I heard was doubtless gossip. [Laughter.]

Mr. VOLSTEAD. If the gentleman will allow me——

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I will admit that the gentleman is right if he will allow me to go on without interruption. I do not know what he is going to say, but I will admit it in advance. [Laughter.] Wheat prices in this country always have depended principally upon wheat prices in Liverpool. This will be the case as long as we export any substantial portion of our annual product. For some years our exports of wheat have averaged about 100,000,000 bushels a year. Canada exported about 50,000,000 bushels last year. We can not relieve ourselves from competition with the Canadian surplus. We may keep it out of our own markets, but we must meet it in Liverpool, where the world's price is registered.

There have been times when the price in this country was too high for export, depending upon local conditions. Conspiracies by grain gamblers on the boards of trade to "corner" the markets have even raised the prices here, temporarily, above the prices in Europe. Just before harvest in 1902 oats sold on the Board of Trade in Chicago at 16 cents a bushel above the price at any market within a radius of 500 miles from Chicago. That price was the result of a "corner" operated by Patten Bros., and like most all operations of that kind it occurred when the oat raisers had none to sell. One of the most beneficent features of the reciprocity measure is that it will tend to stableize grain markets and minimize the evils of grain gambling.

The total yield of wheat in this country for 1910 was 737,189,000 bushels, of which 464,044,000 bushels were winter wheat and 231,399,000 bushels were spring wheat. Canada's total yield for the same year was 149,989,000 bushels, of which 16,610,000 were winter wheat and 133,379,000 bushels were spring wheat. The winter wheat was produced chiefly in the Province of Ontario.

OUR TRADE WITH CANADA.

In 1910 the United States sold to Canada $34,432,000 worth of farm products—sold that value of farm products into the country of cheap labor and cheap land with great capacity for production. Over 16 per cent of all our sales to Canada consisted of farm products. We sold over $7,000,000 of breadstuffs, $4,000,000 of animals, $3,000,000 of meats and dairy products, $5,000,000 of fruits and nuts, $8,000,000 of raw cotton, and so on down the line. Canada sold to us in that year $9,000,000 worth of farm products. Only 9.3 per cent of her exports to the United States were farm products.

Those figures are significant, Mr. Chairman, showing that under existing conditions, with a substantial tariff on the Canadian side on all farm products excepting corn, we can invade her markets and sell our products there in large quantities.

We bought $33,000,000 worth of lumber from Canada and sold her $7,000,000 worth. Her total foreign trade last year was $571,000,000 in round numbers. Her trade with us was $285,000,000, leaving only $286,000,000 with all the balance of the world, $232,000,000 of which was with the United Kingdom.

Our total sales to Canada in 1909 were $192,661,000, and Great Britain's sales to Canada that year were $86,257,000. We sold to Canada $106,000,000 worth of goods more than she bought from the mother country, notwithstanding the fact that Canada extends to the mother country a preferential tariff rate 33⅓ per cent below the rate she imposes against the United States.

What does it mean? It means that it will require a tariff wall higher than any that has yet been established to overcome and destroy the natural disposition on the part of the people of these two countries to cooperate, to do business back and forth, to exchange commodities when it is to their mutual advantage to do so. Canada is the third best customer we have in all the world, and, taking cotton out of account, she ranks second. With her 7,000,000 people she bought more from the United States last year than we sold to all the Republics in South America and all the countries in Asia combined, with their 700,000,000 aggregate population! Progressive, increasing in population, developing as she is and will be, the higher the tide of her prosperity the better customer she will become for the United States and the more valuable our intercourse will become to her. When she reaches the 20,000,000 point in population, at the present ratio of business, she will be the best customer the United States has in the entire world.

Trade is generally profitable to both parties, as it should be. Canada raises very little corn. There was produced last year in all the Provinces only about 25,000,000 bushels, as against 3,000,000,000 bushels produced in this country, and Canada's only corn Province is Ontario. The western farmers of the United States are not concerned about Ontario, nor Quebec, nor the maritime Provinces, but they do feel some concern about Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta. But a country that can not raise corn can not successfully raise beef cattle or hogs, and a country, I repeat, that can not grow clover to fertilize its land, that can not rotate its small grains with corn, can not for any considerable length of time keep up that fertility of the soil that is necessary to produce large yields of wheat and other small grains.

Ah, gentlemen of the House, the fear of Canadian competition on the part of the American farmer, it seems to me, is altogether fanciful. If you go to the Illinois farmer or the Iowa farmer and ask him what he thinks about the danger of competition with a country that can not produce corn, hogs, or cattle, he will look upon you as a freak.

CANADIAN LAND BOOM.

But there are boomers in Canada. They are advertising the wonderful fertility of their soil and the cheapness of the land and the salubrity of their climate. A few years ago fertile lands in the State of Mississippi were advertised in the part of the country where I live at ridiculously low prices, and many of my neighbors disposed of their property and went to Mississippi and bought lands. Those lands felt the effects of the boom and increased in price somewhat, but after a few years of experience every investor that I know of, excepting one, disposed of his Mississippi purchase and came back to good old Indiana a wiser, if not a wealthier, man. It was another Mississippi bubble—a will-o'-the-wisp excursion.

Of course the Canadian lands will all be cultivated in the course of years, and they will support a considerable population, but I want to emphasize the fact that from no standpoint can the Canadian farmer be a dangerous competitor of the American farmer. He is handicapped by both drouth and frost and by the inevitable depreciation of soil fertility characteristic of all small grain regions. This is especially true where the chief crop is spring wheat. Experience in this country shows that when the virgin fertility of the soil is exhausted in spring wheat cultivation, and it only requires a few years of successive cultivation to do that, the land can never be recruited to successfully produce spring wheat thereafter. The first few crops yield abundantly and then the inevitable depreciation begins. This has been the experience of all our prairie States. That is not the case with winter wheat, however. Land in the valley of the Danube that has been farmed for a thousand years produces winter wheat as abundantly as it ever did. Its strength is maintained by rotation of crops and by artificial fertilization, methods that have never succeeded in spring wheat growing.

Talk about raising cattle and hogs in Canada! They have no corn to feed them. They feed all the oats they raise to their horses and sheep. Oats, hay, and barley are all the feed they have. The winters are two months longer in Canada than they are in the part of the country in which I live, and they have to feed stock that much longer every year. Is Canada a dangerous competitor of ours under these conditions? Ah, Mr. Chairman, these conditions are fundamental. They are vital, and they can not be gotten rid of. I was a farmer when I was a young man, and I know something about raising corn and oats, and wheat and cattle.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. That was a long time ago.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes; a long time ago.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman made his money early.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes; I am past 35 now. The Tariff Board appointed by the President under the Payne tariff law made an investigation of relative conditions in this country and Canada recently touching farming and stock raising. Their report was submitted to Congress on the 1st day of last month. The report shows that wages of farm hands are fully as high in western Canada as they are in the United States. The report also shows that prices of farm animals are higher in Canada than they are in this country. I read, in this connection, extracts from the report, showing the prices of horses, cattle, hogs, and sheep in the two countries:

HORSES.

Prices of horses range from $106 to $125 per head in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, and New York. In Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and North Dakota the range is from $111 to $126, and in Montana, Idaho, and Washington from $80 to $108. In eastern Canada prices of horses range from $107 to $139 per head, while in western Canada the range is from $107 to $156. In the great agricultural States of Indiana, Illinois, and Iowa prices range from $120 to $124. In all the Canadian Provinces, except Prince Edward Island, Manitoba, and Nova Scotia, the prices are higher than in any of our States.

As to horses, Canada has no surplus of importance outside of Ontario. The agricultural development of the northwestern Provinces has put prices of work stock and heavy draft teams at a premium in the territory tributary to Winnipeg. During the spring of 1910 it is stated on good authority that not less than 20,000 horses were sold out of Ontario alone for shipment to the market just mentioned, and prospective loss of this trade is giving Ontario some concern at this time. The five Provinces of Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta combined have but 1,863,744 head, as compared with 1,600,000 head now in the State of Iowa alone.

DAIRY COWS.

Prices of dairy cows range from $33 to $39 a head in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, and New York. In Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and North Dakota the range is practically the same. In the western border States of Montana, Idaho, and Washington the range is from $41.80 to $46.50. In eastern Canada prices of dairy cows range from $32 to $48 and in western Canada from $39 to $41. The highest Canadian price quoted is $48 in Ontario, as against $46.50 in Montana, the highest American price.

CATTLE AND SWINE.

Prices of other cattle vary in the United States from $14.30 a head in Minnesota to $27.40 in Montana, while in Canada the range of prices is from $31 in Saskatchewan to $34 in Ontario.

Prices of swine are slightly higher in Canada than in the United States. In our eastern border States—Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, and New York—they range from $10 to $11.10. In the great agricultural States of Indiana, Illinois, and Iowa prices of swine vary very little from those already quoted. In eastern Canada the range of swine prices is from $10 to $13 and in western Canada from $12 to $13. The highest American price is $11.80 a head in Wisconsin, as against the highest Canadian price of $13 a head, which is quoted for Quebec, Manitoba, and Saskatchewan.

SHEEP.

Prices of sheep are much lower in the United States than in Canada, due to the fact that Ontario specializes on pedigreed flocks, as appears later on. In the United States they range from $2.90 per head in Texas to $5.30 in Illinois and Iowa, while in Canada the range is from $4 in Nova Scotia to $7 in Ontario, Manitoba, and Saskatchewan.

While the sheep industry in Canada at the present time is a minor one, the feeding of lambs for market has been an important business in Ontario, as many as 125,000 head having been exported as late as 1907 to the United States and 33,000 in the same year to Great Britain. The surplus has now dwindled, however, to such an extent that practically none was received at the Buffalo stockyards during 1910. In fact, it is reported that a few American-fed lambs have been shipped from Buffalo to Toronto, indicating that Ontario at the present time is scarcely supplying her own wants in this regard. This is, however, an abnormal condition.

I will insert in my remarks a table showing sales to and purchases from Canada of horses, cattle, meat and dairy products, and breadstuffs for the last five years:

Government statistics for five years ending June 30, 1910.

Horses:	
We sold in Canada	$14,172,075
Canada sold to us	2,549,201
Difference in our favor	11,622,874
Cattle:	
We sold in Canada	1,578,179
Canada sold to us	1,193,796
Difference in our favor	384,383
Meat and dairy:	
We sold in Canada	17,011,017
Canada sold to us	904,191
Difference in our favor	16,106,826
Breadstuffs:	
We sold in Canada	31,596,556
Canada sold to us	6,679,884
Difference in our favor	24,916,672

BENEFITS OF RECIPROCITY.

The question is asked, "Where are the benefits of reciprocity with Canada?" I will endeavor to suggest some of them. It will enable people on this side of the boundary line and the people on the other side to trade along natural channels. We should not artificialize markets where it is not necessary to do so. Take the item of coal. Canada has a duty of 53 cents a ton on coal, and we had a duty of 67 cents until the Payne law, and now it is 45 cents.

That duty shuts Nova Scotia coal out of some of the markets in New England. They are now supplied by coal chiefly from West Virginia, but the duty enables Nova Scotia to ship coal 200 or 300 miles farther west than could be done otherwise, and it takes from Pennsylvania and Ohio and Indiana their natural market for coal in Ontario and Quebec. If we had free coal with Canada, Nova Scotia would sell a little more coal to New England—not much; her dutiable coal is inferior in quality to the coal of West Virginia. We would sell more coal to the Provinces north of us, and the consumers of coal in Ontario and Quebec would obtain better coal at a lower price. It would help on both sides of the line. The advantage would be largely with us, because we have better industrial organization and better facilities for transportation. It would operate that way in a great many channels and along a great many lines. Unnecessary transportation is an economic waste. This arrangement would save much unnecessary transportation. These two peoples do not need the trade barrier between them that has existed for a century. It serves no beneficent purpose to either country.

Who are opposing this bill? Every "standpatter" and every friend of "special interests" in the country are against it. Those patriots have suddenly become the champions of the "downtrodden" farmer. Whence this new-born zeal for the tiller of the soil? The bill provides for free lumber, a provision that ought to be hailed with delight by every fair-minded man in the country.

The high price of lumber has become a great burden to the people, and the bill, if it becomes a law, will afford some relief. The Bureau of Corporations recently investigated the subject of timber holdings in this country and discovered an alarming condition of things. It was found that a few wealthy syndicates now own and control millions upon millions of acres of the most valuable timber in the country. Those syndicates do not manufacture lumber, but they hold the timber until they can get their own price for "stumpage" from the millmen. They have made hundreds of millions of dollars from the increase in the price of stumpage. These timber barons confer no benefit upon society. They add nothing to the wealth or welfare of the country, but they grow rich off the necessities of the people. They are now making frenzied appeals through the press and other agencies for the protection of the farmers against the baleful Canadian reciprocity movement. Their hearts are wrung with anguish lest the farmer may suffer an injustice. Great patriots they surely are!

Placing lumber on the free list will alone compensate for every concession made by our Government.

Horses in the western Canadian country are higher in price than they are in the United States. Reciprocity will open up a market for American horses, a market for fruits and vegetables, especially early fruits and vegetables, and many other things. There are a great many things that we can obtain from Canada and many things Canada may obtain from us to the advantage of both countries. There are a great many advantages which I have not time to enumerate, and I do not see any serious disadvantage to either country.

I believe when I cast my vote for this measure I will have voted to advance the welfare of the farmers and all classes of producers in the United States. The talk about discrimination against the farmer is without justification. No sane man in America would purposely discriminate against the farmer. The chief benefit the American farmer derives from the policy of protection is an indirect one. The chief benefit he gets under the policy of protection is in the stimulation it gives to factories and the employment of American laborers at good wages, who buy and consume the products of the farm and thereby make good prices.

What was our campaign slogan in 1896, when the country was in distress? The Democratic leaders said, "Open the mints to free coinage of silver." Our leaders said, "Open the mills and give labor employment." [Applause on the Republican side.] Put money in the pocket of the toiler, so he will be able to buy and consume of the products of the farm and the factory. The people accepted the advice of the Republican Party. McKinley was elected President, the Dingley tariff went into operation, the mills were opened, and they have been open from that day to this. Labor throughout the country was steadily employed at good wages and has been steadily employed ever since. Wage earners bought and consumed, and prices went up naturally in obedience to the law of supply and demand. There are those who say we overdid the prosperity business and created too much demand and prices have become too high. It is hard to satisfy some people.

The Republican Party is now committed to the policy of fixing duties on competitive commodities only high enough to cover the difference in cost of production here and abroad, allowing a reasonable profit to the American producer. It believes in the creation of a tariff commission to ascertain that difference with practical certainty. It believes in adequate protection to legitimate American producers on the one hand and protection of the American consumer against unjust exactions by monopolistic combinations on the other hand. Its great, patriotic leader, President Taft, initiated this historic measure through his negotiations with the Canadian Government. He recommends its enactment by Congress because it is in harmony with the industrial policy of the country and the best traditions of the Republican Party.

Mr. Chairman, these two countries are neighbors. Their people are of the same race, they speak the same language, they have similar traditions and institutions. They are both capable, self-governing peoples devoted to liberty and order. The long land boundary separating them, several thousand miles in extent, is marked by no frowning forts, is guarded by no standing armies. The placid bosom of the great inland seas which are the common property of both countries, is vexed by no battleships or armed cruisers. Gentlemen, this is the most sublime object lesson in the world's history, teaching as it does, that two intelligent, self-reliant, progressive peoples, may live side by side under different flags, with nothing to safeguard their relations but the spirit of justice and fraternity. [Applause.] Let us consecrate that relation, let us strengthen the bond of unity between these peoples, so that we under the Stars and Stripes and they under their own national emblem may be one people in all things that make for our common good, and tend to promote the welfare of mankind. [Applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, 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 Canadian reciprocity measure (H. R. 4412) and had come to no resolution thereon.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT FOR PORTO RICO.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States (S. Doc. No. 813, 61st Cong., 3d sess.), which was read and, with the accompanying

papers, ordered printed and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

As required by section 31 of the act of Congress approved April 12, 1900, entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenue and a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," I transmit herewith copies of the acts and resolutions enacted by the Legislative Assembly of Porto Rico during the session beginning January 9 and ending March 9, 1911.

WM. H. TAFT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 17, 1911.*

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. DICKSON of Mississippi for 10 days on account of important business.

ADJOURNMENT.

Then, on motion of Mr. UNDERWOOD (at 5 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, April 18, at 12 o'clock m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Willis River, Va. (H. Doc. No. 16); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Detroit River, Wyandotte Channel, between Fighting Island and city of Wyandotte, Mich. (H. Doc. No. 17); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Patents was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4125) for the relief of the heirs of Benjamin S. Roberts, and the same was referred to the Committee on Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

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

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 5595) to establish a fish-cultural station and mussel hatchery on the Wabash River, near Vincennes, Ind.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: A bill (H. R. 5596) to provide local rates of postage on parcels on rural routes emanating from the same post office or station; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 5597) to prevent the employment of children under the age of 14 years performing manual labor; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 5598) to establish a fish hatchery and biological station in the first congressional district of the State of Georgia; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5599) to promote the efficiency of the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 5600) authorizing the construction of national highway from Fort McPherson to the United States penitentiary, Fulton County, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BOOHER: A bill (H. R. 5601) to limit the effect of the regulation of interstate commerce between the States in goods, wares, and merchandise wholly or in part manufactured by convict labor or in any prison or reformatory; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROBINSON: A bill (H. R. 5602) authorizing the Leo N. Levi Memorial Association to occupy and construct buildings for the use of the corporation on lots Nos. 3 and 4, block No. 114, in the city of Hot Springs, Ark.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. COX of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 5603) to amend section 15 of an act passed May 30, 1908, and being an act entitled "An act to amend the national banking laws," and provide for payment of interest on public deposits; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 5604) to determine the jurisdiction of circuit and district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5605) to determine the jurisdiction of United States courts in matters of contempt, and to regulate the trial and punishment of same; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5606) defining combinations and conspiracies in trade and labor disputes and regulating the granting of injunctions therein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5607) for the erection of a public building at Central City, Muhlenberg County, Ky.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5608) for the erection of a public building at Glasgow, Barren County, Ky.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: A bill (H. R. 5609) to authorize the coinage of 2½-cent pieces; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5610) to repeal a portion of an act heretofore passed relating to the alienation of the title of the United States to land in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 5611) to retire enlisted men, either in the Army or Marine Corps, after 25 years' service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5612) to adjust the lineal and relative rank of certain officers of the United States Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5613) for the relief of volunteer officers and soldiers who served during the War with Spain and beyond the period of their enlistments; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5614) to acquire the Rancho del Encinal, known as the Henry Ranch, located in San Luis, Obispo County, State of California; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5615) granting to the city and county of San Francisco, Cal., rights of way in and through certain public lands of the United States in California; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5616) to amend section 2746 of the Revised Statutes, relating to additional compensation to the appraisers, deputy collectors, etc., at the port of San Francisco; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5617) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a suitable building or buildings for marine-hospital purposes at San Francisco, Cal.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5618) to confirm the name of Commodore Barney Circle for the circle located at the eastern end of Pennsylvania Avenue SE., in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5619) to amend the Code of Law for the District of Columbia regarding corporations; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5620) to amend section 4514 of the Revised Statutes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5621) to confer jurisdiction upon the Circuit Court of the United States for the Ninth Circuit to determine in equity the rights of American citizens under the award of the Bering Sea arbitration of Paris and to render judgment thereon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5622) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a Court of Claims," and the acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, approved February 24, 1855; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5623) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the bringing of suits against the Government of the United States for destruction of private property"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5624) to provide for payment of interest on judgments rendered against the United States for money due on public work; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 5625) for the relief of water users on reclamation projects in certain instances; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 5626) providing for the purchase of a site and erection of a public building at Washington, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LAFFERTY: A bill (H. R. 5627) for the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Astoria, Oreg.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5628) to amend an act entitled "An act for the sale of timber lands in the States of California, Oregon, Nevada, and in Washington Territory," approved June 3, 1878; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5629) to amend section 2301 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. COX of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 5630) to repeal section 17 of the United States Statutes, volume 14, enacted July 20, 1866, relating to the mileage of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress; to the Committee on Mileage.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5631) for the relief of the nonenlisted officers and members of the crews of the Mississippi Ram Fleet, Marine Brigade, or the Mississippi Squadron; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5632) to pension Army teamsters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5633) requiring railroads to make reports; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5634) to amend section 4004 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, passed March 3, 1873, and entitled "Additional pay for postal cars"; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5635) fixing the mileage of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress; to the Committee on Mileage.

By Mr. HAY: Resolution (H. Res. 98) calling for information as to the number of officers added to the Army under the act of March 3, 1911; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Resolution (H. Res. 99) amending rules; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 100) for appointment of special committee to investigate certain commissions, boards, etc.; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RUCKER of Missouri: Resolution (H. Res. 101) to authorize the chairman of the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress to appoint a clerk to said committee; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. HOWARD: Resolution (H. Res. 102) to provide for an investigation of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HAMLIN: Resolution (H. Res. 103) instructing committees to examine affairs of departments; 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. 5636) granting an increase of pension to James W. Porter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5637) granting an increase of pension to John B. King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5638) granting an increase of pension to Elisha L. Larowe; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5639) granting an increase of pension to John Ingerson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5640) granting an increase of pension to Mingo Williams, alias Mingo Hinds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5641) granting an increase of pension to Samuel D. Might; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5642) granting an increase of pension to William Mereness; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5643) granting an increase of pension to Christian Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5644) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Moon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5645) granting an increase of pension to John Latham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5646) granting an increase of pension to James W. Longbon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5647) granting an increase of pension to John T. Hatch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5648) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Jackson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5649) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Schickedantz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5650) granting an increase of pension to David Rizor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5651) granting an increase of pension to James M. Reynolds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5652) granting an increase of pension to Marion Harris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5653) granting an increase of pension to Hunter Hastings; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5654) granting an increase of pension to Nehemier C. Hilford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5655) granting an increase of pension to Harrison Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5656) granting an increase of pension to David Vestal; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5657) granting an increase of pension to James Milton Thomas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5658) granting an increase of pension to Alfred T. Tallman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5659) granting an increase of pension to Ralph Spring; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5660) granting an increase of pension to Jackson Stouffer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5661) granting an increase of pension to William G. Shute; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5662) granting an increase of pension to Louis Siples; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5663) granting an increase of pension to William Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5664) granting an increase of pension to James M. Francis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5665) granting an increase of pension to William N. England; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5666) granting an increase of pension to Simon E. De Wolfe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5667) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Chamberlain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5668) granting an increase of pension to Laura I. Curry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5669) granting an increase of pension to John H. Carpenter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5670) granting an increase of pension to James K. Polk Brady; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5671) granting an increase of pension to Martin Barnhart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5672) granting an increase of pension to Ernst Boger; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5673) granting an increase of pension to Peter Boger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5674) granting an increase of pension to Eliza J. Barnd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 5675) granting an increase of pension to William Cagney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN: A bill (H. R. 5676) for the relief of the heirs of Thomas G. Flagg, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 5677) granting a pension to Andrew M. Watson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5678) granting an increase of pension to George A. Easterley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 5679) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 5680) granting an increase of pension to Moses M. Whitney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5681) for the relief of John W. Fairfax; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5682) for the relief of John Mann; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 5683) for the relief of the Southern Railway Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5684) for the relief of Emma C. Franner, George W. Seaton, Hiram K. Seaton, Howard Seaton, Mary Seaton, Blanche Seaton, George W. Taylor, Edward Taylor, and Catharine Pomeroy; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5685) for the relief of Gordon Jones, administrator of the estate of William M. Jones, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5686) for the relief of the heirs of Philip Houser, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5687) for the relief of the estate of Mary E. Binns, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5688) for the relief of Mason Shipman; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COPLEY: A bill (H. R. 5689) granting a pension to Charlotte McConnell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5690) for the relief of John Donnelly, deceased; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5691) for the relief of David Kirch; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 5692) granting an increase of pension to John Eslinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DENVER: A bill (H. R. 5693) granting a pension to Rosa Drumm Berry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5694) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Price; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5695) granting an increase of pension to Lithco S. Van Anda; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5696) granting an increase of pension to Arthur T. McLean; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5697) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Mosby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5698) granting an increase of pension to John Day; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5699) granting an increase of pension to Ardon P. Middleton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5700) granting an increase of pension to Henry Babb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5701) granting an increase of pension to Hill C. Crawford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5702) granting an increase of pension to Charles O. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5703) granting an increase of pension to Alberton F. Hopkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5704) granting a pension to William Matthews; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5705) for the relief of Henry W. Anderson; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5706) to refer to the Court of Claims the claim of John S. Armstrong for compensation for loss of wheat in 1862; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5707) granting an increase of pension to William Cunningham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAUGHERTY: A bill (H. R. 5708) granting a pension to Julius Cohn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5709) granting an increase of pension to John W. Werts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5710) granting an increase of pension to William Higginbottom; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5711) granting an increase of pension to Julius Demele; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5712) granting an increase of pension to John C. Bailey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 5713) granting a pension to Hattie Brauda; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5714) for the relief of the estate of Mrs. C. L. Fogarty; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FLOYD of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 5715) granting an increase of pension to William Henderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5716) granting a pension to Garfield Lay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5717) granting an increase of pension to John F. Dailey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5718) granting an increase of pension to Henry Conine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5719) granting an increase of pension to Theodore F. Hawley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5720) granting an increase of pension to James L. Carpenter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: A bill (H. R. 5721) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Stone; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5722) granting an increase of pension to Junius G. Loggins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5723) granting an increase of pension to Enos Douglas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5724) granting an increase of pension to Wallace R. Newton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 5725) granting an increase of pension to Clarence McBratney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARRETT: A bill (H. R. 5726) for the relief of the legal representatives of Isabella E. Cooper, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAMILL: A bill (H. R. 5727) granting an increase of pension to Albert Kampman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARRIS: A bill (H. R. 5728) granting an increase of pension to Luther Stephenson, jr.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 5729) to authorize the reconveyance of certain lands to Abel Ady and wife in Klamath County, Oreg.; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 5730) for the relief of C. A. Sprinkel; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5731) for the relief of Wesley Rankins; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5732) for the relief of James W. Nickens; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5733) for the relief of the heirs of James Bowles, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5734) for the relief of the heirs of James F. Rinker, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5735) for the relief of the heirs of Thomas A. Crow, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HENSLEY: A bill (H. R. 5736) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Rice; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWLAND: A bill (H. R. 5737) granting an increase of pension to Ida C. Emerson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 5738) granting an increase of pension to Mark T. Shrote; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5739) granting an increase of pension to John H. Edge; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5740) granting an increase of pension to Edward Skahan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5741) granting an increase of pension to Grace Miller; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5742) granting an increase of pension to Margaret J. Harvey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5743) granting an increase of pension to Joseph C. Sponogle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5744) granting a pension to Lillie G. Daggett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5745) granting an increase of pension to Carrie W. Dibble; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5746) granting a pension to Shepherd Plummer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5747) granting a pension to Catherine J. Asmussen; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5748) granting a pension to Mary Burnet; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5749) granting a pension to Lillian P. Beaudin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5750) granting a pension to Ellen Murphy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5751) granting a pension to Katherine M. McCarthy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5752) granting a pension to Julius Oppenheimer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5753) granting a pension to Samuel R. Thurston; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5754) granting a pension to Charles Alpers; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5755) granting a pension to Ella Whiteside; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5756) granting a pension to James Ross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5757) granting a pension to Ella M. Gaines; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5758) for the relief of Joseph L. Donovan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5759) for the relief of James Green Geoghegan, alias James Green; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5760) for the relief of former occupants of the present military reservation at Point San Jose, in the city of San Francisco, and to repeal an act entitled "An act to refer the claim of Jessie Benton Fremont to certain lands and improvements thereon in San Francisco, Cal., to the Court of Claims," approved February 10, 1893; to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5761) for the relief of the legal representative of the estate of the late Gen. Oliver Duff Greene; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5762) for the relief of George W. Bell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5763) for the relief of William K. Harvey, alias William K. Hall; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5764) for the relief of Bernard Campbell; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5765) for the relief of the American Biscuit Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5766) for the relief of Mary Jordan, widow of Dennis Jordan; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5767) for the relief of Lieut. Col. Ormond M. Lissak; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5768) for the relief of H. Liebes & Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5769) for the relief of Frank Klein; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5770) for the relief of Helen Wakefield; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5771) for the relief of Piper, Aden, Goodall Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5772) for the relief of John Rothchild & Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5773) for the relief of Arthur G. Fisk; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5774) for the relief of the widow and children of John W. Geering; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5775) for the relief of the estate of Julius Jacobs; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5776) authorizing the appointment of Maj. W. R. Smedberg, United States Army, retired, to the rank and grade of brigadier general on the retired list of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5777) for the transfer of certain land to the Mission Rock Co., of California; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5778) to reimburse the city and county of San Francisco, State of California, for moneys paid by said city and county to various persons upon judgment claims recovered by them against said city and county for damages inflicted to their property by soldiers of the United States Army; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LITTLEPAGE: A bill (H. R. 5779) granting an increase of pension to Charlotte Darnell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOBECK: A bill (H. R. 5780) to grant honorable discharges to the quartermaster volunteers who served in the military service in the Civil War, and including their names in the roster of the Union Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LITTLETON: A bill (H. R. 5781) for the relief of Clarence B. Schenck; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McDERMOTT: A bill (H. R. 5782) granting an increase of pension to James Fleming; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McGILLICUDDY: A bill (H. R. 5783) granting an increase of pension to Patrick J. Carroll; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 5784) granting an increase of pension to W. O. Hartshorne; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5785) for the relief of John Bartholomew; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MADDEN: A bill (H. R. 5786) granting an increase of pension to Richard M. Springer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5787) granting a pension to Timothy McCarthy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MURDOCK: A bill (H. R. 5788) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Reynolds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5789) granting an increase of pension to John Breneman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5790) granting an increase of pension to Michael M. Stuckey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5791) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Barker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5792) granting an increase of pension to A. J. Weaver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5793) granting an increase of pension to Henry Hoff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5794) granting an increase of pension to Edmund Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5795) granting an increase of pension to Owen Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5796) granting an increase of pension to David H. Randall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5797) granting an increase of pension to Henry L. McCain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5798) granting an increase of pension to Samuel S. Garlits; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5799) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Marsh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5800) granting an increase of pension to George Berry; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5801) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Dillman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5802) granting an increase of pension to John H. Modrell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5803) granting an increase of pension to T. Elwood Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5804) granting an increase of pension to George O. Wright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5805) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Boling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5806) granting an increase of pension to John McCray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5807) granting an increase of pension to John Hoffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5808) granting an increase of pension to Charles C. Currier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5809) granting an increase of pension to Irwin R. Layton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5810) granting an increase of pension to Dennis Willard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5811) granting an increase of pension to Leopold Fessler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5812) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Gravel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5813) granting an increase of pension to Morgan T. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5814) granting an increase of pension to Levi B. Wightman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5815) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Collett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5816) granting an increase of pension to Henry Muntz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5817) granting an increase of pension to Augustus Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 5818) granting an increase of pension to Oliver F. Chester; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5819) granting an increase of pension to Ephraim Romine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5820) granting an increase of pension to James C. Mynatt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5821) granting a pension to Nellie V. Cornelius; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5822) for the relief of Laura J. Dills; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 5823) granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Nolan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PROUTY: A bill (H. R. 5824) granting a pension to Peter Bell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUCKER of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 5825) granting an increase of pension to William Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5826) granting an increase of pension to Cassius M. Myers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5827) granting an increase of pension to Green M. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5828) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Francis M. Sheppard; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 5829) granting an increase of pension to William R. Spears; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHARP: A bill (H. R. 5830) granting a pension to Nettie B. Shores; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5831) granting an increase of pension to Samuel J. Ewing; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 5832) granting an increase of pension to Richard Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWITZER: A bill (H. R. 5833) granting a pension to Rebecca Cordell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THISTLEWOOD: A bill (H. R. 5834) granting an increase of pension to William Cavins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5835) granting an increase of pension to William R. Webb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5836) granting an increase of pension to Melvin B. Dimmick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5837) granting a pension to Sarah A. Lovelady; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 5838) granting an increase of pension to John W. Weaver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5839) granting an increase of pension to Robert B. Woods; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5840) granting an increase of pension to Edward J. Hurley, alias John Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5841) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Travis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5842) granting an increase of pension to Phillip Sullivan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5843) granting an increase of pension to Washington C. Shannon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5844) granting an increase of pension to R. H. Robertson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5845) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Phifer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5846) granting an increase of pension to James A. Phelps; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5847) granting an increase of pension to John T. Murray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5848) granting an increase of pension to James Loving; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5849) granting an increase of pension to Elijah W. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5850) granting an increase of pension to Percy H. Allen; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5851) granting an increase of pension to Calvin Beauchamp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5852) granting an increase of pension to Clement Brawner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5853) granting an increase of pension to Granville Corley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5854) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Clack; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5855) granting an increase of pension to John A. Cole; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5856) granting an increase of pension to John K. Caldwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5857) granting an increase of pension to Samuel J. Cates; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5858) granting an increase of pension to James W. Cannon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill H. R. 5859) granting an increase of pension to McHenry Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5860) granting an increase of pension to George W. Doss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5861) granting an increase of pension to C. A. Edwards; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5862) granting an increase of pension to David Gordon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5863) granting an increase of pension to John W. Gillum; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5864) granting an increase of pension to J. W. Grubb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5865) granting an increase of pension to Eliza F. Greenwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5866) granting an increase of pension to Johnathan C. Huffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5867) granting an increase of pension to Richard Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5868) granting an increase of pension to Susan J. Hendrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5869) granting an increase of pension to Nard B. R. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5870) granting an increase of pension to William Jessee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5871) granting an increase of pension to Abner J. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5872) granting an increase of pension to James Kelley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5873) granting an increase of pension to Isaac T. Lee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5874) granting a pension to Parnesia M. Walton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5875) granting a pension to Alice C. Weir; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5876) granting a pension to Russella J. York; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5877) granting a pension to Millie Sweatt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5878) granting a pension to Vesta V. Spears; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5879) granting a pension to Lydia Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5880) granting a pension to Edward A. Poag; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5881) granting a pension to Eugene U. Proctor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5882) granting a pension to Jereasy E. Odell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5883) granting a pension to John Wesley Newman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5884) granting a pension to J. F. Napier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5885) granting a pension to Laura E. Norris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5886) granting a pension to Sarah Mallory; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5887) granting a pension to James Mesker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5888) granting a pension to America McDaniel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5889) granting a pension to Laura B. Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5890) granting a pension to Anna Briggs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5891) granting a pension to James Buck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5892) granting a pension to Thomas Blythe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5893) granting a pension to Frederick Bailor; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5894) granting a pension to William W. Cravens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5895) granting a pension to Susan Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5896) granting a pension to A. J. Clements; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5897) granting a pension to John W. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5898) granting a pension to Kate C. G. Ewing; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5899) granting a pension to Maggie Evans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5900) granting a pension to Mahala Fant; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5901) granting a pension to Sarah Wade Garnett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5902) granting a pension to Lizzie Hampton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5903) granting a pension to Margaret E. Hazel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5904) granting a pension to William H. Jones; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5905) for the relief of Kate Oakes Smith; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5906) for the relief of George M. Smith; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5907) for the relief of Green B. Stewart; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5908) for the relief of Mrs. Repsay Rowan; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5909) for the relief of Benjamin F. Proctor; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5910) for the relief of J. M. Phelps; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5911) for the relief and benefit of Eli W. Owens; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5912) for the relief of Josiah Morris; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5913) for the relief of E. F. Miles; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5914) for the relief of R. P. Breeding; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5915) for the relief of Morton B. W. Camp; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5916) for the relief of J. D. Campfield; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5917) for the relief of James R. Evans; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5918) for the relief of Temple D. Harreld; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5919) for the relief of George R. Harbison; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5920) for the relief of the heirs of George Wright; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5921) for the relief of the heirs of Wilson Ryan; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5922) for the relief of the heirs of J. C. Kennerly; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5923) for the relief of the heirs of Anderson Crenshaw; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5924) for the relief of the heirs of George W. Gray; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5925) for the relief of the heirs of Henry H. Johnston; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5926) for the relief of the heirs of Edmund P. Lee; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5927) to correct the military record of James Mesker; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5928) to correct the military record of William Lacy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5929) for the relief of the estate of Herman Whitney; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5930) for the relief of the estate of H. R. M. Taylor, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5931) for the relief of the estate of Mrs. O. F. Moore, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5932) for the relief of the estate of Rev. James Breeding, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5933) for the relief of the estates of George W. Chatfield and William E. Curd, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5934) for the relief of the estate of W. R. Decker, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5935) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John H. Winkfield; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5936) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Robert N. Stewart, and to grant him an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5937) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Granor Owens; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5938) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of T. J. Caskey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5939) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Woodford Dunn; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5940) appropriating $300 to the heirs of Howard Newman, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5941) appropriating $4,500 to the heirs of Campbell Glover, deceased; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 5942) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Kelsey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5943) granting an increase of pension to Kate A. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5944) for the relief of the heirs of Jenkins and Havens; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5945) granting a pension to James H. Sutherland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIS: A bill (H. R. 5946) granting an increase of pension to Alexander F. McConnell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5947) granting a pension to Louie E. Read; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio: Resolutions of Chamber of Commerce and Manufacturers' Club of Buffalo, N. Y., urging passage of reciprocity bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANTHONY: Petitions of Carrie V. Sheldon and other members of American Woman's League, of Blue Rapids, Kans., and Mrs. Frances Larimer, president, and other members of the American Woman's League, of Leavenworth, Kans., protesting as to action taken by the Post Office Department against the Lewis Publishing Co., of St. Louis, Mo.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Papers to accompany bill for special relief of William T. Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of S. Blamer & Son and 56 other farmers, of Johnstown, Ohio, against any reduction of the tariff on wool; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions adopted by the Chamber of Commerce and Manufacturers' Club, of Buffalo, N. Y., and by Shanesville, Ohio, against Canadian reciprocity agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AYRES: Extracts from minutes of New Orleans Cotton Exchange, requesting all bagging and ties used in baling of cotton to be placed on free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of Chamber of Commerce and Manufacturers' Club of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUCHANAN: Petition of James T. Brown and others, of Sheffield, Pa., requesting withdrawal of troops from Mexican border; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: Papers to accompany bill to increase pension of George A. Easterly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Petition of Farmers Educative and Cooperative Union of Pierce County, Ga., asking for the levy of a duty on Egyptian and other long staple cottons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLINE: Petition of La Grange County Farmers and Horticulture Society protesting against reciprocity bill, without reduction of tariff on manufactured goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIDSON: Resolutions of mayor and common council of Manitowoc, Wis., favoring postal savings bank law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DODDS: Petitions of citizens of Isabella County; Wilson Grange, Antrim County; and Liberty Grange, No. 391, all in the State of Michigan, protesting against the Canadian reciprocity agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOYD of Arkansas: Petition of William Henderson, favoring an increase of pension; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FORNES: Resolution of New York Chapter American Institute of Architects, favoring monument to Abraham Lincoln; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, resolution adopted at mass meeting by the Irish-American and German-American societies of New York, against the enactment of a new arbitration treaty with Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Dunham Post, No. 141, Department of Illinois, Grand Army of the Republic, of Decatur, Ill., favoring the enactment of the Sulloway bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce and Manufacturers' Club of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, papers to accompany a bill for the relief of Clarence McBratney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARRETT: Memorial of Tennessee Legislature, requesting refund of cotton tax; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of Tennessee Society of Sons of the Revolution, requesting publication of all the archives of the Government relative to the War of the Revolution; to the Committee on Printing.

Also, petition for the passage of legislation preventing interstate transmission of race-gambling odds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANNA: Petition of citizens of North Dakota, requesting the passage of House bill 25791, increase for rural-delivery carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of C. F. Hutchinson, La Moure, N. Dak., against parcels-post bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, resolution of John F. Godfrey Post, No. 93, Pasadena, Cal., favoring the Sulloway bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of citizens of North Dakota, against the Canadian reciprocity agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARTMAN: Petition of the Tyrone (Pa.) Branch of the Socialist Party of Pennsylvania, requesting the recall of troops from the Mexican border; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolution of the Cambria County Pomona Grange, protesting against the Canadian reciprocity agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KAHN: Papers to accompany a bill for the relief of James Green Geoghegan, alias James Green; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany bills granting pensions to Lillian P. Beaudin, Catherine Asmussen, and Mary Burnet, and an increase of pension to Mark T. Shrote; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bills granting increases of pension to Carrie W. Dibble and Margaret J. Harvey, and pensions to Lillie G. Daggett and Ella Whiteside; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers accompanying a bill for the relief of W. K. Harvey, of San Francisco, Cal.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany a bill for the relief of Bernard Campbell; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, papers to accompany a bill for the relief of Joseph L. Donovan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KONOP: Petitions of Joseph J. Plank and Wisconsin Wire Works, of Appleton, Wis., and Brown County (Wis.) Buttermakers' Association, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAMB: Resolution of Woman's Club of Monroe, Wis., favoring repeal of the tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolution of Woman's Club of Monroe, Wis., favoring Federal law for the inspection of dairy and meat animals and their products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MOTT: Petitions of numerous citizens of Carthage, N. Y.; Perch River Grange, No. 626, Patrons of Husbandry, Perch River, N. Y.; and Oswego County Fruit Growers Association, Oswego, N. Y., against Canadian reciprocity agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of Indian River Grange, No. 564, Patrons of Husbandry, Antwerp, N. Y., relative to cold storage of food products (S. 7649); to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Carthage Coal Co., Carthage Oil Co., the Eager Electric Co. of Watertown, and of 13 citizens of Carthage, all in the State of New York, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PLUMLEY: Resolution of Graniteville Branch, Quarry Workers' International Union of North America, protesting on the part of the United States in the affairs of Mexico, and Quarry Workers' International Union, Barre, Vt., protesting against intervention by the United States in the affairs of Mexico; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, vote of Saxton River Grange, Saxton River, Vt.; unanimous vote of Orion Grange, South Woodstock, Vt.; and petition of citizens of Putney, Vt., protesting against the reciprocity agreement with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POST: Resolution of Buffalo (N. Y.) Chamber of Commerce and Manufacturing Club, favoring Canadian reciprocity agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RODDENBERY: Petition requesting the withdrawal of troops from Mexican border; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHARP: Resolutions of Local Lodge No. 453, International Machinists, in favor of enactment of the reading or illiteracy test to exclude undesirable immigration and importation of cheap labor; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SIMS: Petition of Richard Smith, relating to granting increase of pension; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULZER: Resolution of New Orleans Cotton Exchange, urging that all bagging and ties used in the baling of cotton be placed on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of citizens of Buffalo and the Niagara frontier, favoring the Canadian reciprocity agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SWITZER: Petition of Springfield Grange, No. 210, Gallia County, Ohio, protesting against the Canadian reciprocity agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TILSON: Petition of Cheshire, Orange, Seymour, North Haven, Wallingford, Totoket, Indian River, Waugumbary, Suffield, Good Will, Somers, No. 105, and Columbia Granges, favoring a parcels-post bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, resolution of Wethersfield Business Men and Civic Association, Wethersfield, Conn., protesting against the Canadian reciprocity agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of citizens of Waterbury, Conn., protesting against the new arbitration treaty with Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Hillstown (Conn.) Grange and West Hartford Grange, No. 58, protesting against the Canadian reciprocity agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIS: Petition of C. P. Frazer and 136 citizens of Mount Victory, Ohio, against Canadian reciprocity bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *April 18, 1911.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., as follows:

Eternal God, our heavenly Father, ever ready to hear and answer the prayers of the faithful, help us to pray and work that we may become factors in the world's great fields of endeavor, workers in Thy vineyards, that we may build for ourselves characters Godlike, in imitation of the world's Exemplar, that Thy kingdom may come, and Thy will be done on earth as in heaven. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CANADIAN RECIPROCITY.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the 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.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Canadian reciprocity bill, with Mr. SHERLEY in the chair.

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I spoke on this subject in the last session of Congress at some length. I have no desire in any sense whatever to make a speech now, but I have some additional facts bearing on the matter which I desire to present, believing that possibly they may be of use in the further progress of this debate.

In discussing the question of reciprocity with Canada in the last session of Congress I tried to show that no harm would come to this country if the terms of the agreement were enacted into law, and that it would be in full accord with the practice of the Republican Party in the past and also with the provisions of the national Republican platform at the present time.

I pointed out—

First. That in every case where we had made reciprocity agreements with other countries the result had been beneficial to both parties.

Second. That the pending agreement was in no sense a general tariff revision, but simply a straightforward business arrangement with a single adjacent country for the reciprocal exchange of such articles as the negotiators of both Governments believed, after most careful consideration, could be made with safety to each other and for the mutual advantage of both, and that the special rates so made had no necessary bearing upon the general tariff relations of either Canada or the United States with the other countries of the world; and

Third. That the racial characteristics of the respective peoples and the climatic conditions of the two countries fully justified an entirely different course of action of one toward the other from that which ought to control our relations with the peoples on the other side of the two oceans, where like conditions do not prevail. I laid down the fundamental principle that competition can not exist between the products of two nations except with reference to their exportable surplus, and showed the statistical position of the principal crops of Canada and the United States in this respect.

I think I demonstrated beyond dispute, for no reply has yet been made by anybody to the proposition, that the higher cost of living which now obtains in this country was due to an enormously increased demand for food products and a proportionately decreased productive power on our part, and that this great change, due largely to immigration and a transition from agriculture to manufacturing, had begun on the Atlantic coast and was steadily moving westward until now its influence was effective and controlling in the central West.

I pointed out, also, that the transference of millions upon millions of the food-producing classes from the nations of Europe into the manufacturing industries of this country had made the tendency to a higher cost of living world-wide, and I expressed my sincere belief that the continuation of high prices for food products was inevitable, and that the only possible effect of complete freedom of exchange of all natural products between the United States and Canada would be to temporarily retard the rapid advances and to steady the fluctuations of the prices of the fast-diminishing export surplus of many of the food products of both countries, and that a considerable period