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

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

of time would be necessary for a permanent readjustment of the present world-wide conditions of the cost of living.

I showed that the land values differed in the different Provinces of Canada as they did in the United States, but that taking all occupied farm lands in the Dominion, the average value was $38.60 per acre, as against a value of $23.38 of all occupied farm lands in the United States.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

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

Mr. HILL. I will yield just for a question. I have only one hour, and I will take it all.

Mr. FERRIS. Where does the gentleman get those figures?

Mr. HILL. I get them, in the first place, from the Census Bureau of the United States, and in the second place from the census bureau of Canada. You will find the one in the Canadian Yearbook. Mr. Durand will give you the figures which he gave to me.

Mr. FERRIS. I only asked for information.

Mr. HILL. I quote now from the report of the Tariff Board of March 1 on that subject, specifying where the main differences are found, for the prices of farm lands are based on the yield per acre and selling price of the product; and that question is a vital one in the problem of the cost of living to all of our people.

I would be glad, if any of you have that report before you, to have you follow me in these quotations. These quotations which I shall read are summaries of the Tariff Board, not isolated extracts of prices across the border line, but the summaries of the whole investigation.

On page 84 of that report the board says:

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

The increase of land values between 1900 and 1910 has been marked in both countries. In certain of the Provinces the rate of increase has been higher than in any of the States. The highest rates of increase in the States are found where the highest land values obtain, namely, in Illinois, Indiana, and Iowa. But, on the other hand, Ontario, while reporting the highest Canadian land value, shows the lowest Canadian rate of increase. It is worth noting that Ontario is feeling the competition of western Canada, just as some years ago the eastern part of the United States felt the competition of our western lands.

It is impossible to make any significant comparative study of land values in western Canada and those in the United States. Western Canada is a virgin region; railroad lands have been sold to settlers at low prices and on liberal terms of payment; the Government has given away millions of acres under a liberal homestead law. In Manitoba the value of land per acre is $29, or $7 less than in Minnesota and Michigan; but owing to the recent settlement of Manitoba the rate of increase during the last 10 years is much greater than in those States.

Concerning wages in the wheat-producing sections, I quote from pages 85 and 86, as follows:

In general, it may be said that the wages of experienced season hands (hands employed for a period of seven, seven and a half, or eight months, beginning about April 1) are on the same general level in Manitoba and Minnesota, and also on the same general level in Saskatchewan and North Dakota, and they are higher in the last-named localities than in the two first named. Where North Dakota and Manitoba join each other the wages for season hands are about $5 higher in North Dakota than in Manitoba. The wages of harvest hands are practically the same throughout the two Provinces and the three States included in this investigation, with the exception of certain large farms in the States, where the rate is about 50 cents per day below the prevailing rate on the smaller farms.

So far as production per acre is concerned, the official reports show that of winter wheat, in which we excel, our land produced in 1910, 15.8 bushels per acre, and of spring wheat, in which Canada excels, her land produced 15.5 bushels per acre.

We produced 460,000,000 bushels of winter wheat as against 230,000,000 bushels of spring wheat. Canada produced 16,000,000 bushels of winter wheat and 133,000,000 of spring wheat. These are in round figures in both cases, for I am quoting from memory in this matter.

While these statements of land values, wages, and acreage product show clearly that there can be no appreciable difference in the cost of production, the fact of real importance is found in Tables 9 and 10, on pages 94 and 95, that in both countries, while the aggregate production has increased, the home consumption has increased still more rapidly—the United States exporting 6 per cent of its product in 1910 as against 10 per cent in 1909 and 15 per cent in 1908.

During the last three years of great immigration into Canada not only have its land values increased more rapidly than ours, but its percentage of wheat exports has fallen from 38.84 per cent in 1908 to 36.17 per cent in 1909 and 33.16 per cent in 1910.

I now call attention to the board's summary of other products. On page 107 it says of oats:

The highest American yields per acre, each about 42 bushels, are reported from the border States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, and Washington. This yield is not equaled by any of the Canadian Provinces. The next highest yields are those of the great oat States, Illinois and Iowa, each of which produces 38 bushels per acre. This is also the yield of Montana.

The yields of Nova Scotia and Ontario exceed this by about 1 bushel.

The highest American farm prices, 50 and 51 cents, are reported from New Hampshire and Vermont, respectively. The highest Canadian prices, 45 and 49 cents, are reported from New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, respectively. Ontario receives 36 cents, as against 42 cents received by the New York farmer. The lowest Canadian price quoted is that of Saskatchewan—28 cents. The lowest American price is that of Iowa—27 cents. It is to be noted that the farm prices of more than half of the oat crop of the United States range from 27 to 35 cents a bushel, and that the farm prices of about the same proportion of the Canadian crop range from 28 to 36 cents.

HAY.

The highest American yield per acre, 1.4 tons, is reported by Montana. Maine, New Hampshire, New York, and Vermont each report a yield of about 1¼ tons per acre. The yields of the great hay States of the Middle West range from 1 ton to a little more than 1¼ tons. In Canada the average yields range from 0.87 ton, in Alberta, to a little more than 2 tons on Prince Edward Island.

What is Prince Edward Island? I have been all over it, from one end of it to the other, and the crop of hay is insignificant, compared with the requirements of either Canada or the United States.

Ontario, which produces more hay than New York, reports an average yield per acre of 1.84 tons, as against New York's average yield of 1.32 tons.

The highest American farm price, over $15 per ton, is reported from New Hampshire and Wisconsin. The highest Canadian price, $14.58, is that quoted for Alberta. The Ontario price is $10.21, as against the New York price of $13.70. It should be noted that, owing to crop shortage, American hay prices were unusually high in 1910.

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 (p. 109).

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 (p. 110).

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 (pp. 110, 118).

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 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.

These are the general conclusions drawn by the Tariff Board from their investigations. So far as retail prices in various localities are concerned, comparisons are of no value as a rule, for they are almost always affected by local conditions, such as methods of distribution and business customs. But I call attention to the fact shown on page 128, that new-laid eggs retail at 30 cents per dozen in Burlington and 40 cents in Montreal; that milk sells at 7 cents per quart in Burlington and 9 cents in Montreal; cream at 45 cents per gallon in Burlington and

50 cents in Montreal; and that butter sells at 32 cents per pound in Burlington and 35 cents in Montreal.

I submit herewith also the table found on page 132, giving the prices on dressed meats both at wholesale and retail in Chicago, Toronto, and Montreal, showing in every case higher prices in Canada than in the United States:

Comparative prices of agricultural products, January, 1911—Dressed meats.

WHOLESALE PRICES PER 100 POUNDS.

	Chicago, Ill.	Toronto, Canada.	Montreal, Canada.
No. 1 beef carcass	$9.50	$9.50	$9.50-$10.75
No. 2 beef carcass	8.00	9.00	.....
Lamb	$8.50- 9.00	12.00	.....
Mutton	6.00	9.00	8.00- 8.50
Pork	10.00-12.00	10.50	12.00- 13.00

RETAIL PRICES PER POUND.

	Buffalo, N. Y.	Toronto, Canada.
Beef:		
Rib roast	$0.14-$0.18	$0.15-$0.25
Rump	.12- .14	.10- .15
Steak, porterhouse	.18- .24	.25
Steak, sirloin	.16- .20	.18- .25
Lamb:		
Leg	.12- .16	.20- .25
Chops	.16- .22	.20- .22
Veal chops	.18- .22	.30
Pork:		
Loin	.16	.17- .20
Fresh shoulder	.11	.11

This investigation and report of the Tariff Board, published since I spoke in February on this question, fully justifies the claim I then made, that the treaty was in strict accord with the Republican national platform declaring that "the true measure of protection is the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad."

Over and over again since this treaty was made public the reduction in the price of wheat has been quoted as proof that the coming of reciprocity was casting its shadow before, and some Members on this floor wore into shreds and tatters telegrams tending to prove that wheat would soon become almost valueless, because Canadian restrictions were not taken off from logs and pulp wood to be manufactured on this side of the boundary at what has always been claimed to be a higher cost of production. As a proof that the law of supply and demand is still in operation, I quote from the market reports of the New York Tribune of March 27 concerning wheat:

Exports of wheat and corn are growing, and as the price of flour has reached an export basis, increased shipments may be looked for. The visible supply of wheat in the United States is 10,000,000 bushels more than at this time last year, while the world's supply is 30,000,000 bushels larger, the two factors, with favorable prospects for big crops in the current year, apparently precluding the possibility of a return of quotations to the high levels of 12 months ago.

I also quote a dispatch from Chicago, published in the New York Journal of Commerce, with reference to barley:

BARLEY HITS RECORD HIGH LEVEL.

CHICAGO, *March 23.*—Barley made an entirely new price record in Chicago to-day. Up to $1.13 a bushel was paid. The rise to-day reached 2 to 4 cents, making a total gain of more than 20 cents in the last couple of weeks. Scarcity of the grain has developed sharp competition between maisters and brought about a boom excelling anything of the kind previously known in the trade.

Is it not manifest that if the proposition for reciprocal trade in these commodities is responsible for these changes, it is working both ways at the same time?

But that is not all, for it is claimed by some gentlemen here that the policy of reciprocity in competitive products is not only a wrong economic one, but that it is "un-Republican" and "ruinous to the protective system." And yet only two years ago the bituminous coal interests of Pennsylvania petitioned the Ways and Means Committee for complete reciprocity with Canada in one of the great products of Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois—bituminous coal—and every Republican on this floor who voted for the Payne bill as it passed the House was guilty of this heresy to Republican principles, for if it is a heresy now, it was just as much so then.

But agricultural implements, which are also competitive products and essential to farming, furnish a still more glaring inconsistency. Our Democratic friends have just reported a bill which will be acted upon in a few days putting these things on the free list, and yet every one of them who voted against the Payne bill voted against not only Canadian but world-wide reciprocity then, and our Republican friends who voted for the tariff bill and now oppose reciprocity with Canada in other competitive articles will have much difficulty in adjusting their conscientious scruples, for paragraph 468 of the Payne bill puts plows, tooth and disk harrows, harvesters, reapers, agricultural drills and planters, mowers, horse rakes, cultivators, thrashing machines, and cotton gins on the free list from any country in the world which will admit ours free.

If any American farmer chooses to pay a higher price for any of these things than he can buy it for at home and so put himself on a parity with the Canadian farmer, he can get them today in England, as the Canadian does, and import them here absolutely free of duty.

The only trouble is he can buy them cheaper at home, and so far as these things are concerned the proposed Democratic bill will be of no benefit to him.

It is only fair to state that this challenge to a world-wide reciprocity in the Payne bill was flung out to all nations at the request of the manufacturers themselves. I defy any Republican or Democrat to gainsay that.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a moment?

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

Mr. HILL. Yes; I will yield—if the interruption is short—for a question.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman inform us whether or not agricultural implements are produced in Canada?

Mr. HILL. Oh, yes; a few; but I guess not so many as we send over there.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Can the gentleman give us a comparison of wages paid in that industry in Canada and the United States?

Mr. HILL. There is no difference between the wages paid in Canada and the United States. I will stand upon that.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him just a moment?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER]?

Mr. HILL. I can not yield. Of course there are different rates of wages. One employer will pay liberal wages, while another will squeeze the life out of his employees. But in a general way I will state that there is no difference in the wages between like people, living in a like climate, under similar conditions.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. But the gentleman has just stated that in some respects the cost of living is higher in Canada than in the United States. If the wage earner has to pay a higher cost of living, is not that an important factor in considering his situation when his wages are the same?

Mr. HILL. Yes; I will answer the gentleman, and say that the cost of living is higher in eastern Canada than in South Dakota.

Now, I commend to the gentleman the next sentence that I am going to read: "Great is Diana of the Ephesians." The opponents of Canadian reciprocity may not see the force of this interjection, but they will if they study their Bibles and familiarize themselves with Paul's experience in Ephesus. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HILL. I can not yield. I have only a few minutes more.

The site of the former Temple of Diana, which I visited three years ago, is now nothing but a great mudhole, and that also is suggestive of many things. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Nor can our Democratic friends congratulate themselves that they are walking now in the paths which their fathers trod, for most of these food products which will come in free under reciprocity with Canada were dutiable at an average of 20 per cent in the Democratic Wilson bill and at from 40 to 20 per cent in the Walker bill of 1846; and about the only thing found in the infinitesimal free list of that still sacred achievement of Democratic revenue legislation among the many made free in this bill are shrubs, seeds, and fish.

Now, if you ask me my idea of protection to a farm product I will give you an illustration. Canada produces about 73,000,000 bushels of potatoes per annum; the United States about 336,000,000 bushels annually. The production is under like circumstances in both countries and in like climatic conditions. Indeed, in many cases the boundary line runs right through the potato fields. The freights to the great markets of this country are substantially the same. I have them here,

given me by the Interstate Commerce Commission, by rail and by the Hamburg-American and North German Lloyd steamship companies from Germany, yesterday, by telegraph:

Railroad rates on potatoes, carload lots, to New York.

From—	Cents.
St. Paul, Minneapolis, Oshkosh, Manitowoc, Green Bay, Wis.; Escanaba, Bagley, Mich.....per bushel	21.68
Fredericton, St. Johns, Morrison, New Brunswick...do	15.53
Caribou, Daggett, Presque Isle, Me.....do	17.87
Houlton, Me.....do	15.53
Van Buren, Me.....do	17.58
Ashland, Me.....do	16.99
Greenville, Me.....do	14.65
Hamburg and Bremen, Germany, by steamer.....do	9.80

The freights to the great markets of this country are substantially the same. Whatever difference there is, possibly 1 cent a bushel, is in our favor. No duty is needed from Canada, because there is no difference in the cost of production. But across the ocean is a country of small area, with a population of 60,000,000 people—Germany—which produced last year 1,800,000,000 bushels of potatoes, six times as many as we did with our 30,000,000 more population. With the cheap labor of Germany, she can do it at an average cost of at least 10 cents a bushel less than we can. More than that, Germany can put those potatoes into New York City by water at a freight of 5 cents a bushel less than the rail rate from any producing points in the United States. I would ascertain, through a careful investigation by the Tariff Board, what the average difference in the cost of production is and would make a duty to fully cover it. That is my idea of protection. That is the competition from which I would protect the American farmer, and that is Republican protection, as I understand it.

The fact of the case is that Canadian reciprocity is not in any sense a tariff question, and I am profoundly glad, gentlemen, that it is not a party one [applause], for it has been negotiated by a great Republican President and, in my judgment, will receive the approval of a majority of both parties on the floor of this House. [Applause.] In its very essence—and I shall discuss it from this point hereafter—it is a question of the future cost of living in this country, and that problem vitally affects every individual in the land. It goes into every home, not only, as the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HINDS] said, the home on the farm, but into the tenement house as well, into the humble cottage of the poor and the palace of the rich likewise. It is as insistent and compelling in the great city as in the country village, and it demands the anxious thought of every nation on this new continent, as it has already become the despair of every nation on the old one.

Three years ago I visited a great factory in Berlin, and was shown through it by an intelligent foreman who could speak a little English. "What do you pay for meat here," said I, "roasting and boiling pieces?" "Meat! Workmen know no meat. Potato and cabbage, cabbage and potato," was his reply. And I understood the significance of a country of 60,000,000 people raising 1,800,000,000 bushels of potatoes every year. "What is the price of butter?" I asked. "No butter can buy. Oil," he answered.

I have traveled for a month in the Orient, with an educated, cultivated gentleman as a guide, and his continuous diet was boiled rice, with a little dried fish added on feast days only.

Half of the population of the world to-day are struggling for a bare existence, and I never want to see on this continent such a civilization as that kind of sustenance compels.

The political complexion of Great Britain to-day is determined by the size of a loaf of bread, and the socialism of France and Germany is in reality a protest against scanty nourishment and the inability of the masses to obtain those things which make life tolerable and give to men ambition and hope of better things in the future for themselves and those dependent on them.

The increased cost of living was the dominant factor in the last election in this country, and mistaken as I think the people were as to the underlying causes of higher prices, they were not mistaken in the fact of their existence, for they were faced with the proof of it every day.

They did not stop to think that every year a million immigrants are added to our population beside its natural increase. They did not realize that eight-tenths of these settled in the manufacturing and mining sections, and that in the last decade nearly 10,000,000 of people, most of whom were food producers across the ocean were changed to food consumers here, and, besides that, the cities were growing enormously at the expense of the farming sections, making more food consumers and less food producers still.

They saw the splendid development of the West and the prosperity of the South and wondered at the resulting conditions as they were affected by them, forgetting the fundamental fact that no matter how much supply may increase, if demand increases more rapidly still, prices are bound to advance in proportion; and so they voiced their protest at the polls, and you gentlemen on the other side of this Chamber are now politically responsible for a situation which a Republican system of taxation did not cause, and which a Democratic system can not change, for increased demand for food products pressing upon the same area of production is certain to advance the price of the product and the increased return on the investment means higher land values, which in turn compels higher cost of production in the future. There can be no remedy except in a larger area of production or a reduced standard of living which will lessen demand.

In the last Congress I set forth in some detail the change from agricultural to industrial conditions in the States east of Indiana, and I call further attention now to the increase of manufacturing in the South and the limitation of the productive power of that section to the single crop of cotton, and I am satisfied that the present census of the United States will show that, with possibly two or three exceptions, the States east of the Mississippi River are nowhere near self-sustaining so far as food products are concerned.

In the two decades from 1880 to 1900, while this great industrial change was going on in the Eastern States, the value of all farm property in New Hampshire, Vermont, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Ohio decreased to the amount of $325,800,779, and in the same decades the value of all farm property in Indiana, Illinois, Nebraska, Kansas, Iowa, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Missouri increased $4,773,031,222. The addition to the wealth of those great States was enormous, and yet it can be easily accounted for by the fact that in a previous generation the value of much of that land had been merely nominal and had come into the possession of the owners at very low prices, much of it by the payment simply of the homestead fee of $1.25 an acre and that the increment was the result of long and hard struggles in subjecting it to cultivation, and with the low prices then prevailing securing the improvements which now make life enjoyable to the present possessors.

But the new census will show a wholly different condition of affairs. The natural movement to higher prices which a constantly increasing demand has caused, while it has affected all agricultural sections throughout the country, has given to these great cereal-producing States of the Central West by the greatly increased prices of their products an added wealth in increased land values which I do not believe has been equaled in any like period of time and in any similar territorial area in the history of the world.

In making this second comparison, I have not been able to get the census returns of the State of Ohio, but I have no doubt that State has shared in the results of these changes in equal proportion with the neighboring Eastern States of New York and Pennsylvania as it did before.

I will insert in the RECORD the changes in the land values alone, not including buildings and live stock, in order to show the added wealth of agricultural investments in the East and West in the single decade of 1900 and 1910. During that time the States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania show an increased value of land alone in the sum of $328,515,000, thus practically bringing them back to conditions which obtained 30 years, ago, and substantially recouping the previous loss.

Eastern States—increase of land value, 1900 to 1910, farm land alone.

	Value.	Gain.	Per cent.
Maine	$85,923,000	$36,569,000	74
New Hampshire	44,327,000	8,828,000	25
Vermont	58,255,000	12,441,000	27
Massachusetts	104,273,000	17,348,000	20
Rhode Island	14,837,000	1,415,000	11
Connecticut	71,527,000	19,086,000	36
New York	703,214,000	152,040,000	28
Pennsylvania	627,185,000	51,792,000	9
New Jersey	122,357,000	28,996,000	31
Total	1,831,898,000	328,515,000	.....

Over against this increase I call attention to the remarkable showing of the eight States of the Middle West—Illinois, Indiana, Nebraska, Kansas, Iowa, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Missouri—which in this single decade, now existing as settled communities, and with conditions in no way arduous and burdensome as those which had prevailed in their previous history, find themselves now in the possession of an investment increased, so far as land value alone is concerned, in the sum of $7,140,534,000.

Western States—increase of land values, 1900 to 1910, farm land alone.

	Value.	Gain.	Per cent.
Illinois	$3,081,564,000	$1,567,450,000	104
Indiana	1,325,475,000	637,842,000	93
Nebraska	1,613,077,000	1,126,471,000	231
Kansas	1,534,552,000	1,002,364,000	188
Iowa	2,799,025,000	1,542,273,000	122.7
Wisconsin	591,032,000	60,489,000	11
Minnesota	1,016,889,000	457,587,000	82
Missouri	1,441,529,000	746,058,000	103
	13,403,143,000	7,140,534,000	.....

In addition there was an increase of buildings and farm implements of $1,584,837,000.

The entire increase in the manufacturing industries of the whole United States for the first half of this decade, as shown by the census of 1905, was $3,707,440,473, so that it is fair to assume that in addition to a means of livelihood, and over and above the accumulations of live stock this 10-year period has given to the agricultural population of these eight States an increment of land value and buildings far greater than shown by the entire manufacturing industries of the whole United States for the same period. Note the added value of the farm lands of a single State like Illinois, aggregating as it does $1,560,450,000, an increase of 104 per cent, or 9 per cent annual addition to the investment over and above good dividends every year. Indiana shows 93 per cent; Nebraska, 231 per cent; Kansas, 188 per cent; Iowa, 122 per cent; Wisconsin, 11 per cent; Minnesota, 82 per cent; Missouri, 103 per cent. What that means to Illinois, the third manufacturing State in the Union, is shown by the fact that it is more than double the entire investment of that State in manufacturing, at the beginning of this 10-year period, and that the increase in manufacturing capital during the first 5 years on which we have the census figures was less than one-third of the value added to farm lands alone.

Now, I do not cite these figures with any feeling of envy or anything else but sincere rejoicing at the great prosperity which has come to this section of our common country, and by no vote or act of mine would I knowingly or willingly do anything which would detract from it. The men of the West have built up great empires there which have added to the glory of the whole land and to the prosperity of every section of it, and I am thoroughly confident that their present achievements, great as they are, are but promises of a still more glorious future.

But in this great industrial change which is surely coming to them, as it has already come to Ohio and the East, a new basis of cost of production of food products of the land must in the very nature of things be reckoned with, and it is hardly fair in looking into the future to say that the present movement is an attack upon the farming industry, in view of the fact that these enormous additions to the agricultural wealth of the country have been the result of the irresistible movement toward higher prices, which have affected all alike, but which have been far from being equally distributed in the respective industries. I call attention to the statements made in the United States Crop Reporter for January, 1911, which, I think, will be somewhat of a surprise to many people in this country, especially those who have been in receipt of sundry and various circulars with which the country has been flooded during the last two months, some of them anonymous and some of them bearing the imprint of the agricultural associations of the country. This governmental report shows an average increase in the money return per acre in the United States of the crops of corn, wheat, oats, barley, rye, buckwheat, potatoes, hay, tobacco, and cotton in 1909 of 72.7 per cent over and above the like return per acre in 1899, the unit increase on corn being 96.7; wheat, 69.5; oats, 62.7; barley, 37; rye, 44.8; buckwheat, 25.5; potatoes, 40.7; hay, 46.1; tobacco, 53; and cotton, 92.

On the other hand, the same documents will show as bearing on this all-important question of the cost of living that the department made at the same time that the other figures were tabulated a comparative statement of the prices of 85 articles purchased by farmers in 1909 and 1899, and in explanation of both tables I submit the conclusions drawn by Mr. Victor H. Olmstead, chief of the bureau, who says:

> From the foregoing data it appears that whereas the acre of the farmers' crops of 1909 was 72.7 per cent more than in 1899, and the cost of the articles purchased by them increased about 12.1 per cent, the purchasing power of the produce of 1 acre in 1909 was about 54 per cent greater than the purchasing power of the product of 1 acre in 1899. An acre of corn having increased 78.6 per cent, its purchasing power increased 60 per cent. An acre of wheat having increased 114 per cent, its purchasing power has increased 91 per cent, and an acre of cotton having increased 65.6 per cent, its purchasing power has increased 48 per cent.

I commend these tables in the Crop Reporter of January, 1911, to your consideration.

Under these circumstances it hardly seems to me that the circulars to which I have referred have fairly stated the situation to the farmer. I do not think that this was intentionally done, nor do I think that many of the other statements made in these circulars were intended to be misleading, although that is unquestionably the fact. For example, I find in one of them a statement as follows:

> The farmers receive much less protection than the manufacturers, for, while farm products are taxed on the average of about 25 per cent, manufactured articles are taxed on the average of about 45 per cent—

clearly showing an effort to convince the agricultural community that manufacturers as a distinct class are specially favored in the tariff law, and this I emphatically deny. I do not now wish to argue the question as to whether the export products of the soil are the direct recipients of the benefits of the protective system or not, but I will publish as a part of my remarks a table showing the ad valorem equivalent of the duty on 47 of the principal articles produced on the farms in the various sections of this country, and I make the assertion now, that if wool, tobacco, and sugar were classified as farm products in the agricultural schedule, as they should be, that schedule would show a higher rate of duty than any other schedule in the Payne tariff bill, except wines and spirits.

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Connecticut yield?

Mr. HILL. I have not the time. If I have time when I get through, I will answer any questions.

Some duties in the agricultural schedule, applying Payne rates to 10 years' importations, 1898 to 1907.

	Per cent.
Bacon and hams	21.65
Beef	20.18
Mutton	17.85
Pork	13.39
Veal	24.78
Poultry	42.97
Lard	15.10
Tallow	10.05
Wheat	26.62
Wheat flour	25
Oats	35.71
Corn	22.52
Buckwheat	31.32
Barley	61.16
Hay	52.93
Hops	49.51
Honey	51.29
Butter	28.83
Cheese	41.62
Milk	17.54
Eggs	64.04
Lemons	69.36
Apples	31
Zante currants	67.48
Biscuits, sweet	50
Rice	80.45
Onions	54.38
Potatoes	42.13
Figs	41.01
Oranges	69.20
Dried fruits	45.38
Green olives	27.13
Orange and lemon peel	58.58
Raisins	39.81
Preserved fruits	47.20
Almonds	57.31
Preserved citron	55.09
Filberts	56.78
Walnuts	50.77
Peanuts	21.08
Sugar, 96°	85.15
Leaf tobacco	70.88
Wrapper tobacco	209.02
Wool, class 1	59.35
Washed wool	88.04
Scoured wool	62.19

I will also print the ad valorem equivalent rate of duty on each schedule covering the importation of the first six months of the Payne bill, and thus permit the agricultural population of the land to draw their own inferences as to the correctness of the statements in the circulars referred to.

Percentage of ad valorem duty for six months, Oct. 1, 1909, to Mar. 1, 1910, on actual importations under the Payne law.

Schedule—	Per cent.
A. Chemicals	23.5
B. Earths	49.7
C. Metals	31.8
D. Wood	12.6
E. Sugar	51.9
F. Tobacco	77.4
G. Agriculture	29.55
H. Spirits	68.7
I. Cottons	49.0
J. Flax	47.4
K. Wool	59.6
L. Silk	51.1
M. Pulp and paper	18.9
N. Sundries	14.21

And sundries, or Schedule N, includes a greater volume of importations than any other two schedules put together.

I cite these figures also as a clear and distinct reply to another statement in one of these circulars, which says:

We hold that the farmer should receive exactly the same measure of protection as is given the manufacturers, and that there must be no reduction of duties on farm products, either by reciprocity or tariff revision, unless the duties on all manufactured articles are at the same time correspondingly reduced.

I find this same theory of the protective system set forth in a circular issued by the Cattle Raisers' Association of Texas, in which it is claimed by the residents of that overwhelmingly Democratic State that import duties, whether levied as a protective tariff or as a tariff for revenue, or on any other basis, should be so levied that their industries would receive an equal share in whatever benefit may flow therefrom.

Now, this is a theory of protection which is entirely new to me, for I had supposed that the whole system was based on an equalization of differing costs of production in this and other countries, and hence, where no difference exists, no duty would be collected; but this claim would suggest a wholly different idea—that hereafter it is to be a system of favoritism shown by a bountiful Government to all of its people on a basis of share and share alike. My suggestion is that no greater inequalities in effective duties will be found anywhere in the law than in the rates in the agricultural schedule which I have heretofore cited, and that the adoption of such a new system as an exact equalization of them would wholly do away with the necessity in the future of the services of a Tariff Board and would make the enactment of such tariff law an easy task, for it would consist of but one single rate applicable to all importations. I do not think that such a claim needs further consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McCALL. I will yield to the gentleman 10 minutes more.

Mr. HILL. No people on earth will render a more unbiased judgment on any great question of this kind than the intelligent and thoughtful people of the United States, and I am sure that time only is needed to correct the mistake which, in my judgment, was made last fall in giving to the Democratic Party the control of the future revenue system of the country.

I have spoken of the necessity of reckoning with the new basis of investment in estimating the cost of food products in this country in the future, and I now call attention to a most remarkable confirmation of my fears, found in a speech made by a Senator from a wheat-producing State, and which has come to me through the regular mail, and from which I have, therefore, no hesitation in quoting. I refer to a speech made by Senator GRONNA, of North Dakota, on February 28, 1911. He says:

We do not now produce all the wheat of which we are capable. There is still land left which will produce wheat, and although this land, or much of it, will not grow wheat profitably with low prices, it will produce a large amount of wheat if the owners are assured that the price will remain high enough to make it profitable. This applies not only to land which is at present owned by private individuals, but also to considerable public land still remaining. Most of the increase in our wheat production, however, must come from increased yields rather than from increase of acreage. More intensive cultivation will increase the yield per acre, and with the increase in price which will follow the overtaking of our production by our consumption such intensive cultivation will be brought about. If the tariff on wheat is removed, however, such improved cultivation of our wheat lands will be delayed. Agriculture is an industry of diminishing returns; after a certain point in cultivation of land has been reached, although additional cultivation will increase the yield, each additional unit of crop so produced will cost more in capital and labor expended than did the preceding units. Consequently those additional units will not be produced until the price received for the product has reached such a point that it will be profitable to expend this additional amount of capital and labor in producing them. With our markets thrown open to Canadian wheat, the production of which is less expensive than that of most American wheat, the price will be prevented by the Canadian wheat from reaching the level making it profitable to raise the additional bushels per acre.

I ask the thoughtful consideration of Members of this House in both parties to this plain proposition thus clearly stated that no action should be taken by the Congress which should in any way even temporarily retard the increase in the cost of production of this greatest of all food products, an increase which the Senator candidly admits to be inevitable in the future.

If the claim was made that no harm should be done to land investments honestly and laboriously acquired, as practically all of the tillable public lands of the United States have been, until no more now remain for homesteading, and that prices of wheat should be maintained to give a liberal return on such investments now with a fair chance of future increment, I should admit that the claim was just and reasonable, whatever I might think of the possibilities of such legislation. But I do not believe that the people of this country will deliberately enter upon any course of action which they know in advance will for all time continually increase their cost of living, until they are forced to it by conditions from which there is no possibility of escape.

Assuming present prices for both lumber and wheat to at least continue, and probably to advance, as I believe they must, yet I can see no more justification for free lumber from Canada for the Northwestern States than I can for free wheat from Canada for the rest of the country.

All through those States the demand is insistent for the extension of the area of forest products to take in all of Canada and give us her lumber and logs and pulp wood free of duty and other restrictions. The demand is justified on the ground of conservation of material resources.

I stand for the same extension of food production and plead the conservation of human life as at least equally entitled to your consideration. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The speech I have quoted demands the development of unprofitable areas here and the intensive cultivation of our own soil, and it is admitted that both can be secured only at a higher cost of food to the masses of the people. I stand for complete freedom of trade with Canada, if need be, to retard the advances in food products, which all concede must come.

The Senator from North Dakota pleads for dollars, I plead for humanity. Not for the rich; they can take care of themselves; but for the poor and the needy, in the years to come. Not for the manufacturer, but for the wage earner; not for the great landowner, but for the day laborers upon the farms and in the mines, and for the plain people of the land in every section, East and West, North and South—the men who carry the burdens in time of peace and fight our battles in war. [Applause.]

Within the natural lifetime of your children and mine, yes, of one-third of the people now living, these United States will have a population of 200,000,000 souls.

The opportunity is ours to provide for their welfare now.

The meat products of this great Nation, and a once possible competition from the Argentine Republic, are already controlled by a few great capitalists. I will not, in face of increasing prices for cereals, vote to limit the God-given possibilities of this whole continent and so subject those who shall come after us to a like monopoly in grain, let the consequences be what they may. [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania if he will consume some of his time.

Mr. DALZELL. What time did the last gentleman occupy?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania on his side has used 4 hours and 41 minutes, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL] has used 2 hours and 15 minutes, and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] 4 hours and 12 minutes.

Mr. DALZELL. How much time did the last speaker occupy?

The CHAIRMAN. He occupied 1 hour and 10 minutes, which is included in the statement just made.

Mr. McCALL. I think the Chair has stated a greater amount of time than was yielded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood the gentleman from Massachusetts to yield 1 hour in the first instance and 10 minutes in the second.

Mr. McCALL. Yes; but yesterday I yielded only an hour, which was not all occupied.

The CHAIRMAN. On yesterday the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] used an hour and five minutes. To-day the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] has used 1 hour and 10 minutes, making a total of 2 hours and 15 minutes.

Mr. McCALL. I think the Chair is mistaken, but I accept the statement of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the record at the desk.

Mr. DALZELL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HAMILTON] one hour. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the President condensed the scope of this proposition into a single sentence in his message of January 26 last, when he said:

Reciprocity with Canada must necessarily be chiefly confined in its effect on the cost of living to food and forest products.

That is, reciprocity with Canada so called will have little or no effect on manufactured products, but will be "confined in its effect" to farm and forest products.

So far as lumber is concerned, I voted for free lumber, when the Payne bill was under consideration, and we would have had free lumber if Democrats representing timber interests had not prevented it.

This agreement proposes, first, a free list of farm and some other products.

Second, a conditional arrangement as to pulp and print paper.

Third, it proposes an arrangement for the mutual protection of the manufactured products of both Canada and the United

States on terms agreed upon, subject to Canada's preferential arrangement with certain foreign nations.

Both Canada and the United States are protection countries, both have prospered under protection, and both propose to continue to protect their factories upon an agreed basis, but they mutually agree that the agricultural products of both may enter the markets of either duty free.

CANADA'S WHEAT AREA.

Let us consider the farmers' relation to this transaction. Let us consider it, Democrats and Republicans, so far as possible, in a nonpartisan way.

Canada has a population of about 8,000,000 and an area of about 4,000,000 square miles. Of that area about 2,000,000 square miles lie within the so-called unorganized Northwest Territories, which reach from Labrador to Yukon and from Ontario to the polar regions.

To the south of the western sweep of the Unorganized Territories lie the organized Territories of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta. Manitoba has an area of about 74,000 square miles, about the size of North Dakota. Saskatchewan has an area of about 250,000 square miles. Alberta has an area of about 253,000 square miles; and each is almost big enough to hold North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Illinois, and Michigan combined. It can not be definitely stated, but there is probably more wheat land in Canada lying west of the Red River of the North than there is in the United States west of the Mississippi, and the Canadian wheat land yields an average of 22 bushels to the acre, while the wheat land of the United States yields an average of 15 bushels to the acre.

The most authoritative statement I have been able to obtain as to the wheat-growing area of Canada is contained in an article contributed to the August, 1910, number of a periodical called Science, by Prof. M. A. Carlton, cerealist in the Agricultural Department.

The article is called "The future wheat supply of the United States." I will read a part of it:

A careful study of the conditions in Canada reveals a possibility in increased production far ahead of any other present exporting country. Outside of Manitoba, wheat production has only fairly begun, and yet the entire production can be made as large as that of the United States at present.

The undeveloped resources of Alberta and Saskatchewan are very great. These two Provinces and Manitoba are of chief present importance in grain production. The available farm area of the two larger Provinces, based upon reports of provincial officials, is about 250,000,000 acres out of a total land area of 310,000,000 acres. This farm land would furnish a similar proportion for wheat as now employed in Minnesota and Kansas, or about one-ninth of the area. This should be particularly capable of attainment because of the impossibility of any considerable corn production. One-ninth of this farm area will furnish a wheat area of almost 28,000,000 acres. Manitoba employs now almost 3,000,000 acres. A conservative estimate therefore may be made in round numbers of 30,000,000 acres as the possible wheat acreage for these three Provinces in 1950.

The present average yield per acre of both spring and winter wheat for the three Provinces, calculated from previous 10-year records, appears to be about 22 bushels, which should increase to at least 25 bushels. This rate of yield would allow a total annual production of 750,000,000 bushels, of which over 600,000,000 bushels would be an increase over present production. This possibility leaves out the increases that will occur in older Provinces and the probable production in northeastern British Columbia and the Northwest Territory.

A possibility of wheat cultivation, even in northern Alberta, is not a matter of theory, but has been fully tested. In the year 1908, 35,000 bushels of wheat were already grown in the vicinity of Fort Vermilion, at an average yield of 24 bushels per acre. Two stone mills and a modern roller mill are established at this point, which is 350 miles north of Edmonton. The wheat grown is probably not the best, but appears to be of fair quality and has a fine appearance.

DAMAGED BUT NOT INJURED.

It is proposed by this trade agreement to permit millers and shippers to buy wheat on both sides of the international boundary line free of tariff interference.

Now, it will scarcely be claimed by anybody that the American farmer will be benefited by the free importation of Canadian farm products into the United States in competition with his own. But it is claimed that things which the farmer sells will be bought cheaper, and since things which the farmer sells will be bought cheaper, it follows that it is deliberately intended that the farmer shall be compelled to sell cheaper; and the means whereby it is deliberately intended that the farmer shall be compelled to sell cheaper is Canadian competition, to be created by this agreement.

But we are told that in some way, not involving the reduction of the middleman's profit, the people who live in large cities will be permitted to buy things cheaper, and the farmer will be compelled to sell things cheaper, but that the farmer will suffer no injury by reason thereof.

We are told that wheat will overrun from Canada into the United States and that the American farmer will have to take less for his wheat, but that he will be all the better off. [Laughter.]

We are told that bread will be cheaper, and the only man of all the 35,000,000 engaged in "gainful occupations" in this country required to contribute to that result is the farmer, and the farmer is expected to enjoy it. [Laughter.]

We are further told that in order to facilitate this agricultural contribution system wheat should be free and flour protected at the rate of 50 cents a barrel.

Now, the purpose of this agreement in its relation to the miller is made perfectly clear on page 28 of Senate Document 862, which I think I have a perfect right to call an inspired document, inasmuch as I think it is generally understood that it was prepared by one of the commissioners who negotiated this treaty. On page 28 it says:

The millers will be enabled to regain in large part the enormous losses they have suffered in recent years with respect to their foreign sales.

Excellent! But who is going to recoup the farmer for recouping the miller [laughter and applause] and enabling the baker and the packer and the brewer to make large profits out of the consumer?

It is said the millers are to recoup themselves for "enormous losses." That means, of course, that the millers must make enormous gains, because they are to recoup themselves for "enormous losses." And how are the millers to recoup themselves? Obviously, out of the farmer on the one hand and the consumer of bread on the other hand.

LOOKING AT THINGS FROM A HIGH PLANE.

Inasmuch, however, as we are "linked together by race, language, and geographical proximity," and because Canada has never cost us anything for gunboats or military equipment, the President invites the farmer to look at this thing "from a high plane" [laughter] and to recognize the equity and breadth of international comity of an arrangement that will injure him financially, require him to divide his home market with Canada, and sell the balance of his crop abroad subject to the toll of the miller and the shipper.

Gentlemen, the farmer would be able to view this transaction from a higher plane if his view were not obstructed by the discrimination against him and in favor of the miller of 50 cents a barrel on flour, while his wheat is made free *in the interest of cheaper food.*

The farmer would be able to see this transaction from a higher plane if his view were not obstructed by the discrimination against him and in favor of the brewer by a duty of 45 cents a hundred on barley malt, made from barley which the brewer is permitted to buy of the farmer free, *in the interest of cheaper food.*

The farmer would be able to view this transaction from a higher plane if his view was not obstructed by a discrimination against him and in favor of the packer of a cent and a quarter a pound on dressed meat cut from the carcasses of animals which the packer is permitted to buy of the farmer free *in the interest of cheaper food.* [Applause on the Republican side.]

HOW LIVERPOOL "FIXES" THE PRICE.

In order to see this thing from a high plane, we are invited to consider that Liverpool fixes the price of wheat anyway; but, on page 27 of this inspired document, we are told that "the price of wheat in the United States generally averages, as to the northwestern crop, fully 10 cents per bushel and sometimes so much as 15 cents per bushel higher than in the corresponding sections of Canada."

Does Liverpool "fix" it that way, and if Liverpool "fixes" it that way, what has the duty got to do with it anyway?

Of course if Liverpool fixes it that way, the duty would make no difference, and if the duty makes no difference, there would be no reason for removing the duty.

This Liverpool-price idea has been in circulation so long that a great many people accept it without reasoning upon it; but Liverpool does not "fix" the price. The price does not stay "fixed." It never did stay fixed. Gentlemen around on this floor here in debate for the last two days have been quoting all sorts of simultaneous prices. The price fluctuates from day to day. It goes up with the report of an unseasonable frost, and it goes down with the report of a timely rain.

But the farmer is invited to welcome Canadian crops and to market his own abroad. If Liverpool is a good market for us, why is it not a good market for Canada? Besides, Canada is "linked" with Liverpool "by race, language," and political institutions. Now, if this is not a better market than Liverpool, why should Canada want it? [Applause on the Republican side.] And if it is a better market than Liverpool, why should we give it to Canada? [Applause on the Republican side.]

THE FARMERS' WELFARE VITAL TO THE WELFARE OF THE COUNTRY.

Gentlemen, for years we have been telling the farmer that his welfare was vital to the welfare of the whole country, have we not, Democrats and Republicans alike? For years we have been telling the farmer that the prosperity of the country depends in a great measure upon the prosperity of agriculture.

Were we hypocrites when we told him that, or was it true? And if it was true, and it was, is it any less true now than it was in 1908, when we told him that last?

While yet the grain fields of Canada were unplowed we told the farmer that while protection to his grain was of little value, protection as a policy was of immense value to him, because it built up a market at his door, and now that he is beginning to receive some benefit from direct protection shall we take it away from him while leaving every other class protected?

While yet the grain fields of Canada were unplowed we told the farmer that the more people there are employed in factories the bigger the town; that the bigger the town the better the market for the farmer, and that the better the market for the farmer the more valuable the farm.

We told him that the more people there are employed in the factories the more people there are to buy what the farmer grows to sell, and that the more people there are to buy what the farmer grows to sell the more the farmer gets for what he grows to sell.

We told him the more the farmer sells of what he grows to sell the more the farmer buys of what the manufacturer makes to sell, and we told him the more the manufacturer sells of what he makes to sell the more men he employs to make more goods to sell to everybody; and the more men there are employed to make more goods to sell to everybody the more money they have to buy of everybody.

We told the farmer that men out of work buy less and less at the store, and that when men out of work buy less and less at the store the store buys less and less of the wholesaler, and the wholesaler buys less and less of the factory, and the railroad hauls less and less to everybody and for everybody.

We told him that the more men there are out of work the less money there is in use and circulation, and that the less money there is in use and circulation the lower the price of everything.

And this is all eternally true; but manufacturing New England, which is as much indebted to protection as any part of the Union, wants a special dispensation in her own behalf [applause and laughter on Republican side], so that she can buy food of the Canadian farmer free and at the same time be permitted to go on selling her protected manufactured products to the unprotected farmer of the West. [Applause on the Republican side.] How broad, how generous, how altruistic, how characteristic! [Prolonged applause and laughter on Republican side.]

My friend Cushman, now dead, once applied an old story to New England, and invited her to let go of the tariff teat or quit kicking the cow. She is likely to do both if this thing goes through. [Applause and laughter on Republican side.] There are a great many people west of the Hudson. [Laughter.]

Gentlemen talk about low prices. The quickest and surest way to get low prices and hard times and industrial rust and cobwebs and industrial stagnation, and empty dinner pails and smokeless chimneys, and wheels that stand still while the unused current sweeps by is just to turn the management of business over to the political successor of the architects of the Wilson bill. [Applause on the Republican side.] Then the consumer will be able to buy things cheap. But, gentlemen, the bun in the grocery window is never more remote than when you have not a nickel to buy it with. [Applause on the Republican side.]

BUILDING ROADS AND BRIDGES FOR CANADIAN COMPETITORS.

Now that we have built up here on American soil a market of $25,000,000,000, with trade tributary to it traveling over our own rivers, lakes, and railroads—and we are proud of it as Republicans, because it has been built up under Republican policies—it is now proposed to invite Canada in to participate with us and compel our farmers to seek a foreign market.

For years it has been our theory that inasmuch as the foreigner contributes nothing for the maintenance of our schools, churches, roads, bridges, and internal improvements, he ought to be required to go down in his pocket and produce something to contribute to our tariff fund for the privilege of selling here. Now, it is proposed to compel the farmer to tax himself to build roads and bridges for the convenience of his Canadian competitors to travel over and compete with him in our markets. [Applause on the Republican side.]

CLASS DISCRIMINATION.

Lately we have been congratulating the farmer on the fact that he is receiving just fair prices for what he has to sell, and it is the first time for years that we have been able to do that. But whatever the American farmer plants from this time on he must plant on shares with Canada. [Applause on the Republican side.]

This agreement, stripped of all verbiage, is a proposition to cheapen American farm products. By it it is proposed that the farmer shall receive less, in order that the people who live in large cities may pay less.

Let us consider this. We have a population here of about 92,000,000, and of that population about 35,000,000 are engaged in so-called gainful occupations. Of these 35,000,000 engaged in so-called gainful occupations about 12,500,000 are engaged in agriculture, about 8,500,000 in manufacturing and mechanical pursuits, about 6,000,000 in trade and transportation, and about 8,500,000 in professional and domestic service, and we are all interdependent.

For years we have argued that you could not strike a blow at any one of these industrial divisions without striking a blow at our whole industrial system, and it is true. But by this you propose to levy upon the farmer for contribution to all the rest. Is it fair to levy upon one industrial class for the benefit of all the rest?

"EQUAL RIGHTS FOR ALL; SPECIAL PRIVILEGES TO NONE."

Some years ago somebody paraphrased a statement made by Thomas Jefferson in his first inaugural message into the expression, "Equal rights for all and special privileges to none," and Democrats have been quoting it ever since under the mistaken impression that they were quoting Thomas Jefferson. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Is it "equal rights for all; special privileges to none" to protect every other industrial interest in this country and leave the farmer exposed to competition?

Is it "equal rights for all; special privileges to none" to remove protection from the farmer's wheat and protect the miller at the rate of 50 cents a barrel on the flour he makes of the wheat he buys of the farmer free?

Is it "equal rights for all; special privileges to none" to remove protection from the farmer's oats and protect the manufacturer at the rate of 50 cents a hundred pounds on the oatmeal and rolled oats he makes out of the oats he buys of the farmer free?

Is it "equal rights for all; special privileges to none" to remove protection from the farmer's barley and protect the brewer at the rate of 45 cents a hundred *in the interest of cheaper food?*

Is it "equal rights for all; special privileges to none" to remove protection from the farmer's cattle, sheep, hogs, and "all other live animals," and protect the beef trust at the rate of a cent and a quarter a pound on dressed meats cut from carcasses of the cattle, sheep, hogs, and "other live animals" it buys of the farmer free?

Is it "equal rights for all; special privileges to none" to protect the distiller at the rate of $2.60 a gallon on whisky made out of rye which he is permitted to buy from the farmer free *in the interest of cheaper food?* [Applause on the Republican side.]

Is the proposition to protect every large industrial division and leave the farmer exposed to competition "equal rights for all; special privileges to none"?

You southern gentlemen: Suppose Canada grew cotton, how many of you would oppose protected cotton; and if Canada grew cotton and there was a protective tariff on cotton, would you be in favor of taking the duty off cotton; and if Canada grew cotton and there was a protective tariff on cotton, would you gentlemen be in favor of removing the duty from the planters' cotton and permitting the New England manufacturer to be protected in the fabrics he would make from the cotton he bought of the planter free?

How would that square with your theory of "equal rights for all; special privileges to none"—on paper? [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

The line of discrimination runs through this transaction as straight as a gun barrel, and you Democrats are going out of your way to help to perpetrate it.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] the other day talked about fooling the American farmer. Well, I reckon that the farmers of North Carolina are a heap easier fooled than the farmers of Michigan. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The farmer of Michigan understood the drift of this transaction instantly.

You gentlemen hope to carry the next election. Do you expect the aid of the farmer? I admit he is going to be between the devil and the deep sea.

You can not make loose change of the American farmer in your dickers with foreign nations or in your schemes for political power without the farmer finding it out. We have the free rural mail delivery nowadays.

Gentlemen, I would not be at all surprised to discover that this special session will become known in the next campaign and known in history as the "antifarmer session." [Applause on the Republican side.] And, my Democratic brethren, your relations to it will be a good deal like that of the man who drew an elephant in a raffle. [Laughter.]

THE FARMER'S PATRIOTISM.

Gentlemen, the American farmer is patriotic. From the days when the "embattled farmer fired the shot heard 'round the world" at Concord he has been fighting the battles of the Republic. Half clad, half fed, and poorly armed, through cold and privation, sometimes with bleeding feet, he followed Washington to Yorktown and to victory.

The first time the American flag, Mr. Chairman, ever challenged an enemy or inspired a patriot in battle he followed it at the Brandywine and he has been following it ever since.

Its stripes are red with the blood of patriots shed that its stars might shine together, and farmers' blood has helped to dye it red. [Applause.]

He has built his home upon the frontier, and sometimes in the silence and stillness of the forest he has listened for the tramp, tramp of coming millions. And as soon as the advance guard has arrived he has built the American schoolhouse and hoisted the Stars and Stripes above it.

The American farmer is patriotic. If it were necessary to make a sacrifice for the good of his country, he would do it again and again as he has done it before, even to the last supreme sacrifice of his life.

FAIR PLAY.

But, Mr. Chairman, the American farmer, like every other manly man, likes fair play. He likes it in your country just as he likes it in mine. Even the intermediate dealer, when he takes his rake-off out of this assessment of the American farmer, will scarcely respect himself the more for taking it, or his Government the more for giving him the chance to take it. [Applause.]

Why, gentlemen, if it were proposed to levy exclusive contributions upon them the newspapers of this country would break out in scare heads and double-leaded editorials immediately. But the great metropolitan dailies of the country, to whom is being held out the hope of future benefits, view the somewhat hopeless and inarticulate efforts of the farmer to avert this injury to him with a tolerant and languid interest.

If the railroads were to be specifically assessed for the benefit of every other industrial class in this country, they would cut down wages, lay off labor, and lay off trains. But Mr. James Hill's railroads run into the wheat fields of Canada, I understand, and Mr. Hill and his fellow haulers are content.

If it were proposed specifically to assess labor and capital and manufactures for the benefit of all the other industrial classes, this Capitol would be besieged. And yet the farmer is expected to take his loss and smile, smile, and keep on smiling. Well, gentlemen, he may not smile much right now, but he has been studying the meaning of reciprocity, and he will know how to reciprocate. [Laughter.] He has been studying discrimination, and he will know how to discriminate—in November, 1912. [Applause on the Republican side.]

THE FARMER COMPELLED TO SELL LOW AND BUY HIGH.

The reason for this discrimination against the farmer is said to be the high price of food.

Times are good and prices are high, and good times and high prices generally go together, and bad times and low prices generally go together. When times are good they are good for everybody, and when they are bad they are bad for everybody.

We all like high prices, but we like them for what we have to sell; and we all like low prices, but we like them for what we have to buy. We all like high prices and we all like low prices—Democrats and Republicans—but we like them when they are coming our way. But this is the first time in the history of our country when it has been deliberately advocated as a policy that one great industrial class of our population should be required to both buy high and sell low for the benefit of the other industrial classes.

What are the causes of high prices? One cause, by common consent of scientific investigators, is defined by the so-called quantitative theory of money.

That theory imagines that the commodities of the world are in one pile. It imagines that the money of the world is in another pile, and it balances the money of the world against the commodities of the world, and as money increases in quantity in its relation to commodities it is correspondingly decreased in value in its relation to commodities. Therefore it takes more money to buy commodities, and therefore more money makes higher prices. That is the so-called quantitative theory of money.

Fifteen years ago the annual production of gold the world over was $202,000,000. In 1910 it was $454,000,000. Prices are up the world over—up in Europe, up in South Africa, up in China and Japan, up in South America, up in the United States, and up in Canada.

Where there is a universal condition it is reasonable to look for a universal cause, and the increased production of gold is said to be that cause.

THE LAW OF SUPPLY AND DEMAND AS AFFECTED BY MONOPOLY.

With universal high prices caused by the increase of money in its relation to commodities other causes may conspire. For illustration, the law of supply and demand.

The law of supply and demand may operate normally, it may be affected by monopolistic methods, or it may be affected by sociological conditions.

But, Mr. Chairman, this is the first time that this Nation has ever proposed, directly or indirectly, to recognize and, by implication, to sanction monopolistic methods.

The millers of Canada and the United States are protected from the rest of the world, first, by geographical location, and, second, by the tariff laws of their respective countries.

By this agreement they are given free range of the wheat fields. Themselves being the only American market for wheat, and themselves being the only American producers of flour, they can within certain limits fix the price of wheat when it goes into their mills, and fix the price of flour when it comes out of their mills.

They know that as a rule the farmer is obliged to sell soon after harvest to save storage, shrinkage, and wastage and to stop interest on his mortgages. They will give him the opportunity of selling at their price then or later on.

When wheat goes into their mills they control the flour and bread market of North America, and they participate in the control of the world's supply of wheat.

Minneapolis, the milling center of the universe, is on this side of the line and dictates terms to lesser mills.

On the other side, according to Senate Document No. 862, there are now in operation mills at Fort William, Winnipeg, and Keewatin, with a capacity of from 4,000 to 10,000 barrels daily. One Montreal concern, with a chain of mills from Montreal to Winnipeg, claims to be the largest millers in the British Empire, with a daily capacity of 17,500 barrels; another, with offices at Montreal and Winnipeg, is making 10,500 barrels of flour daily; another, whose head office is Toronto, with mills at Winnipeg, Goderich, and Brandon, claims a daily capacity of 7,000 barrels.

Knowing the modern tendency of corporations to organize themselves into combinations, it is difficult to believe that these strong Canadian milling companies have not an understanding among themselves as to prices.

Knowing the methods of corporate combinations, it is impossible to believe that "the largest millers in the British Empire" would permit small competitors to grind long except on terms agreed upon.

Knowing the modern method of international trade combinations, it is difficult to believe that the milling center of the universe on this side of the line and the "largest millers in the British Empire" on the other side of the line do not understand one another.

They themselves are a part of the so-called Liverpool market, because through them and their cooperators the surplus finds its way abroad subject to their toll. To assume that these milling companies have not taken advantage of this opportunity, and to assume that they will not continue to take advantage of this opportunity, is to assume that the millenium has arrived in the milling business, and of this we have no evidence.

Human nature is selfish, and it is never less selfish when organized into corporations; and corporations are never less selfish when organized into trusts.

EXPROPRIATION.

I said a moment ago that the law of supply and demand might be affected by sociological conditions.

There has been a constant movement of our population from the country into the cities. Fifty per cent of our population has become congested in the great cities of this country, and the undisguised purpose of this arrangement is to require farmers to furnish cheaper food to the people who live in large cities.

Such a thing as to select one grand division of our industrial life for compulsory contribution to all the rest has never been done before.

Now, setting aside the question of the justice or the injustice of this proposition in a government of supposed equal rights for all and special privileges to none, would this "ex-

propriation"—to adopt a socialistic term—of the proceeds of the farmer's toil for the benefit of the people engaged in manufacturing and mechanical pursuits, for the benefit of the people engaged in trade and transportation, for the benefit of the people engaged in professional and domestic service, accomplish the results expected?

This means that twelve and a half million people engaged in agriculture are to be levied upon for the benefit of the other 80,000,000, among whom are organized colossal corporate combinations which have challenged the attention of the world and contested the power of courts and legislatures to control them.

The Minneapolis price of wheat from January, 1910, to January, 1911, inclusive, ranged from 10 to 16 cents higher than the Winnipeg price.

It is a scientific fact that when two fluid bodies standing at different levels flow together, they tend to reach a state of equilibrium at a common level.

Imagine two ponds of equal size, one 10 feet higher than the other, separated by a narrow neck of land. Remove the barrier and the higher pond will fall and the lower pond will rise until they are exactly at the same height.

Apply this to the wheat areas of Canada and the United States. It is clear that the price of wheat will range lower in the United States and higher in Canada, by reason of this agreement, and that a price equilibrium will be reached. Who will get the benefit of it? It is certain that the farmer will lose it—that is foreordained by this agreement—but who will get the benefit of it?

If the people who live in the great cities will not get the benefit of it, then this agreement is utterly indefensible from any standpoint.

THE EVOLUTION OF A LOAF OF BREAD.

From the best information I have been able to obtain, about 72 per cent of a bushel of wheat becomes flour and about 28 per cent becomes shorts and bran. It takes, on an average, a trifle less than 5 bushels of wheat to make a barrel of flour, depending on the character of the season and the quality of the wheat. The wholesale millers' price of a barrel of flour ranges from $5.50 to $6.50 per barrel, and the price of bran ranges from $22 to $26 a ton. Bakers buy flour at jobbing prices, close to the millers' wholesale prices.

A bushel of wheat, according to the best estimates I can get, and I have gone to scientific sources to obtain this information, will make 60 loaves of bread as bread is commonly baked in this country.

I know it was stated in the Senate that it would make 75 loaves, but I looked that up and I am satisfied that the Senator was wrong when he made that statement. Now, assuming that the farmer will lose 10 cents a bushel—and the less he loses the less the consumer will be benefited, of course—divide 10 cents a bushel by 60 loaves, do you suppose that the consumer of a loaf will get the benefit of that one-sixth of 1 cent after the bushel of wheat has traveled from the wheat field to the table of the consumer?

Suppose the farmer loses 5 cents a bushel, and divide 5 cents by 60 loaves. Do you suppose the consumer will get the benefit of that one-twelfth of 1 cent?

Follow the bushel of wheat from the wheat fields to the miller, from the miller to the baker, and from the baker to the consumer.

I assume that before that bushel of wheat has become 60 loaves of bread it has first been sold to a wheat buyer, who gets his percentage for handling. Next, it has been stored in an elevator, which gets its percentage for storing. Next, it has been carried, say, to Minneapolis by a railroad, which gets its percentage for hauling.

Next it has been sold to a miller, who converts it into flour and makes his profit for handling and grinding, and in addition to that he has taken out the bran and shorts.

Next the flour has been sold by the miller to a wholesaler, who makes his profit for handling.

Next it has been carried by a railroad, which gets its percentage for hauling.

Next it has passed into the hands of a wholesale baker, who transforms it into 60 loaves of bread and makes his profit for baking.

The loaves have been hauled by a railroad, which gets its percentage for hauling, and they have been handled by a retail grocer, who gets his profit for handling.

The wholesale bakers in big cities ship these loaves along the lines of railroads radiating from the big cities; they go to the little towns along the way, and there the retailers sell them to their customers for 5 cents a loaf.

By the time that bushel of wheat has traveled from the wheat fields of the Dakotas or from Saskatchewan, or wherever it comes from, to the table of the consumer of bread it has paid storage, rent, clerk hire, delivery service, miller's wages, baker's wages, miller's profits, baker's profits, wholesaler's profits, retailer's profits, and railroad, telegraph, and telephone service. Do you suppose the intermediate dealers and handlers along the way from the wheat fields to the ultimate consumer will not absorb the one-sixth or the one-twelfth of 1 cent per loaf? Do you suppose the ultimate consumer is going to get the benefit of that? Certainly not.

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

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Certainly.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Of course the gentleman has not overlooked the fact that it is doubly provided that he shall not, from the fact that on 4½ bushels of wheat a reduction of 10 cents represents 50 cents, and that is retained on the flour as soon as the miller makes it in Minneapolis.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Precisely.

There is a vast difference between the modern machine-made porous openwork loaf and the bread made by the farmer's wife from the flour made from the wheat that the farmer hauled to the local mill; and there is a vast difference between the mill of to-day and the mill of a few years ago, and there is a vast difference between the population to which the mill was tributary a few years ago and the population to which the modern mill is tributary.

Wheat fluctuates from day to day in the markets, but the price of the commercial loaf never fluctuates.

All that fluctuates is the amount of bread in the loaf, and that fluctuates surreptitiously, and generally fluctuates downward.

Wheat has fallen off in price since this agreement was promulgated.

The farmers are thousands of dollars poorer by reason of it, but not a loaf has been bought cheaper by reason of it, and not an ounce has been added to the loaf.

It is unnecessary to follow the course of a bushel of oats or a bushel of rye from the field to the consumer, or to follow the course of a bushel of barley from the field to the vat of the brewer. The general result of loss to the farmer, no gain to the consumer, and profit to the middleman is the same.

FARM PRICES AND PULLMAN PRICES.

Now, I want to tell a little personal experience. I have the old farm where I was brought up. You gentlemen of the South call it a plantation. I think more of that old farm than any place on earth. I had a law practice when I came to Congress, but I have not any left. I have the old farm left.

Mr. MURDOCK. Good! [Laughter.]

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. And I am going to keep it unless the sheriff gets it away from me at the end of some of these political campaigns. [Laughter.] Now, a year ago last November my tenant came to me and said, "We have some potatoes to sell." I said, "What can we get for them?" He said, "Twenty-six cents a bushel. They have got to be culled and selected in order to bring that." He said the local market was glutted, but some one was buying for shipment. I said "All right, we might as well sell them." The price did not really pay for the cost of growing and handling. We got 26 cents, less the cost of hauling and handling.

The next day I took the train to come to Washington. I went into the dining car to get my dinner—you call it dinner here, but we call it supper in my country, and I like the name better. I think it tastes better.

I ordered a baked potato and a steak. The steak was $1.25 and I paid 15 cents for that baked potato, more than half of what I got for a bushel of my potatoes the day before. [Laughter.] These are Pullman prices and they are hotel prices, and the same difference between the price to the producer and the price to the consumer ranges all the way down from porterhouse to "chuck steak."

Let me tell you another thing. On the 12th of March I had a letter from a constituent in Allegan County, Mich. He said, "Just think of it; the President says prices are high, with wheat at 85 cents a bushel, eggs at 14 cents a dozen, and potatoes at 25 cents a bushel, and other commodities in proportion." That is within 150 miles of Chicago.

Do you think it is quite fair to assess the men who get these prices for the benefit of all the rest of us, my Democratic brethren? Do you think you are doing a just and patriotic thing? By and by, if you are not careful, it may possibly react on you. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

There are some people who are never satisfied unless they pay more than a thing is worth. They never think they are getting a good thing unless they pay more than it is worth, and the dealer always knows his customer and is ready to accommodate him. [Laughter.]

There is another class of sycophants who can not afford it, but who are always happy to pay a high price for anything they eat or drink or wear, providing they can eat it or drink it or wear it in the upper regions of the financially select.

They are always known, because the dollar always knows its kin by instinct, but they would rather be patronized than not to be present.

There is another class, who live in the regions of too much, where the Pullman car is a connecting link between establishments called homes, where every tick of the clock ticks cost.

There is another class of loafers, parasites, criminals, and others who get rotten before they get ripe. [Laughter.] These people do not need our sympathy and are not entitled to it, but the people who are working for low wages, and low salaries, do need our sympathy, and they ought to have it, and they do have it, and the supreme argument for a protective tariff is that it does protect American labor from the cheap labor of Europe and the Orient.

John Mitchell, in his book on Organized Labor, says:

> The American people should not sacrifice the future of the working classes in order to improve the condition of the inhabitants of Europe.

And he is right. Neither should we sacrifice the farming classes in order to improve the condition of the inhabitants of Canada. The argument is as good for the farmers as it is for the laborers. [Applause.]

THE MOVEMENT FROM COUNTRY TO CITY.

Why has our population been shifting from the country to the city?

One reason is that people work 16 hours a day on the farm and they work 8 hours in town. Another reason is to earn more money. Why, gentlemen, if the farmer is so rich that he ought to be assessed for the benefit of the rest of us, why have his children left the farm?

Another reason is that young men and young women are lured by the glitter and glare and show of the city, and think they will have greater advantages there, but after they get there they find the pavements are hard and monotonous, that rents are high, that food is high, that most people are rated according to their bank account, and that it is more than a hundred miles between the fashionable and unfashionable sides of a brick wall. [Applause.]

I was reading a few days ago a report of a commission appointed in the city of New York on Congestion of Population, and that commission says that in the Borough of Manhattan—and I hope some Representative from the Borough of Manhattan is here—there is a block where the density of population is 1,260 to the acre.

That means a space 6 feet square—a little bigger than a grave—for a human being to eat and sleep and live and die in. Piled up there 10 stories high in those tenements whole families live sometimes in two rooms and take boarders.

That is bad for the health of a community, bad for the morals of a community. Not only are the tenements in these districts crowded, but the streets are crowded.

In his book on Housing Reform, Mr. Lawrence Veiller shows that conditions in New York are without parallel in the civilized world, and he says:

> In no other city are there the same appalling conditions with regard to lack of light and air in the homes of the poor.

The death rate of children ranges from 60 to 92 to the thousand. This congestion breeds crime and disease and poisons the body politic. It causes increasing rents and lower wages.

One-twentieth of the assessed valuation of the Borough of Manhattan is said to be owned by eight families, estates, and corporations. The commission reports that—

> Low wages, high rent, increase of land value, and the cost of construction and labor all seem to work in a vicious circle, the effect of which is indirectly to increase congestion and lower the standards of life in the congested districts.

There are other cities in this country where congestion committees might find conditions to report upon.

Mr. Chairman, this is going on while in the country outside of the smoking, steaming piles of city masonry, where people are stacked up, story above story, there are thousands of acres of land where homes of cleanliness and comfort, peace and plenty await the industry of intelligent agriculture. Do we need to annex Canada? [Applause.]

The Socialist can find no better argument for overturning our present social and political system than right here in the congested districts of New York.

But, after all, why destroy the whole system? Why not reform New York?

The question of whether government of the people and by the people will be able to continue to govern itself is no longer a far-off question, but is here and we are already in the midst of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, there is something more to be done, gentlemen, than to legislate against farmers in the hope that some vestige of what the farmer loses may run the gantlet of intermediate greed and reach these poor people who live in these congested districts.

And one thing to be done is to reform your educational systems, so that city boys and girls may be fitted for something else than city life.

Another thing is to stop crowding your factories into your city blocks, thereby crowding neighboring tenements with laborers who want to be near their work.

Another thing is to keep them nearer the ground, and not to herd helpless employees in city lofts without adequate fire escapes. Such a condition is only little less than barbarous. Every one of these city fires emphasizes the fact that by a certain quality of commercial mind commerce is considered of more importance than human life.

Another thing is in some way to limit the monopoly of land holding which enables a few landlords to collect dividends from squalor, vice, and misery.

THE TESTIMONY OF THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE.

But they tell us the farmer is rich and can afford to be made an exception of, while trusts are undisturbed. Read Secretary Wilson's report for 1910. He shows you that the farmer does not get 50 per cent of the price the consumer pays for agricultural products.

That was before the exigencies of Cabinet service made it necessary for him to modify some of the views that he had before expressed [applause and laughter on the Republican side], and he goes on to say that if the farmer has lately been getting just a little better price for what he has to sell, it is due him for all the years of hardship that he has gone through.

Some of us who have lived a little closer to the farms than some of you city men know something about this, and I say to you that I never encountered a public question since I have been here that touched my heart and conscience like this question has, and I would rather go out of Congress than to stand for it. [Applause on the Republican side.] But I will not have to do it. [Renewed applause.]

He tells us that down to recent times—

> The prices of farm products received by farmers were even less than the cost of production and often little, if any, above the cost of production.

In commenting upon the recent advance in farm products he says:

> That this should have been so was merely a matter of justice to the farmer to equalize the reward of his efforts with the rewards received in other lines of production.

After showing that by a careful, scientific, and exhaustive investigation he has found that the middleman gets over 50 per cent of the price charged the consumer, and in many instances a great deal more, he closes this branch of his report with the statement that—

> From the details that have been presented with regard to the increase of the prices of farm products between the farmer and consumer the conclusion is inevitable that the consumer has no well-grounded complaint against the farmer for the price he pays. The farmer supplies the capital for production and takes the risk of losses; his crops are at the mercy of drought and flood and heat and frost, to say nothing of noxious insects and blighting diseases. He supplies hard, exacting, unremitting labor. A degree and range of information and intelligence are demanded by agriculture which are hardly equaled in any other occupation.

AUTOMOBILES.

But some one has heard that out in Kansas some farmers own automobiles.

Well, one thing is fairly certain, that when a farmer owns an automobile he has not mortgaged the place to buy it, as many a city parvenu has done.

In 1908 the correspondent of the New York Post thought it was of sufficient importance to telegraph the news across the continent both ways that a circus was in town and that a farmer had been seen following a circus with his family in an automobile.

Why, gentlemen, it was not many years ago that the farmer did not have money enough to buy a ticket to a circus. It was not many years ago that he was selling hogs for $3 a hundred; it was not many years ago that he was burning corn for fuel. It was not many years ago that he was reading Coin's Financial School [laughter] and figuring how he could make 50 cents worth of silver legal tender in payment of past-due debts.

Now he is considered so well off that you, my Democratic brethren, want to assess him for the benefit of the rest of us. [Applause.]

BAD POLICY.

This proposition, in my judgment, is bad industrial policy and bad political policy. It is bad industrial policy because it is bad to discriminate among industrial classes. It is bad political policy because it introduces this trade agreement into an orderly course of procedure which was being evolved by the Republican Party to provide for the levying of duties which should "equal the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad." That policy proposes an upward limit on duties. Why? To prevent domestic monopolies from overcharging domestic consumers. It proposes a downward limit. Why? To protect American labor from the cheap labor of Europe and the Orient and to maintain the standard of American citizenship.

The first step in that orderly course of procedure was the creation of a Tariff Board for the scientific ascertainment of that difference.

The next step was the report of this ascertainment by the Tariff Board to be used by the Ways and Means Committee for checking and comparison of the testimony of interested witnesses. The next step was the framing of such ascertainment and testimony into law. The effect of this irrelevant, inconsistent, and unfair agreement, in my judgment, will be to indefinitely postpone the execution of this policy.

Gentlemen, I am in favor of reciprocity, but I want reciprocity between the farm and the factory, reciprocity between cotton and corn, reciprocity between the North and the South, reciprocity between the East and the West—reciprocity among ourselves. I do not want reciprocity that will compel the farmer to plant on shares with Canada and market his surplus abroad. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS].

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I feel somewhat reluctant to follow two such distinguished speakers on the other side, but my diffidence would be more acute if it were not for the fact that one of them is traveling in one direction and one in the other, both on the same side of the House and of the same political faith. To my mind, as I have been able to study this Canadian reciprocity treaty in my primitive way and in my simple way, for I am not a tariff expert, this contract, or compact, between Canada and this Union of States is nothing more than a simple agreement where each makes some concessions and each will receive mutual benefits. I do not claim that all of the advantages are on the side of the States, nor do I share the belief of the alarmists and the inspired articles—partly inspired by patriotism and, I am informed, partly by cash—that say this agreement when adopted will heap disaster upon us and play havoc with us all.

REDUCES 600 SCHEDULES AND INCREASES NONE.

It deals with approximately 600 of the schedules, and every one of them are either reduced to the free list or reduced from the Payne-Aldrich tariff rate and not a single increase of a single schedule. This compact or treaty places 41 paragraphs of the Payne bill that are now on the dutiable list on the free list and makes marked reductions of the present rate on 59 paragraphs. The compact is so arranged that it does not interfere with any future arrangement of our tariff laws, and it is full of good, wholesome provisions for our people generally.

WHO ARE PARTIES TO THIS TREATY.

Let us pause for a moment and see who the contracting parties to this agreement are. On the one hand the United States, with her 92,000,000 people, who have increased in population in the last 10 years 21 per cent, and as the other party to this contract we have Canada, with her approximately 7,000,000 people, who have increased in population in the last 7 years approximately 33 per cent.

SOME GOOD REASONS WHY TREATY SHOULD BE ADOPTED.

Further, we find that along our northern border we join Canada for a distance of more than 3,000 miles, and the conditions of the people and the country are not essentially different in any respect.

We find the two people speaking the same language, bound together by ties of marriage and blood. We find 600,000 of our Americans residing within their borders, and we find 1,500,000 of the Canadians residing within the States. We find the two peoples carrying on the same business endeavors; we find them with the same hopes and aspirations; and I can not think that two countries where the conditions are so nearly identical should longer be separated by any imaginary line. [Applause.] Speaking for myself, I can not but think that we should have absolute free trade between two such countries the same as we have it between the sister States of the Union. [Applause.]

WILL NOT REDUCE PRICE OF LAND.

We find it charged in the inspired farmers' journals—some inspired by patriotism and some, I am informed, by cash—that this treaty if adopted will reduce the price of land in the States; but such can not be true from any precedent we have to blaze the way. For as we have seen the golden West settled reservation by reservation and State by State, we have likewise seen the price of land both in front and behind the tide of western empire increase in price fifty, yea, one and two hundred per cent. We find by consulting the statistics on this very interesting question that of the occupied land in Canada the average price per acre is approximately $38 per acre, while the average price of the occupied land of the United States is but approximately $23 per acre. It has been called to our attention that the price of land in Minnesota, one of our northern border States, and in Manitoba, one of the border provincial States just opposite, was at variance to the amount of $10 per acre. I am not here to dispute those figures, but am here to dispute the fact that they prove that land is either more or less valuable in Canada than it is in the United States, for, as all of us have often observed, prices vary more than that right in adjoining States, and often without apparent cause. In my own State of Oklahoma, on the Oklahoma side of Red River the land is worth from $20 to $40 per acre, while on the Texas side of the river, in the State of Texas, approximately if not quite the same lands can be had for from 25 to 50 per cent less. It is often caused by press dispatches—abnormal and speculative values built up by booms given it by railroad and real-estate promoters. I think it is safe to say the value of lands in Canada and in the United States of like kind and character are essentially the same in price; so the scarecrows erected by the protectionists and high-tariff adherents are again not trustworthy. It at least is no occasion for alarm and no reason why the treaty which we have before us should not become a law and thereby reduce the exorbitant burdens of the Payne-Aldrich law that was so recently by the people universally repudiated.

WILL NOT REDUCE WAGE SCALE, BUT WILL STIMULATE WAGES.

Again it is asserted by the inspired journals and the protectionists that it will destroy our high-wage scale for the American laborer. Again we find that the wage scale in Canada is essentially the same as in the United States, and, if anything, is a little higher. Instances can be cited where it is higher in the States, and like instances can be cited where it is higher in Canada, usually if not quite always due to the fact that some local condition is playing an active part rather than by reason of any tariff cause, either directly or indirectly. The opposition to the pact on this ground is but the careworn expression or ghost head that the protectionists always drag out when they hope to defeat any reduction in the tariff whatever. They always call to their assistance the tender sympathies possessed by all for laborer to accomplish their own selfish ends.

No one on this side of the Chamber would be a party to any reduction of the wage scale for the American laborer, for, in my judgment, he is not at present being paid too much. [Applause.] No one on this side of the Chamber would be a party to the dragging down of labor in any form, for it is the willing hands that toil that is the very hope of the Republic and the pride of us all. [Applause.] The exception we take is of having the high protectionists make the laboring men carry the load for their high protection schemes when the laboring man gets none of the profit or glory. Labor and her offspring has too long borne the brunt of selfish manufacturers, monopolists, and trusts, and it should not longer prevail or be allowed to endure.

WILL NOT BE DETRIMENTAL TO FARMERS' INTERESTS.

It is charged by certain high-tariff oracles by word of mouth and in print that the enactment of this pact means the reduction of the American farmer to the very dregs. My reply to that charge is that I do not believe it in theory or in fact. I came of a race of farmers, and I love as well to-day as then the traditions of those industrious, good people, and if I did believe it I would fight and vote against it as often as it appeared for passage.

Again, it is asserted that it is unfair on its face; that it does not portray the first principles of fairness. My answer to this is I do not believe it; on the contrary, it seems to me that the burdens and virtues are quite well distributed between the two

countries. It does not in places go as far as I would prefer, but it is a long step in the right direction, and it is my cheerful prediction that the American people will be glad we gave it to them after they really understand what it does for them.

TREATY PLACES LUMBER ON FREE LIST.

In the treaty the United States gets free rough lumber, and the beneficial results that flow from this provision are almost unnecessary of dilation or explanation. Only last year with a sky-high tariff on lumber we imported into the United States from Canada more than the sum of $19,000,000 worth of boards and deals, let alone the $7,000,000 additional for lumber of other denominations. I ask you high protectionists who are opposing this treaty, Will that do the American home builder of the broad prairies good or harm? Will that help the courageous pioneer to subdue the West? Will it not be beneficial to every citizen in all the land save the Lumber Trust? I ask you if the Lumber Trust is expected to lend its hearty support to any treaty which metes out to it tardy justice that has long been delayed by the aid of Representatives who are here in one form and another championing their cause? I ask you if it is any wonder that we find articles in many of the purchasable papers inspired by cash denouncing the pact as unfair and one-sided? It has even been charged, and by men of intelligence, that free lumber would do no good to the home builder, but these figures on a moment's thought belie themselves when we find the amount of lumber imported from there to build homes with, even though bearing an unconscionable duty, to be more than $19,000,000 in a single year.

We have seen the home builders and the pioneers of the West too long struggling beneath their too heavy load in their efforts to erect a little shelter over their heads. We have sat here complacently and seen lumber in 1908 sell at an average price of $11.08 per thousand, and in 1909 we have seen the same lumber sell for an average price of $15.37, and have seen it go up in price each day since that time. We have seen the forests of the country being reduced to underbrush and cut-over lands. We have seen timber lands all held by a few lumber barons while the American people have gone homeless and roofless. We have seen the forests of the country denuded and made bare with no corresponding good effect to the people who build the homes and carry on civilization. This one provision of the treaty will help every home builder in the land. This one provision will beget the respect of all the people who are not financially interested, and they should not be heard to longer defeat plain competition on a subject so vital to all of our people.

REDUCTION ON SHINGLES FROM 50 TO 30 CENTS PER THOUSAND.

Again, we observe that the Payne duty of 50 cents per thousand on shingles has been by this pact reduced to 30 cents. It has even been asserted that this provision would not avail the home builder anything, but this can not be true, for only last year we imported from Canada $1,759,000 worth of shingles to cover our very heads from the sunshine and the rain. Shingles, in my judgment, should go on the free list and remain there, and if we had Democrats in power at both ends of the Capitol, I imagine they would go there; but if we can not get what we want, is it not right to do the next best thing and take the best reduction we can get with a Republican President and Republican Senate to deal with? I can not think this logic is bad. I believe it will be acceptable to the people of this country when they have time to digest and find out the articles they have been reading are inspired not alone by patriotism, but mostly by high tariff campaign managers and cash. [Applause.]

REDUCTION ON LATHS FROM 20 TO 10 CENTS.

The Payne rate of duty on laths to use in plastering our houses is by this pact reduced from 20 to 10 cents. It cuts the rate in half. Some one may say that does not amount to anything, but, my friends, it does, for only last year we imported from Canada into our own United States the sum of $1,802,000 worth of laths.

BARB WIRE ON FREE LIST.

This treaty puts barb wire on the free list. This commodity is used extensively for fencing throughout the length and breadth of the country, and our farmers will appreciate this duty provision, I am sure. It is true that the Steel and Iron Trust may not want the change, and we find the gentleman from Pittsburg [Mr. DALZELL], in charge of the time, yielding it only to Members of this House who are opposed to this bill. We challenge not his right, but we submit it is quite a frank thing for him to do to come here on the floor of this House and oppose this pact on the ground that it is detrimental to the farmers. We can not but wonder if he is not most concerned about the farmer that farms the steel mills in the heart of Pittsburg. His presence in opposition to this bill and his well-known tariff views speak louder of his real views than any open declaration he could make.

WOOD PULP ON FREE LIST.

This pact puts on the free list wood pulp and pulp wood from which print paper is made, of which there was imported into the United States from Canada last year in pulp wood $6,389,553, in cord and wood pulp $3,021,347, to the end that knowledge may be more cheaply and freely disseminated. It places the father in a better position to buy schoolbooks for his children, or will enable him to educate them now, where heretofore he could educate them but partially. It places books and magazines within more easy reach of both rich and poor. It is a step in the right direction and well worthy of the efforts sought in bringing it about.

NEW ENGLAND PAPER TRUST PROTEST.

It is true that we have on our desks of this date and for each preceding day since this session began protests from the Paper Trust of New England, but we must legislate for all as distinguished from the few. We must not maintain monopoly and break down competition when the intellectual advancement of our people are at stake. We must not sit here and allow the few New England selfish paper trusts to fatten at the expense of the many when it strikes at the intelligence and the advancement intellectually of our very Republic. I believe none other than parties directly interested have assaulted the wisdom of the reduction of this schedule. It is so self-evident and so patent to all that this step should now be taken, and it is but tardy justice to the great press of the country, who have more to do with the molding of public opinion than any other agency within our land to-day. I say it is with delight that this schedule is swept away and is now taking its place on the free list. I can not but think the authors of the Payne bill must feel ashamed at their failure to enact it when they were in power and the Payne bill became a law at the last Congress. It played no small part in their retirement at the polls last year, and it will play some part in keeping them retired if they receive their just rebuke.

COTTONSEED OIL ON THE FREE LIST.

This treaty puts cottonseed oil on the free list, and this can not be said to be unfair to the American cotton planter. On the contrary, it is a great help and stimulus to him, for it will open a new field and a new market without any competition whatever, for as all are aware cotton is not raised in that latitude. This will mean much to the cotton section, and the cotton farmer will have gratitude in his heart, for his new and widened market made possible by the enactment of this righteous provision in his behalf.

SALT ON FREE LIST.

It places salt on the free list. This will help the stock raisers of this country and will be of slight benefit to us all, and no one can say it is not in the interest of the citizens of the United States to remove from them the grasp, at least partially, of the Salt Trust.

FISH ON FREE LIST.

It puts fish on the free list, and only last year we purchased $49,000,000 worth of fish, so this will be of help to us and no possible harm to us. It will afford a wider market in which to secure our fish without the payment of exorbitant tariff taxes added on at the customhouse.

REDUCES TARIFF TAX ON ALL KINDS OF AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS.

It reduces the tariff rates on all kinds of plows, harrows, thrashing machines, wagons and buggies, and all kinds of farming implements used on the farm. These articles should, in my judgment, go on the free list, but remember we have a Republican Senate and a Republican President to deal with, and we have to take the best we can get until you give us commission to legislate for you in both ends of the Capitol and at the White House.

WILL NOT AFFECT WHEAT GROWERS.

Again we find the inspired by cash and patriotism journals and oracles contending that we are discriminating against the American farmer because we cut the Payne tariff rate on wheat from 25 cents per bushel to 12 cents. My answer to this charge is that the 25-cent rate nor the 12-cent rate has not in the past and will not in the future have anything whatever to do with the price of wheat in this country or in Canada. There is not a country in this world that can compete with us in the raising of wheat anyway, and the tariff has been but an idle recital on the statute book, without affording the farmer one grain of protection in sheaf, at the granary, the elevator, or the mill. It is charged that wheat is 10 cents higher on our side than on the Canadian side. This is true but partially. Both crops are controlled largely, if not absolutely, by the price in Liverpool, and in some cases from local conditions, usually

transportation facilities, there are variances of 10 or more cents per bushel. It is, however, true that wheat in Winnipeg is higher than in the States for more than one-third of the year. I submit the prices of wheat often vary this much within a single State, and the figures do not prove that generally such is the case, and the safe prediction to make is that, the conditions being practically the same, the price of the land and labor being practically the same, both crops being controlled by the Liverpool market, the prices are not essentially different. This, of course, is not a universal rule, for local conditions vary the prices; also, corners or hoarding oftentimes are causes for wheat going up or down suddenly.

To the end that we may not be mistaken about the matter, let us consult the statistics to ascertain just how much wheat we sent to Canada last year. In 1910 we sent to Canada to get the benefit of the outrageously low price referred to by those opposing this pact 2,111,370 bushels of wheat; and how interesting it is to observe that only 135,441 bushels of wheat came from Canada to get the benefit of our high prices, asserted to be caused by our tariff on wheat of 25 cents per bushel! The charge of the high-protection advocate will answer itself when these figures are analyzed. How refreshing it must be to the American farmer to know that he is no longer to be the cat's-paw that is to shield the greedy manufacturer while he grows rich from legislation and pleads for the farmer to stand by him because there has appeared on the statute book an idle recital of 25 cents a bushel on wheat! Such a proceeding is merely the selling to the farmers razors that will not shave. It is merely deceiving to get the farmer's help to further deceive the poor consumer of this country, who has hunger gnawing at his very stomach and whose poor cupboard is bare. [Applause.]

I tell you, sir, I rejoice to see this mask torn from their insincere faces and let the American producer and consumer come into his own. I am proud that the American farmer is one who neither needs nor asks protection. He merely asks honest, open, frank treatment. He merely asks honest, frank government, economically administered, where every man stands equal before the law. He merely asks fair treatment and no more, and asks no more idle recitals which are only intended to deceive, with no corresponding advantage to him. [Applause.]

CORN SCHEDULE—EXAMINE IT CLOSELY.

High protectionists who are trying to beat this pact by means fair or foul have even gone so far as to assert that when this bill becomes a law that it will reduce the corn growers to poverty and bring want and disaster to their very door.

Pause for a moment and let us ascertain to what extent this charge is true. Last year the United States produced 3,125,713,000 bushels of corn, of which we exported 44,072,209 bushels to Canada. Canada last year produced only 18,726 bushels, of which 5,881 was imported into this country from Canada. Can there be a man so ignorant or unfair as to claim that Canada is any competitor for us in corn? Can there be a man so unfair of mind or thought that would teach or try to teach the American farmer that the 15 cents per bushel provided for by the Payne bill has had in the past or ever will have in the future anything to do with the price of corn? I tell you, sir, this tariff for the farmer has been and is now a delusion and a snare merely to blind his honest and unsuspecting eyes to the end that they may exploit him and the consumer at the same time. Is there a farmer in all the land outside of the city of Pittsburg who fears that the reduction of the duty on corn will affect his future endeavors at raising corn? The question but answers itself, and it is but an humble example of the viciousness and deception of the Payne bill from beginning to the very end. Is it any wonder that they, the Republican Party that tried to father it, were retired last year? Is it not within the realm of respectable prophecy that it will be some time before such an unfair party will be restored to power?

VEGETABLES ON FREE LIST WILL HELP OUR PRODUCERS.

Enemies of the pact, some inspired by patriotism, some by greed, and some by cash, assert that it puts the vegetables on the free list and thereby is a stroke at the farmer. Again we may answer the charge that it is unfair to our people by observing that we exported to Canada last year in vegetables $865,563, while Canada sent us from their borders but $682,455, and the tariff was higher in Canada than in this country. So it can readily be observed that to sweep away the duty on vegetables or to reduce it to any marked degree would be beneficial to our people rather than detrimental. It would be a widening of our market for the producer without any serious competition from them, for if we exceeded them in exports last year with the unfavorable tariff rates against us we can surely compete with them when placed on an equality with them, as per the terms of this pact.

HIGH-TARIFF MEN ALWAYS FIGHT RECIPROCITY AND PROPHESY DIRE RESULTS.

It is not unusual or without precedent to find high-tariff advocates denouncing reciprocity treaties. The same dire predictions were made when we entered into reciprocal relations with Hawaii, Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Philippines. Still, in each case we have seen great prosperity and improved conditions spring from them to both countries engaging in them. So eminently true is this statement with reference to Hawaii that under its beneficent terms she became a part of us. Since that era of great denunciation of this pact during the McKinley administration our trade with that country has increased more than fifteen-fold.

Again, we observe that we have reciprocal trade relations with the Philippines, which have a greater population than Canada, and our trade has increased by leaps and bounds, until it has reached the incredible amount of more than 70 per cent in a single year. Upon entering the identical relations with these countries the same hue and cry went up that cheap labor and cheap land and other unworthy conditions would glut our markets and destroy the Republic, but none of their weird prophecies have come true, and I feel that their dire prophecies of to-day will be forgotten on the coming morrow as the stream of prosperity and wholesome results spring from a pact so full of good things and so evenly divided between the two contracting parties.

RECIPROCITY A REAL REVISION OF PAYNE LAW.

I am for the treaty, for it grants the first affirmative relief from the vicious and unconscionable duties of the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill. This is the first chance to take a step in the right direction, in partially, at least, undoing what the Payne bill did. The Republican Party two years ago promised revision and gave it not. They were at the ballot box justly relieved from power, because they did not keep the faith. We were sent here because we were expected to keep the faith. This pact is a reduction of the tariff, and a marked one at that, and let none be deceived or fail to keep the faith by whim, selfishness, or caprice.

PARTY PLATFORM FOR FREE LUMBER.

Let no Democrats return to their people and say they voted against free lumber, when our party platform bears a solemn command so to do! Let no Democrat return to his people with quibbling excuses that he voted "no" for this reason and for that, when practically every implement the farmer uses is reduced in tariff taxes and not a single one increased! Let no Democrat return to his people and be forced to admit that he voted against the removal of the tariff on cotton-seed oil, barb wire, and sewing machines. Let no Democrat return to his people and answer that he voted against this pact for some trivial reason, when it reduces the tariff on 600 items of the Payne bill and does not raise a single item.

OUR DUTY TO KEEP THE FAITH.

The American people sent us here to keep the faith, and we ought to do it. The man that falls without the breastworks will be caught in the same net as the Republicans were when they failed to revise the tariff and keep the faith.

The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] in a speech some time ago said he was for this pact because it was not a revision of the tariff at all. My friends, I am for it because, in my judgment, it is a marked revision and accomplishes a great deal strictly along Democratic lines. I rejoice that both he and I arrive at the same goal though we travel entirely different paths. Our faces are both toward Democracy and the light of day, and when the final vote is cast it will be two votes to reduce the tariff from whatsoever cause we may elect to cast them. [Applause.]

PRESIDENT TAFT ENTITLED TO NO EULOGY.

Some are disposed to eulogize the President for his great foresight and broad statesmanship in bringing on this pact. I can not with consistence or sense accord him so generous a treatment. For, as we will recall, he signed the Payne bill after banqueting the hosts that made it repeatedly and thereby helped to perpetrate the fraud, and then, in an effort to conceal the wrong, asserted in his Winona speech, and in other speeches as well, that it was the best tariff law ever written.

After swift and effectual repudiation came from the people of every crossroads in all the land, he then sought the nearest route for the band wagon and mounted himself in the front seat and said, "Come on, Democrats; Betty and I killed the bear." But we of the Democratic faith who believe in lowering the tariff must not be shortsighted in such matters, for the

American people are farseeing people and know his every political prank and ours as well. His political somersaults will not justify faltering on our part. It should but serve us to heed the pitfalls and avoid the embarrassment. If anyone may be said to really be playing the generous rôle to-day it is the Democratic Party. The Democrats passed reciprocity last session, and they will pass it again this session. We find his high-tariff leaders all against it, and we find our party keeping the faith and championing it.

SWEEP ASIDE FEARS AND FOREBODINGS OF DANGER AND KEEP THE FAITH.

It will not hurt the farmers. The expansion of trade will do them good. No nation can compete with our producers. Labor will not be damaged, but benefited, by the new fields of endeavor that this closer relation with our neighbor will bring.

Pass this bill and release the farmer from bondage, where he has been held by the high protectionists as a buffer to pull through their unholy schemes of high protection and robber tariffs.

Do not longer let the greedy monopolist pick the threadbare pockets of the needy behind tariff walls that are unconscionable, outrageous, and unjust.

I tell you, sir, the American farmer neither needs nor asks protection and special laws for his benefit. He occupies the happy station of being able to say, "We can meet any competition that comes, and we welcome it." His industry, energy, thrift, skill, and intelligence will more than cope with all who may come or go.

The passage of this treaty with Canada is a step toward the goal of a revenue tariff with all the countries of the world and free trade with Canada. By voting for this bill we have our faces toward the light of day. We are but keeping abreast of the changing conditions and the advancing times.

We were sent here to keep the faith, and we must keep it. The Republicans failed to keep the faith in making the Payne bill, and how swift their just rebuke! Their fate is but the common fate of all, for in each life some rain must fall. This treaty reduces the tariff on 600 items and does not increase a single one. I say it is the duty of every Democrat to keep the faith and vote for it.

The ravages of hunger and gnawing of stomachs among our citizenship dulls the patriotism of strong men. Bare cupboards, poverty, and pain turn the hands on the dial of this Republic backward rather than forward, and God forbid that this be done now or in the future. Suffering and pain breed socialism, anarchy, and pain. Let us pass this bill and secure what good there is in it, and let us pass more tariff bills and make greater reductions when and where needed.

Let the high-tariff Republicans and a few misguided insurgents walk hand in hand in error, but let us of the Democratic faith keep the everlasting faith. [Applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that I want to yield for several short speeches on this side at this time. I now yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KONOP].

Mr. KONOP. Mr. Chairman, I am a new Member here and do not want to take much valuable time from the older Members in the discussion of this important measure. I come from the great Republican State of Wisconsin. I come from a State that, I think, has been largely Republican in name but not Republican in principle. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I come from the great State of Wisconsin, which is strongly Republican; but as long as I have taken any interest in political affairs I have always stood for and believed in the principles of the Democratic Party, and I believe in those principles now. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And more so, Mr. Chairman, do I believe in the principles that I have so long fought for and sought for now, because what occurred last Thursday and Friday proves to me conclusively that the principles of the Democratic Party are right. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Why, gentlemen, I remember the time when the principle of electing United States Senators by the people was first proposed it was denounced by the Republicans as socialism. I also remember the time when the Democrats proposed to have publication of campaign contributions before election instead of after election, so that the American people might know where the money comes from that pollutes the American electorate, and then the Republicans said "Let us publish contributions after the election."

This bill that was passed for the publication of campaign contributions, to my mind, does not go far enough. I believe the American people will in the near future demand that a limitation be placed on the expenditure of money for campaign purposes, so that any man, be he rich or poor, may run for any office in the gift of the American people. [Applause.]

This Canadian reciprocity to my mind is a Democratic proposition. I can not understand how any Democrat on this side of the House can go back before his constituents and say that he is a Democrat if he votes against this proposition. I have always believed in the principle of a tariff-for-revenue only, and I believe in it now. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

But, gentlemen, my colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], yesterday said that this Canadian pact was discriminatory against the farmer. It is discriminatory, but I ask the same gentleman if every protective-tariff bill enacted by any Congress has not been discriminatory and class legislation? [Applause on the Democratic side.] Just as you begin to tear down the tariff wall, the highly protective tariff wall, you must commence being discriminatory step by step until you reduce the tariff down to a revenue basis. [Applause.]

It is discriminatory, but if the gentlemen on the other side who are opposed to this pact love the American farmer so much, we will give them an opportunity to love him hard, to love and kiss and hug him before we get done. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

There have been different arguments advanced in the discussion of this Canadian reciprocity pact, and one of these maintained by some gentlemen on this side is, that it will not reduce the price of grain but will reduce the cost of living. My colleague from Wisconsin maintains the contrary. He says that it will reduce the price of grain and not reduce the cost of living. I believe, Mr. Chairman, in taking the bull by the horns. I have been born and brought up on a farm. I have worked on a farm and I know the hardships of a farmer, and I believe in being fair and honest with him and tell him the truth.

It seems to me that those arguments are absolutely inconsistent, and you can not reconcile them. If this Canadian pact is going to reduce the price of farm products, it will necessarily reduce the cost of living; and, vice versa, the contrary is true. Now, then, what is the use of quibbling, figuring in a few cents here and a few cents there? Suppose that this pact should reduce the price of wheat, and suppose it should reduce by a few cents the price of other farm products that go to make up the provisions of the people, yet I believe that in this pact there is enough that the farmer will gain by reductions of the tariff on other things that he has to buy, so that he will be fully recompensed. We have been dillydallying and quibbling over a few cents here and a few cents there; but, gentlemen, what of those men who labor in the city, in the mill, and in the factories, men who have been begging and praying for more food? What of their appeal for bread? Go to the home of some our laborers in our cities. Go to that lowly hovel where poverty, grim and relentless, stands on the threshold. Look at the lean and hungry look of mother and children, and ask the farmer if he will deny more bread. I know the American farmer. I know his sympathetic and patriotic heart; it beats in unison with his coworker in the city. It is not a matter of dollars and cents, but it is a matter of justice and right between man and man. My friends, if this Canadian pact is going to partly reduce the cost of living for those people, I am in favor of it, because I hope to God that in this great country of ours no American citizen need deny himself the three essentials of life—food, shelter, and clothing. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, I come from a farming community, and I want to say right here that I also come from a paper-manufacturing community. I come from a community that has 17 or 18 paper mills and pulp mills; and yet, my friends, I believe that if I vote for this pact I will benefit this country at large, and I would not be selfish and come here and vote against it when it will be a benefit to the country at large simply for the sake of benefiting the paper mills in my district. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I was elected in a Republican district, a Republican district that cast 5,000 majority for the Republican candidate for governor. I had the courage to put in my platform a declaration in favor of free paper, free pulp wood, and free pulp; and yet I was elected in a paper-mill district. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I can not and will not violate that pledge now. I had a meeting before I came to this session of Congress with several paper-mill men in my district, and they told me that they wanted to be fair, and I believe that they are fair. Some here have attacked the Paper Trust, but I want to say that the paper manufacturers in my district are not unreasonable, and they were fair in their demands. They said:

We are in favor of having absolute free trade in paper, pulp wood, and pulp between Canada and the United States; we are able to compete with all the world. We want absolute free trade with Canada,

and if Canada would remove her restrictions on the exportation of pulp wood from Crown lands, we would be in favor of this Canadian pact.

In looking over the hearings before the Committee on Finance of the United States Senate I ran across some statements made by a paper manufacturer of my own State, Mr. John Strange, a man known in political circles, a former lieutenant governor of our State, and a paper manufacturer. Before that committee he made this statement:

The error which has lodged in the public mind concerning the need of Canadian wood because of a possible depletion of our forests has been the predominant reason for demanding a concession in favor of Canada. I say, gentlemen, without fear of successful contradiction, that we do not now need, nor have we ever needed, nor will we ever need, Canadian spruce or other paper wood, any more than we will need Canadian cucumbers or dandelions.

That is the statement of a paper manufacturer who claims that we have enough pulp wood in our own country never to need the pulp wood of Canada. Further on, on page 7 of this document, he goes on and says:

The Menominee Indian Reservation, over which so much contention has been had with reference to the wisdom of manufacturing under the direction of the Government and employing the Indians, contains approximately 3,000,000,000 feet of virgin timber, and grows enough wood to supply all of the fiber needed for all of the print mills in Wisconsin. As far as the Indian interests are concerned, it would be a matter of good public policy to create a large pulp plant there to utilize that which is going to waste in connection with a sawmill. The Menominee Reservation is quite sufficient to grow at least 500 cords of wood per day.

Minnesota owns enough timber to supply the needs of all of the mills in Wisconsin and Minnesota. The increase will do that, fostered by the State forester. Wisconsin has taken steps to purchase a million acres of old cut-over lands and others; and by reforesting those lands a supply largely in excess of the consumption of the mills of Wisconsin would be provided. Michigan is acquiring title to from two to three million acres. Without any great effort upon the part of the three States I have named, 20 years hence they will have an abundant supply of forests, more than adequate to furnish all the lumber and paper products that the trade will demand.

This is a statement from a paper-mill man of the State of Wisconsin. He says there is enough pulp wood for the manufacturer of Wisconsin, and I suppose the same fact is true more or less in New York and New England. On page 9 of the same document appears the following statement of Mr. Strange:

I can not comprehend, gentlemen, how an error of this extent ever got into the public mind. I have stood single-handedly against all the paper manufacturers from the time this agitation started. I said, "Argue this proposition solely upon the ground of free trade or protection as a fundamental policy. The supply of timber is so superfluous in this discussion that it ought not to enter into it." I can point you to where we have four times as much growing timber as we can possibly consume, without any thought of preservation or protection.

Now, I want to say right here, I hoped and wished that this agreement would have provided for absolute free trade, and it would have provided for absolute free trade if Canada would have consented to it. But, my friends, I believe it is a step in the right direction. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HAMILTON] quoted slightingly the expression, "equal rights to all and special privileges to none." That doctrine is a Democratic doctrine; it is a Democratic axiom; and let us apply it to every measure that this House will enact. Equal rights to all and special privileges to none is an axiom that need not only be applied to tariff legislation but to all other legislation enacted by every legislative body in every country of the world. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would like to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I have two short speeches on this side, and I would desire to yield to those gentlemen.

Mr. DALZELL. The gentleman has used about an hour and twenty minutes on his side, and I would now be glad to yield some time. How much time would the gentleman desire to yield now?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I desire to yield 45 minutes, and then I will yield back to the gentleman's side of the House. I desire to yield to two gentlemen.

Mr. DALZELL. Very well.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GEORGE].

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, mindful of the custom of this House to regard a new Member as a political accident, I rise with humility to address myself to the question of Canadian reciprocity.

In coming here, I came with a mandate of a great constituency to help reduce the high cost of living, and I regard this bill as the first step in that direction. I came here, Mr. Chairman, from a district normally Republican. I came here as a Democrat, but elected, or helped in the election, by, I compute, 10,000 Republican votes, so that I may be regarded as a kind of eclectic in politics.

The question is, What has the tariff to do with the high cost of living? Out of the mouths of the fathers of Republicanism I think we can answer, for, if I remember correctly, Mr. Blaine, Mr. Sherman, and Mr. Garfield proclaimed themselves protectionists, but protectionists who believed in a protection that should lead to free trade. Their argument was simple. They asked for a tariff against things from without in order to induce production within. They argued that cutting off competition from without would enable home producers to charge more within; that these increased prices would induce competition among producers within this country; that this competition among domestic producers would reduce domestic prices; and that ultimately these domestic prices would fall so far that they would be no higher than foreign prices, and that then this country could throw down the tariff wall and proclaim free trade with all the world.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what has been the course of things? It has been just this, that we have piled up a tariff which has increased prices in the United States. Concurrently with that has come the formation of combinations within our country for controlling production here and keeping prices up, and even driving them higher. So that, instead of leading to reduced prices and free trade, the tariff policy has been accompanied by trust and other monopoly combinations and to higher prices.

Therefore, carrying the mandate of my constituency, I rise here to support this Canadian reciprocity bill with a view of breaking down some of these combinations and reducing prices by letting in competition from outside.

I have been in Canada quite recently. How are these Canadian people different from us? I should say that there is little or no difference. I found that on getting close to the Canadian line Canadian money mingled with our own currency. I found after I got over the line that our currency mingled with the Canadian currency; that Canadian and United States money freely passed and without distinction among Americans and Canadians. I found that I could go into a Canadian post office and with United States money buy Canadian stamps. I found that the people on both sides of the line interchange newspapers, and that the whole current of life is concurrent; that the people north of us were practically of us; that the one thing that separates us is the humbug tariff. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We need no protection of forts or arms on either side of the line. We need nothing to make us one people save the opportunity to exchange freely—that same relation that exists between State and State. Therefore I have great joy in supporting this reciprocity bill.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, I myself stand upon this side of the House of Representatives in what is perhaps a peculiar relation. I look not only for the time, and I hope it may come speedily, when there shall be no tariff whatsoever north of us, but I look to see no tariff south of us, no tariff east of us, no tariff west of us, but perfect freedom of trade with all the world. [Applause.]

I am the type of American that is not afraid to say he is an absolute free trader. I was so elected, and so long as I live I shall proclaim that truth as I see it. I stand with the Democratic Party now, not because I believe that the Democratic Party believes as I do, or, at least, declares as I do, but because it is, at least, moving in that direction. I am glad to be of the party that has its face toward the light.

I heard the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] talk yesterday on this floor about cotton. He talked of the pathetic condition to which American labor would be reduced from any breaking down of the tariff walls with a people east of us or west of us. He talked about Japanese labor and Japanese cotton mills. Let me tell you that I have been in these Japanese cotton mills; that I visited the cotton mills of Osaka; that I have seen American machinery in their mills, and German machinery, and English machinery, and Japanese machinery; that I have seen the operatives working at these machines. I have verified the fact that American laborers in similar occupations are paid very much higher wages than the Japanese laborers. That would seem to be as far as we need go. It is as far as we are carried, at least, by the gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber. But let me explain this, Mr. Chairman: Gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber who produce these facts fail to produce another most important fact that should accompany them, namely, the fact that relates to the productive power of the respective laborers in the two countries. I found on my visit to the Osaka mills that while precisely the same machinery is used in both countries—the same machinery in Osaka as that used in the Carolina mills, for instance—and that while wages in the Japanese mills were one-fourth the rate of those paid in the Carolina mills, the productive capacity of labor in Japan was but one-fourth of that in the Carolinas.

From this fact and facts like it I base the declaration that, while we pay higher wages in this country, we are preeminently

the machine-making and machine-using people of the world. Because of this our laborer produces, dollar for dollar, more than the laborer anywhere else in the world. I assert, and I am ready to prove, that our people, because of their high wages, are not at a disadvantage in production. They are, on the contrary, at a distinct advantage. Because we have higher wages in this country we have the most productive labor in the world. We produce more machines, we get more from them, because we use intelligence with our labor, because we mix brain power with manual power. We have the greatest natural resources in the world and the labor that produces cheapest; and hence we can, if we have absolute freedom of exchange, become the greatest producer in the world.

My colleagues here on this Democratic side, be not afraid. Courage is what our people want now. They will vote for men, they will support parties that have courage. It is what we most need in this time of our history.

For the high cost of living is the greatest of all questions just now. I come from the part of the country that most needs a reduction in the cost of living. New York City is the greatest, the richest, the grandest of all our cities, and yet side by side with these riches is revealed the gauntest poverty. One of the gentlemen on the other side just a few minutes ago spoke of this. He referred to our towering buildings. We are about to put up a 50-story building. But we have buildings with several subcellars. Yet we have conditions there that, alas, beat the world for degredation of mankind. Nowhere is population so congested. We have village populations in square blocks. We have in two contiguous square blocks enough children to fill a whole public school, and that school is made to accommodate 2,500 children. We bury 10 per cent of our people in potter's field at public expense. We have conditions that were never seen in any civilization of the world. God knows that this question of the cost of living is the direst one that can come before a large part of our people. Then, what shall we do about this tariff? I am here to work for a reduction of it. Let it be ever so little as a start, I will work for that. I will patiently serve for that.

But I hope, Mr. Chairman, that this is but the beginning. My hope is and my feeling is that it *is* but the beginning. My hope for years has been that once we would raise the tariff issue the whole sham and swindle of it would come tumbling down.

We have the greatest natural resources in the world. We have the most wonderful and potent mingling of bloods. We have the largest homogeneous population. We have the greatest possibilities in production.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I take great pleasure in supporting this bill. Though I be the only man in this House to stand as a free trader, I do so here, because I believe that before a great while the predominant political issue in this country is going to be the straight-out issue, not of percentages, not as to a little tariff reduction here and a little tariff increasing there, but as between the principle of protection on the one hand and of free trade on the other. I long to see that kind of freedom of commerce that will knit together the nations of the earth; that will lead us to perceive the folly of great war navies and the wisdom rather of sinking such navies in the bottom of the sea, and of binding ourselves to the other bodies of mankind by bonds of trade. A free commerce will bind us closer than all the treaties in this world. Then will not rise a question of what the Japanese are going to do to us or what the Germans are going to do to us, of what the English are going to do to us. It will be a question of better, larger, wider production and exchange. It will build up our factories as nothing else will build them. It will make real progress in the conditions of labor, as against warfare and increasing hardships under the false system of protection. It will mean a prosperity that this country has never before seen. It will mean freedom, the heritage of our Nation, and it will lead to another great step forward in the great cause of progress. Mr. Chairman, I yield back any time I have not used. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREGG].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. GREGG of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, it may be of interest to the gentlemen in this Chamber, in view of the position which I take in regard to reciprocity, to inform you that the district I represent is probably one of the most important in the United States. It is known as the twenty-second congressional district of Pennsylvania, and is composed of the counties of Butler and Westmoreland. My home county, Westmoreland, is bounded on the west by the district which the learned and distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] has the honor to represent. It contains—as a matter of fact, is the second in point of production of bituminous coal in the State of Pennsylvania, its coal fields producing what is known as the great Connellsville coking coal, the Greensburg steam coal, and the Irwin gas coal, which latter is known to most people who live in the cities of Philadelphia and New York for the reason that it is used exclusively as a gas coal. Within the confines of my district there are also several large plants of the United States Steel Co. Within the confines of that district there is located also one of the largest plants of the American Window Glass Co., besides probably the largest tin-plate factory in the United States and one of the largest aluminum factories in the United States and a large wire factory. In Butler County there is located what is known as the Standard Steel Car Co., and, in addition, probably one of the greatest oil-producing territories in the North—what is known as the Butler field. Moreover, it is a distinctly agricultural district, probably more than one-third of its inhabitants being engaged in the honorable, honest, and staid pursuit of farming, and everywhere is seen the fructifying results of honest toil. Consequently you see that probably, from a political standpoint, I should be a protectionist and should be opposed to the question of Canadian reciprocity. But I desire to say here that, although I represent a district having over 310,000 inhabitants, I have not heard one single word of protest from the many interests which I represent.

To my mind, this bill should be passed, first, because of the natural conditions. There is no more reason for a tariff wall between Canada and the United States than there should be between the States lying east of the Mississippi and the States lying west of the Mississippi. It is an economic problem, not a political one. It is a problem which, to my mind, appeals to the broad statesmanship of every individual Member of this House.

Mr. James J. Hill, in an address which he delivered in Chicago on the 15th of February, said:

> The proposed reciprocity agreement is an example of constructive statesmanship. In contrast to many of the matters that come before Congress, it is fashioned to large national ends, and it is inspired by a policy which the greatest minds of the country have approved.
>
> The proposed agreement is only the embodied voice of a mutually beneficial trade intercourse demanding its rightful freedom.

The same people, the same climate, and the same natural conditions exist in Canada as exist in our own country. They speak our language; we theirs. The children of the Canadians are taught the same three "R's" that we learned in our boyhood. They have the same civilization, a civilization that was made possible when the courageous Bouquet and his brave comrades drove Pontiac and his warriors from the wilderness of western Pennsylvania.

Secondly, we have precedent in supporting this bill, because, as has been said here in this House, in 1854 there was enacted a bill which to a very large extent was the same as this one and known as the Elgin treaty. This reciprocal arrangement, which proved very advantageous to the people of the United States, was abrogated in 1866 by reason of political differences between Canada and the United States, growing out of the Civil War.

Turning, then, to the other side of this question, I think I am justified in saying that the opposition to this treaty comes principally, first, from the lumber interests, which have been liberally treated by the Payne-Aldrich bill, and whose chief business seems to be an endeavor to corner all the timber and lumber in our country and increase the cost of the building of an American home; second, from the paper combination, which has been once, and recently, dissolved by a Federal court; third, from those who desire to arouse public sentiment among the farmers of this country in order that they themselves may benefit politically by it. Therefore I say that the opposition to this bill comes largely—in fact, almost exclusively—from those who have selfish motives.

It is conceded, I believe, that the official statistics show that trade is in our favor. I refer now to a document issued by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD], taken from statistics furnished by the various departments of this Government, and which I ask unanimous consent to print as a part of my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The letter referred to is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 31, 1911.*

DEAR SIR: On April 4 Congress will take up Canadian reciprocity. It were well for the people to be considering it also. It is a subject upon which there is much misunderstanding.

The Lumber Trust and the Paper Trust are waging a fierce fight against reciprocity. They are making desperate efforts to get the farmers to join them. Wherever possible they have enlisted the papers

which circulate among the farmers. They try to make the farmers believe that, by reason of the tariff, he gets more than the fair market price for his products.

Canada has a tariff which operates against our products sold in Canada; we have a tariff which operates against Canadian products sold here. Reciprocity is an agreement between the two countries to modify both tariffs with a view to more extended trade.

In spite of these obstructive tariffs a large trade has grown up between us and Canada. In five years ending June 30, in goods of all kinds—

We sold in Canada	$886,417,376
Canada sold to us	393,913,673
Difference in our favor	492,503,703

These figures show that Canada is a good country for us to trade with. Any country which buys from us more than it sells to us is a good country to trade with. No tariff wall should stand between us and such a country.

You are from Missouri. Let me show you.

Government statistics for five years ending June 30.

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

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?

You ask why Canada favors reciprocity if it is to give us the best of it on these products? The answer is easy.

First. The Canadian tariff is added to the price which the Canadian consumer must pay. Canada desires to relieve her people from this extra price.

Second. Canada is willing to take her tariff off of the goods which we sell her if in return we will take our tariff off of the paper, wood pulp, and lumber which she sells us. Even with our high tariff against her Canada has, during the period of time under consideration, sold us $98,668,630 more paper, pulp, and lumber than we sold her. If our tariff against these products were removed she would sell us a still larger amount of these timber products. How could that hurt the Missouri farmer?

Who then would be hurt by reciprocity? I will tell you. The Lumber Trust and the Paper Trust. Reciprocity would bring Canadian lumber and paper here to be sold in competition with the American lumber and paper. This would give the American people cheaper paper—the Missouri farmer cheaper lumber to build houses and barns. So you see why it is that these trusts are making such frantic efforts to defeat reciprocity. They desire to hold a monopoly of the American lumber and paper markets.

These trusts are very active now trying to fool the farmer. Every newspaper and farmers' paper which can be controlled will carry scare headlines in an effort to alarm the farmer about reciprocity. The trusts always have money to conduct their campaigns. Let the farmer be of good cheer. He is not the fellow who will be hit by reciprocity. He will be helped. The Lumber Trust and the Paper Trust are they who will feel the weight of this measure.

Let me show you about the Paper Trust. Knowing that I represent an intelligent people, I felt that I would like to call their attention to some of the facts connected with reciprocity, so they could have a clearer understanding of the subject as its discussion progresses. I could think of no other way to disseminate these facts so well as by sending out this letter. I have sent it to over 30,000 people. How much do you suppose I had to pay for simply the plain paper upon which these letters are written? Just $40. That is the sort of prices you pay for writing paper, newspapers, schoolbooks, etc. Reciprocity would cut these prices. No wonder the Paper Trust opposes reciprocity.

Yours, truly, DORSEY W. SHACKLEFORD.

Mr. GREGG of Pennsylvania. In this letter it is disclosed, as was stated on the floor of the House yesterday, that in the five years ending June 30, 1910, in goods of all kinds the difference in our favor was $492,503,703, while along certain other lines, largely the products of the farm, we sold to Canada $53,030,755 more than Canada sold to us.

If these are the conditions, then I can see no particular objection to the passage of this bill.

It is argued upon the floor of this House that the admission of certain foodstuffs without duty will increase the supply and consequently be injurious to the producer. It would follow, then, that if the supply was increased the price to the consumer would be decreased.

I would especially appeal to-day for the man who earns his living and supports his family by honest toil and by the sweat of his brow—for the man with the pick in the mine, for the man behind the plow, for the man behind the throttle, for the man in the factory, for the man behind the counter, and the man at the desk. I appeal for the great toiling masses who pay the exacting taxes which support the Government and respond to the call of their country in her hour of danger.

It may be that there are some inequalities in this bill, but if there are inequalities in it and in the schedules as provided in this pact between Canada and the United States, and those inequalities may to some extent affect the people of the district which I have the honor to represent, I know that the same patriotism which has controlled their action in the past will actuate them in the future, to the end that the greatest good may be rendered to the greatest number, that the many may be served rather than the few. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Pennsylvania use some of his time?

Mr. DALZELL. I yield one hour to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. PICKETT].

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to express my indebtedness to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GEORGE] for clarifying the atmosphere on one phase of this debate. Selected by the leader of the majority as one of the spokesmen for the Democratic Party in the discussion of this question, we have a right to assume that he, in part, at least, expresses the ultimate aim of his party in respect to the tariff question. I refer to the statement made but a few moments ago on this floor that he is "an absolute free trader," and that he is standing with the Democratic Party because it is "moving in that direction." We on this side of the aisle will be glad to meet that issue now, as we have met it in the years past, for it has been lifted from the arena of controversy before the American electorate by the logic of facts and the wisdom of experience. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Like my friend from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], I, too, was interested in the remarkable and eloquent address delivered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN], but from a different angle. The gentleman from North Carolina referred to the achievements of his party in this House during this session, pointing to the passage by the House of the resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States so as to provide for the election of Senators by a direct vote of the people and to the measure passed a few days since providing for the publicity of campaign contributions before elections. He seemed to enjoy a peculiar feeling of exultation, joined in by his colleagues, who responded with generous applause at his reference to the passage of these two measures. When I recall the fact that a similar resolution has been passed by the House several times in the past, when the Republicans were in control, and when I recall the further fact that a Republican House during the last Congress passed a publicity bill containing the same provisions as the bill passed at this session, I am prompted in the spirit of good humor that has characterized our partisan repartee to suggest the application of that familiar couplet:

> The lightning bug is a brilliant thing, but it hasn't any mind;
> It stumbles through existence with its headlight on behind.

[Laughter.]

But, Mr. Chairman, I rose for the purpose of discussing the measure pending before us. It is perhaps one of the most important measures that has been considered by Congress for many years; one in which the people are deeply interested and which is destined, if enacted into law, to become an absorbing issue in the near political future.

The name given the pact has in itself misled the people into assuming that it is reciprocal in fact as well as in name. It is doubtful if a measure of such importance has ever been presented to the public as one-sidedly as this measure. The metropolitan press, for reasons with which you are all familiar, have to a large extent favored the pact and they in turn have been followed by other papers without an independent examination of the subject. The facts, however, are becoming known and the people are beginning to see that they do not sustain the general statements and conclusions made by those who favor it. Already a strong reaction has set in which will grow stronger as the people study for themselves what it does and what it does not do. It has been held out as a reciprocal trade agreement which implies that Canada is granting to the United States something of equivalent or approximate value for our opening to Canada the best market place in the world for her surplus agricultural products. It has been urged that its effect will be beneficial to our people; that our farmers particularly will not be injured (but when speaking of the farmer they always speak in the negative); that our manufacturers, and especially those engaged in manufacturing agricultural implements, will be benefited by gaining access to Canadian markets on advantageous terms. To those on this side of the aisle it is said to be in harmony with the policy of reciprocity for which our

party has stood in the past and which our great leaders have advocated. In brief, it is held out as a diplomatic victory, the culminating and crowning achievement of long years of effort on the part of the United States, and that those who oppose it are standing as obstructionists in the path of progress.

In his address before the Chicago Association of Commerce, February 15, 1911, the Hon. Philander C. Knox, Secretary of State, said:

This brief outline brings in a general way the history of reciprocity in our trade relations with Canada down to the work of this administration and shows the historical fact that for more than half a century the statesmen of Canada, of Great Britain, *and of the United States* have, by repeated effort, testified and reaffirmed an abiding and fundamental belief in the principle of American-Canadian reciprocity.

The clear inference from the foregoing is that this country for half a century has been striving to secure an agreement *such as is now proposed* from Canada, and that the agreement is in accord with the policy of reciprocity for which our statesmen have stood in the past.

Later on in the same address Mr. Knox said:

The abolition of the reciprocity treaty of 1854 by the United States marked a historical *step backward* in the trade relations of the two countries.

Speaking in the city of Springfield, Ill., on February 11, 1911, our distinguished President said:

We have taken up these things that are involved in the Canadian reciprocity treaty because opportunity offered. Now is the accepted time. Now Canada is in the mood. She is at the parting of the ways.

In other words, that this is the one psychological moment in the past 50 years when Canada has been in the mood to enter into an agreement of this character.

During the progress of this debate a difference of opinion has been expressed relative to the effect of the former treaty. The distinguished Representative from New York [Mr. HARRISON], in his remarks yesterday, observed that the cause of the abolition of the former treaty was not economic.

It seems to me proper that the historical facts should be clearly and fairly presented to the people, not only with respect to the former treaty and its effect, but also as to the attitude of both this country and Canada toward a renewal of that treaty. It is a familiar rule of law, with which our profession is familiar, that the courts will follow the construction which contracting parties themselves give to an agreement. I therefore propose to take up the former treaty and show how the two countries regarded it when the facts were before them, when they could see the conditions at the very time when they were charged with the responsibility of passing judgment upon it, and then I propose to follow it down to the present time and show from the records that there has never been a time in the history of our country since the abolition of the former treaty when any of our great statesmen, or the people themselves, would have supported the proposition that is now before us.

HISTORY OF TREATY OF 1854 REVIEWED—SIMILAR TO PROPOSED PACT—EFFECT DISASTROUS TO OUR PEOPLE AND TREATY IS ABROGATED BY THE UNITED STATES—VIEWS OF PROMINENT STATESMEN FROM LINCOLN TO M'KINLEY—PERSISTENT EFFORTS OF CANADA TO RENEW CONSISTENTLY OPPOSED BY OUR GOVERNMENT ON GROUND NOT RECIPROCAL.

The treaty of 1854 provided for the free interchange of the following articles:

Grain, flour, and breadstuffs of all kinds; animals of all kinds; fresh, smoked, and salted meats; cotton-wool; seeds and vegetables; undried fruits; dried fruits; fish of all kinds; products of fish and all other creatures living in the water; poultry; eggs; hides, furs, skins, or tails, undressed; stone or marble in its crude or unwrought state; slate; butter; cheese; tallow; lard; horns; manures; ores of metals of all kinds; coal; pitch, tar, turpentine; ashes; timber and lumber of all kinds, round, hewed, and sawed, unmanufactured, in whole or in part; firewood; plants, shrubs, and trees; pelts; wool; fish oil; rice; broom corn and bark; gypsum, ground or unground; hewn or wrought or unwrought burr or grindstones; dyestuffs; flax, hemp, and tow, unmanufactured; unmanufactured tobacco.

It will be observed that so far as the interchange of natural products is concerned, and particularly the products of the farm, that Mr. Fielding, the Canadian minister, in making his report recently to the House of Commons of Canada of the proposed agreement, was right when he said that it was "the former treaty with comparatively little change."

I will discuss the question of the slight reductions in manufactured articles later on. That treaty was concluded in June, 1854, and went into effect in March, 1855. Within a few years after the treaty became operative its effect was such that the people began to call upon Congress to pass a resolution giving notice of its termination. Congress took such action in January, 1865, and the treaty was terminated in March, 1866. As I have suggested, the practical effect of the treaty on the prosperity of the people of this country was then before Congress and the people. I now propose to show from the records that the cause of its abolition on the part of our country was *purely economic*, the discussions both in the House and in the Senate being directed solely to the result of the treaty on our interests. In view of the similarity of the treaties, the opinions expressed at that time by men whose names stand forth in history as among our great leaders are of peculiar significance now. I quote briefly from Mr. Elihu B. Washburn, of Illinois, who said:

I am for the unconditional abrogation of the treaty. Every Member must see that the treaty as it now exists ought to be changed, and if it is to be changed I say let us in the first place abrogate the treaty entirely. If Great Britain, which derives, as I contend, all the benefits of the treaty, wants another, let her come and ask us, and do not let us go to her.

Charles Sumner, of Massachusetts, expressed himself as follows:

The people of the United States have been uneasy under the reciprocity treaty for several years—I may almost say from its date. There was a feeling that it was more advantageous to Canada than to the United States; that, in short, it was unilateral. This feeling has of late ripened into conviction.

In the present case the feeling is ripening very rapidly into a conviction that the pending agreement is unilateral, and as soon as the facts are known this feeling will become a conviction.

John Sherman, of Ohio, spoke as follows:

The treaty has operated from its beginning against our interests, and it can be plainly demonstrated by the tables which are furnished by the Secretary of the Treasury that from the beginning our trade has fallen off and theirs increased, comparatively. While the goods we receive from Canada come to us duty free, except to a very insignificant amount, they charge us duty on more than half of what we send to them. Can that be said to be reciprocal? Our exports and our imports, our trade with Canada, is about equal; we send to them nearly as much as they send to us, but they charge us duties on one-half of what we send to them. We substantially admit all that they send us free. Such a statement as that—and it can not be gainsaid and can not be denied—shows that the treaty is unequal and that there is no reciprocity in it.

What John Sherman said had been the effect of the former treaty as to the imports from Canada coming in free while our exports to Canada were dutiable we know in advance will be the effect of the proposed agreement.

Senator Chandler, of Michigan, characterizes the treaty as follows:

If instead of a treaty of reciprocity this treaty had been called a treaty to encourage emigration from the United States into Canada, a treaty to encourage production in Canada instead of in the United States, it would have been more justly named.

Those words can be applied with equal force to the agreement before us.

Senator Foote from one of the New England States expressed himself as follows:

I believe it to be very generally conceded that while this reciprocity treaty, so denominated, has proved highly beneficial to the interests of the people of the British Provinces, and has contributed very largely to their interest and prosperity, it has, at the same time, proved injurious and prejudicial to the interest and prosperity of the American States. The very title of the treaty is a misnomer. There is nothing reciprocal about it; there is nothing reciprocal in its operation; it produces no reciprocity of benefits between the two Governments. It is beneficial to one only of the contracting parties and injurious to the other. Such are the practical results of its operation. This, at all events, is the prevailing, if not quite the unanimous, opinion of the American people, who now, after an experience of its effects for 10 years, demand as with one voice the abrogation of a contract which they regard as partial, unjust, inequitable, and one sided, as soon as it can be done through the forms prescribed in the treaty itself.

I want to commend to the Representatives from New England the position taken by another distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, afterwards Vice President of the United States, and a great commoner of the people, Mr. Wilson, who, in speaking on the treaty said:

When this treaty was negotiated, it was believed to be for the general interests of the country, and in Massachusetts it was especially believed to be for our fishing, manufacturing, commercial, and railroad interests. I have ever been in favor of the treaty, and up to this time could never have been induced to vote against it. I am not clear now that it is not for the interests of the State I in part represent to let it stand. I am inclined to think that it is for our interest that the treaty should stand as it now does. For the interests of the whole country, I am of the opinion that it ought to be modified or perhaps abrogated.

Mr. Blaine, who was then in the House, voted in favor of terminating the treaty, and while I do not find in the RECORD any expressions of opinion at that time, he reviews the subject in his Twenty Years in Congress, as follows:

The right in the fisheries conceded by the treaty of 1854—originally ours under the treaty of 1782 and unnecessarily and unwisely renounced in the treaty of 1818—was not given freely, but in consideration of a great price. That price was reciprocity of trade, so called, between the United States and the British North American Provinces in certain commodities named in the treaty. The selection, as shown in the schedules, was made almost wholly to favor Canadian interests. There was scarcely a product in the list which could be exported from the United States to Canada without loss, while the great market of the United States was thrown open for nearly everything which she could produce and export. *All her raw materials were admitted free, while all our manufactures were charged with heavy duty, the market being reserved for English merchants.* The fishery question had been adroitly used to secure from the United States an agreement which was one sided, vexatious, and unprofitable. It has served its purpose ad-

mirably as a makeweight for Canada in acquiring the most generous and profitable market she ever enjoyed for her products.

The resolution calling upon the President to give notice of the termination of the treaty was passed by the Senate *with only eight dissenting votes*, which fairly illustrates the view of the people at that time as to the treaty.

Among those who voted to terminate the treaty were Senators Grimes and Harlan, of Iowa; Mr. Allison, of Iowa, then in the House and afterwards of long and distinguished service in the Senate; John A. Kasson, of Iowa, then in the House and whose eminent career as a diplomatist is known to you all.

The resolution was signed by Abraham Lincoln.

And now I desire to trace the subsequent history of our country and of Canada in respect to a renewal of the treaty, for the attitude of the parties in reference to its renewal is the strongest evidence of how they regarded its effect.

In January, 1866, a delegation came to Washington from Canada with a view of opening negotiations for the renewal of the treaty, but it does not appear that our Government gave them any encouragement. In February, 1866, and before the treaty had, in fact, expired, Sir Frederick Bruce, the British minister, made an effort to reopen negotiations and addressed a formal letter with that in view to our Secretary of State, Mr. Seward, one of the greatest premiers of all our history. In the letter of Mr. Bruce are these significant words, which well expresses the feeling of Great Britain on the subject:

Her Majesty's Government would be well content to renew the treaty in its present form.

He was undoubtedly right, for there never has been a time, as I will show to you, when they would not have been well content to have renewed the treaty either in the then present form or in the form now proposed. I now read from the reply of Mr. Seward:

The now expiring reciprocity treaty constitutes almost the only case in which the Executive Department has by negotiation assumed a supervision of any question of either commerce or finance. Even in that case the Executive Department did little more than to make a treaty, the details of which had been virtually matured beforehand in the Congress of the United States, and sanction was given to the treaty afterwards by express legislation. The question of continuing the treaty involves mainly subjects of the special character which I have before described. Careful inquiry made during the recess of Congress induced the President to believe that there was then no such harmony of public sentiment in favor of the extension of the treaty as would encourage him in directing negotiations to be opened.

Mr. Seward undoubtedly reflected the feeling of the people at that time. I also commend that portion of his letter relative to the initiative of this character of legislation. In brief, that it should originate in the House, as our forefathers contemplated and provided in the Constitution.

In 1867 the confederation of the various Provinces of Canada was effected, and history tells us that one of the chief issues in the campaign in favor of confederation was that the General Government would be in a better position to urge and secure a renewal of reciprocal relations with this country.

In 1868 the Canadian Government, in the first tariff law passed by it inserted a clause to which I called attention on a former occasion, but for the purpose of the continuity of these observations I will now insert in the RECORD. I find that I do not have the tariff of 1868 with me, so will quote from a later tariff, that of 1879, which is substantially the same.

Section 6 is as follows:

Any or all of the following articles—that is to say, animals of all kinds, green fruit, hay, straw, bran, seeds of all kinds, vegetables (including potatoes and other roots), plants, trees, and shrubs, coal and coke, salt, hops, wheat, peas and beans, barley, rye, oats, Indian corn, buckwheat, and all other grain, flour of wheat and flour of rye, Indian meal and oatmeal, and flour or meal of any other grain, butter, cheese, fish (salted or smoked), lard, tallow, meats (fresh, salted, or smoked), and lumber may be imported into Canada free of duty, or at a less rate of duty than is provided by this act, upon proclamation of the governor in council, which may be issued whenever it appears to his satisfaction that similar articles from Canada may be imported into the United States free of duty, or at a rate of duty not exceeding that payable on the same under such proclamation when imported into Canada.

It will be observed that Canada under this provision held out a standing offer to this country, so far as free interchange of farm products and the products of the forest, etc., are concerned, substantially the same as that now proposed.

In 1869 Sir John Rose, Canadian minister of finance, came to Washington for the purpose of opening negotiations on the subject, but the records tell us that our Government took no steps at that time in the matter. In December, 1869, President Grant, in his message to Congress, referred to the subject as follows:

The question of renewing a treaty for reciprocal trade between the United States and the British Provinces on this continent has not been favorably considered by the administration. The advantages of such a treaty would be wholly in favor of the British producer. Except possibly a few engaged in the trade between the two sections, no citizen of the United States would be benefited by reciprocity.

There seems to be no equivocation in the language of President Grant on the subject or in his statement as to the attitude of our people.

In 1870 the Canadian Government again offered to negotiate on the subject, and in 1871 Sir John McDonald, who was in Washington on other Government business, again sought to open negotiations, but our Government gave no heed to these suggestions.

In 1873–74 representatives of the British Government again brought up the subject with our Government, a form of treaty was drafted, and submitted to President Grant, who, in turn, transmitted it to the Senate. It was rejected in February, 1875.

The Canadian tariff of 1879 carried the provision before referred to.

In 1890 Canada again sent representatives to Washington to secure a reciprocity treaty with this country; that was during the administration of President Harrison and when Mr. Blaine was Secretary of State. Negotiations were pending for a couple of years. In 1892 the Senate passed a resolution requesting the President to transmit to the Senate all information pertaining thereto. And now I want to read from President Harrison's message on the subject:

The result of the conference as to the practicability of arranging a reciprocity treaty with the Dominion of Canada is clearly stated in the letter of Mr. Blaine, and was anticipated, I think, by him and every other thoughtful American who had considered the subject. A reciprocity treaty limited to the exchange of natural products would have been such only in form. *The benefits of such a treaty would have inured almost wholly to Canada. Previous experiments on this line had been unsatisfactory to this Government.* A treaty that should be reciprocal in fact and of mutual advantage must necessarily have embraced an important list of manufactured articles and have secured to the United States a free or favored introduction—

I ask you to mark the language "free or favored introduction," because I will refer to that proposition a little later on—

of these articles into Canada as against the world; but it was not believed the Canadian ministry was ready to propose or assent to such an arrangement. * * * It is not for this Government to argue against this announcement of Canadian official opinion. It must be accepted, however, I think, as the statement of a condition which places an insuperable barrier in the way of that large and beneficial intercourse and reciprocal trade which might otherwise be developed between the United States and the Dominion.

President Harrison understood clearly the theory of a reciprocal trade agreement, which, expressed in simple form, *is that our country should receive some consideration for concessions granted to Canada;* that when we let Canada into our markets we should be given access to Canadian markets; that access to Canadian markets on the same terms as other nations is not a consideration for opening our markets to Canada, a principle that seems to have been entirely ignored in drafting the agreement before us. President Harrison submits with his message a letter from Mr. Blaine.

The name of James G. Blaine is connected perhaps more than any other great leader of our party with the policy of reciprocity, and I desire that the record show the light in which he viewed the subject at that time, when substantially the same proposition as is now proposed was before him.

I may be pardoned for digressing long enough to say that I was raised in the Republican faith; my belief in the policies of the Republican Party has strengthened as the years have passed. I came into manhood's estate when the "Plumed Knight" was the matchless leader of our party, and I have never ceased my admiration for his leadership or for the policies he advocated. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Blaine says:

At the first conference, on February 10, the commissioners stated that they were authorized by the Canadian Government to propose the renewal of the reciprocity treaty of 1854—which was terminated in 1866 by the action of the Congress of the United States—with such modifications and extensions as the altered circumstances of both countries and their respective interests might seem to require.

In answer to an inquiry, the commissioners stated that the modifications or extensions contemplated in the schedules of articles should be confined to natural products, and should not embrace manufactured articles.

The commissioners were informed that the Government of the United States would not be prepared to renew the treaty of 1854 *nor to agree upon any commercial reciprocity which should be confined to natural products alone;* and that, in view of the great development of industrial interests in the United States and of the changed conditions of the commercial relations of the two countries since the treaty of 1854 was negotiated, it was regarded of essential importance that a list of manufactured goods should be included in the schedules of articles for free or favored exchange in any reciprocity arrangement which might be made.

The commissioners then inquired if the Government of the United States would expect to have preferential treatment extended to the list of manufactured goods of the United States on their introduction into Canada by virtue of a reciprocity treaty, or whether it would regard the Canadian Government as at liberty to extend the same favors to the manufactured goods of other countries not parties to the treaty on their introduction into Canada.

That identical proposition is presented to us under the proposed agreement, and now let us see what answer Mr. Blaine gave. His reply was as follows:

The reply given them was that it was the desire of the Government of the United States to make a reciprocity convention which would be exclusive in its application to the United States and Canada, *and that other countries which are not parties to it should not enjoy gratuitously the favors which the two neighboring countries might reciprocally concede to each other for valuable considerations and at a large sacrifice of their respective revenues.*

I call particular attention to what Mr. Blaine says as to other countries enjoying gratuitously the privileges which we have purchased by giving Canada free access to our markets.

President Harrison, in his fourth annual message, again discussed the matter, concluding with this sentence:

The benefits of an exchange of natural products would be almost wholly with the people of Canada.

I now come to one of blessed memory, whose public life and career were intimately associated with the protective policy of the Republican Party, and who was one of its greatest leaders, but whose name, I regret to say, has been used to conjure favor for an agreement for which not one sentence or one syllable ever uttered by him could be construed as in its favor. I refer to William McKinley. [Applause.] In his inaugural address in 1897 President McKinley said:

The end in view is always to be the opening up of new markets for the products of our country by granting concessions to the products of other lands that we need and can not produce ourselves, and which do not involve any loss of labor of our own people, but tend to increase their prosperity.

I thought of these words when the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] was making his speech. It was indeed entertaining to observe the labored effort of my good friend from Connecticut to square his present attitude with the attitude of our party and with his former attitude on this great economic question. As he walked back and forth, up this aisle and then up this, his face at times resembling the grim visage of Moloch, and again speaking with such pathos that you could imagine the tears dropping from his words, I was reminded of the description by Tolstoi, in one of his novels, of a character who employed "one half his faculties in deceiving himself and the other half in trying to give an appearance of reason to his illusions." [Laughter.]

And now I want to refer to the last speech of McKinley at Buffalo, which has been so tortured by excerptation, in which he said:

By sensible trade arrangements, which will not interrupt our home production, we shall extend the outlets for our increasing surplus. A system which provides a mutual exchange of commodities is manifestly essential to the continued and healthful growth of our export trade. We must not repose in fancied security that we can forever sell everything and buy little or nothing. If such a thing were possible, it would not be best for us or for those with whom we deal. We should take from our customers such of their products as we can use without harm to our industries and labor. Reciprocity is the natural outgrowth of our wonderful industrial development under the domestic policy now firmly established.

What we produce beyond our domestic consumption must have a vent abroad. The excess must be relieved through a foreign outlet, and we should sell everywhere we can and buy wherever the buying will enlarge our sales and productions and thereby make a greater demand for home labor.

The period of exclusiveness is past. The expansion of our trade and commerce is the pressing problem. Commercial wars are unprofitable. A policy of good will and friendly trade relations will prevent reprisals. Reciprocity treaties are in harmony with the spirit of the times; measures of retaliation are not.

If perchance some of our tariffs are no longer needed for revenue or to encourage and protect our industries at home, why should they not be employed to extend and promote our markets abroad?

It will be noted that McKinley predicated his statement on the foundation stone that whatever agreement is made *must be without harm to our industries or labor.*

In the Republican national platform of 1900 our party declared:

We favor the associated policy of reciprocity, so directed as to open our markets on favorable terms for what we do not ourselves produce, in return for free foreign markets.

And in 1904 our national platform declared as follows:

We have extended widely our foreign markets, and we believe in the adoption of all practicable methods for their further extension, including commercial reciprocity wherever reciprocal arrangements can be effected consistent with the principles of protection and without injury to American agriculture, American labor, or any American industry.

Such is a brief review of the former treaty and the attitude of the United States and Canada in respect to it. It shows that the former treaty was substantially the same as the present pact. It shows that the treaty of 1854 was abrogated by the United States because it was injurious to the interests of this country. It shows that for half a century Canada has been sitting on the doorstep of our Government, repeatedly and persistently seeking a renewal of that treaty. It shows that our country has consistently, during all of this time, refused to enter into such a treaty on the ground that it would not be reciprocal and would not be for the interests of our people. It shows that our greatest statesmen from Lincoln down to the present, including such names as John Sherman, Elihu Washburne, Zachariah Chandler, Justin Morrill (the father of the Republican policy of protection), William B. Allison, William H. Seward, Ulysses S. Grant, Benjamin Harrison, James G. Blaine, William McKinley, and many others have of record repudiated the former treaty and opposed such so-called reciprocity as Canada has heretofore offered and now proposes. In view of the undisputed facts and records of history, the statement of Mr. Knox that the abolition of the former treaty was a "backward step" is indeed most remarkable.

I submit on this branch of the subject that the pact before us is not in harmony with the policy of the Republican Party nor any of its platform declarations, nor with the position of our leading statesmen.

THE AMERICAN FARMER—PACT NOT IN HARMONY WITH POLICY OF PARTY—NEW SOIL IN COMPETITION WITH OLD—WILL BE UNFAIR TO AGRICULTURAL INTERESTS OF THIS COUNTRY—CANADIAN FARMER SUBSIDIZED—CONDITIONS COMPARED.

I will now turn briefly to its effect on the farmers of our country. During the last Congress I submitted some remarks on this branch of the subject. Other gentlemen who have preceded me have ably covered it. I do not, therefore, feel justified in discussing it with the detail I otherwise would. The effect and, indeed, the very purpose of the bill is to place the products of the farm in free and open competition with Canada. Its advocates on the Republican side, while claiming adherence to the protective policy of our party, propose to exclude the farmer from the application of that policy. Their position and the manifest effect of the bill is an abandonment of the protective policy, so far as the farmer is concerned. When that policy is abandoned as to one-third of our people—one-third of our producers—the policy fails. Our party has never before urged a policy of half protection and half free trade. The Democratic side favor the bill, saying it is a step in the right direction. They say, "Let's have free trade for the farmer first and for all later on."

We have witnessed during the debate on this feature of the bill a most remarkable variety of excuses and apologies. By some it is averred that the cost of living should be reduced, and that this reduction will come from competition of Canadian products with the products of American farmers. Others glide quickly over this phase of the question, and with labored effort seek to show that it will not affect the farmer. It is interesting to listen to the gentlemen from our large centers, whose knowledge of agriculture comes chiefly from looking through the windows of Pullman palace cars, speeding 60 miles an hour, discuss farming. Some, indeed, like the gentleman who is said to have conducted the negotiations with Canada—I refer to Mr. Pepper, whose contribution on the subject was presented as a Senate document—have the temerity to affirm that it will benefit the farmer.

Not only is this measure inconsistent with the protective policy for which our party has stood in the past, but it is in direct contravention of our last national platform and the recent definitely announced policy of our party, both on the part of our President and the Republican side of Congress. We have created a Tariff Board for the purpose of securing information as a basis of applying the measure of protection announced in our last national platform—the difference in cost of production at home and abroad. A partial report has been submitted. It includes the conditions in Canada and in this country on this very subject. It shows a difference in cost of production of farm products in Canada and the United States. It shows conclusively a difference in the price of farm products in the two countries. And yet it is absolutely ignored. I am one of those who have believed and still believe in a tariff board that will investigate and report the facts for the information of Congress. We have an able board, a board that has the confidence of all, and yet it is proposed to proceed headlong, without giving its report any consideration whatever. I protest against such action.

I was much impressed by the description of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HINDS] of the decadence of New England farming between the years 1860–1890. It recalled to my mind a conversation I had with a gentleman in my own State just a few months ago. He was born and passed his boyhood days on a New England farm and then joined the movement westward, locating in Iowa. As the evening shadows of life approached, his mind wandered back to the old home and he longed to return once more to the environments of his childhood days. At last he went back, and getting off at the station, his heart full of tender memories as he drew near to the sacred scenes of those early days, with the pictured faces of loved ones before

him, started for the old home; and I shall never forget the touching pathos with which he told how he was unable even to find the spot. Decadence had done its work. The farm, the home, was no more. Nothing but desolation. Sadly he turned his face again to the West. That is what competition with the new soil of the West did to the agriculture of New England. What will that vast empire of new and fertile land in western Canada do to our Middle West if thrown into free competition? I am here to protect the interests of our American farmers and leave solicitude for Canadian farmers to Canadian representatives. [Applause.]

The movement of rural population has always followed the opening up of new soil. You can go back in the history of our own country and trace the movement from New England westward. There is a reason for it. Old soil can not compete with new soil on an equal basis. The cost of production is less on new soil than on old soil. With the use of soil comes the necessity for rotation of crops, for fertilizing, putting back into the soil that which is taken out. This is a material element of cost. The deserted farms of New England, as well as other Eastern States, until recent years tell the story. Right across the Potomac, in Virginia, within sight of our own eyes was once a thriving agricultural section. To-day the country is flooded with literature telling of Virginia farms that can be purchased for less than the value of the improvements—beautiful homes standing tenantless. In recent years, since farm prices have become remunerative, there has been a movement to reclaim the abandoned farms of New England and of Virginia and other places, but if the prices of farm products are not maintained at a relatively remunerative figure this movement will stop. I am in favor of conserving our own lands.

The movement that has taken place in this country has been followed, to some extent, in the movement to western Canada, but it will be greatly emphasized if this measure becomes a law. Fortunately I come from a section of the country that has some knowledge of Canada. We know that the farmers of the West have been lured to Canada by the cheapness of her lands. The friends and neighbors and relatives of our people have journeyed there; some have remained, others have invested. In nearly every town in our State will be found real estate agents advertising Canadian lands. In brief, our people know something about the subject.

If this measure passes, the movement to Canada will be greatly increased. It is admitted that already its influence is being felt. I am not in favor of encouraging emigration from this country to Canada. We need the sturdy farmers of this country; we can not afford to lose them. We want to populate our own soil, intensify our farming, make rural life attractive, and encourage in every fair and legitimate way our agricultural resources. We should not ignore the very basis of our prosperity.

It seems to me superfluous to discuss the proposition that $150 per acre land can not compete with land at from $10 to $25 per acre with equal fertility. The report of the Tariff Board gives the average value per acre of improved land in Iowa in 1910 as $109, in Alberta, $20; in Saskatchewan, $22; Manitoba, $29.

What makes the difference in the value of land? Not soil alone. The character and fertility of soil is, of course, important, but there are other considerations. The settled state of the country brings educational advantages. Schools are maintained where the boys and girls can obtain an education. This affects the value of land. Some of the greatest statesmen of our country and captains of industry and finance began their education in the country school. Every farmer believes in education. Proximity to places of worship and churches also affects the value of land.

Then there is a social value to land—the communal spirit of the neighborhood; opportunity for exchanging visits; forming friendships; the advantages of associations of a social, political, agricultural, religious, fraternal, or other nature; all promoted by the incidents of a settled country, such as good roads, telephones, free rural mail service, railway and interurban service, easy access to numerous cities and towns. Again, there is the question of market accessibility, both for buying and selling.

All of these affect the value of land just as they affect the value of real estate, either business or residential, in the city. The land itself may not be any better or may not be more fertile or more productive per acre than land that does not have these advantages and the value of which is far less. Our lands have this value; the lands of northwestern Canada do not. The farmers there are pioneering, just as our farmers did years ago. Our farmers have helped to develop our country and have contributed their share in payment of these advantages which now give to their land its present value. Is it fair, is it just, is it defensible to place them in open competition as to their products wth the Canadian farmer, with his new and fertile soil and cheap land?

I will insert in the RECORD a table which I prepared showing the average yield per acre in the United States and in Iowa and in Canada of various farm products in the year 1909. The figures in this table are taken from the Canadian yearbook of 1909 and the Yearbook of the Department of Agriculture of the United States for 1909:

	Iowa.	United States.	Canada.
Wheat.....bushels..	17.00	15.80	21.51
Oats.....do....	27.00	30.30	38.00
Barley.....do....	22.00	24.30	29.71
Rye.....do....	17.80	16.10	18.78
Buckwheat.....do....	15.00	20.90	27.64
Potatoes.....do....	89.00	106.80	192.96
Hay.....tons..	1.64	1.42	1.44
Flax.....bushels..	9.80	9.40	15.98

It will be noted from these tables that in the articles enumerated the average yield per acre is greater in Canada than in the United States, or even in Iowa, which we think is the best farming State in the Union.

I shall not stop to discuss the question of prices; that there is a difference between the price of farm products in Canada and in the United States can not be successfully controverted; that Canada is already a large exporter of farm products is true, and that her exports will increase is equally true. How can it benefit our farmers to throw her surplus agricultural products into American markets? But they say the price of farm products is fixed in Liverpool, and the old delusion of the markets of the world has been resurrected during this debate. No one has yet reconciled this argument with the difference in price that obtains in towns along the Canadian border. Take Portal, N. Dak., and North Portal, Canada, a street dividing the two, where, as the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. HANNA] has pointed out, there is a marked difference in the price of wheat, barley, flax, and other products raised in the same community, on the same soil, with the same transportation facilities—just a narrow strip of 80 feet dividing the two. The farmers of this country know the difference between a home market for the substantial part of their products and shipping them to the seacoast, and then 3,000 miles across the sea to be sold to the underpaid labor of London and Liverpool. Canada knows the same thing. *If not, why has she been knocking at our door for half a century to get into our markets? She realizes their value, even if some of the gentlemen on this floor do not.*

There is one point to which I wish to direct attention before it escapes me. I want to say to the Democratic Members from the North who represent agricultural districts that you will have a hard time explaining to your constituents why you voted for free trade on all the products of the farmer of the North, while the farmers of the South, where the control of your party lies, retain protection on their principal products, such as rice, tobacco, cotton, sugar, and other things. I do not wish to draw sectional differences into this debate, but I shall not sit silently by and permit such discriminatory legislation to be passed without a protest.

Returning after this digression, I will refer briefly to the policy of the provincial governments of Canada in subsidizing their agricultural interests. In the reports of our Consular Service in Canada, in the Daily Consular and Trade Report, are found frequent mention of the steps taken in this direction. The Canadian Provinces, Manitoba and Saskatchewan, are establishing grain elevators. The same Provinces, as well as others, are also subsidizing the dairy industry through Government creameries, and, in addition, farmers living at a distance from a creamery can ship their cream without cost—that is to say, the express charges are paid. Consul General John E. Jones, of Winnipeg, Canada, in a report of recent date, tells of the impetus given to the industry. I read as follows:

> The records show that before the creamery was opened, in 1908, dairy butter was worth 12½ cents in trade; from July 1 to the end of October the lowest price the Government paid was 21½ cents and the highest price 31½ cents per pound of butter fat. This was cash and the payments were made twice a month.

Can anyone doubt what will be the result, so far as the production in Canada is concerned, with the aid of Government subsidy? Can our farmers compete with the cheap lands of Canada aided by Government subsidy? Is it fair that we should expect them to?

This is not a new policy for Canada. She did the same thing for the cheese industry, which developed until Canada is one of

the great cheese-producing countries of the world. In 1909 Canada exported to Great Britain alone 164,090,903 pounds of cheese.

Already Canada is exporting butter. Her export of butter to Great Britain in 1909 was 5,353,770 pounds. Will it not be just as easy to develop the dairy industry in Canada through Government subsidy as it has the cheese industry? To my mind, easier.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. From whom does the Canadian Government get the funds with which they are subsidizing these farmers?

Mr. PICKETT. I do not know. I suppose they get them from the people; but that is immaterial on this point.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I just wanted to know from curiosity.

Mr. PICKETT. It is immaterial to the question so long as they do it.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. They tax the farmer to get it, do they not?

Mr. PICKETT. I do not know as to that. I am not familiar with the taxing laws of Canada, but understand the taxes on farmers are very low.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I would like to know one other thing. You spoke a moment ago about certain people not being affected by this Canadian reciprocity while the northern farmer was affected by having his protective tariff stricken down. As a compensation for that the Canadian tariff against the northern farmer is also stricken down, is it not?

Mr. PICKETT. Oh, yes; but we are not exporting northern farm products into Canada in any considerable amount.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Is there not as much benefit in the one as there is injury in the other?

Mr. PICKETT. There certainly is not. If the percentage in the increase of Canadian production of farm products continues for the next 15 years as it has in the past 8 years, and the same increase obtains in this country as in the past 8 years, the production of Canada will equal the production of the United States in practically all farm products except corn. Canada has a population of less than 8,000,000, while our population is over 90,000,000; therefore her surplus will increase in much greater proportion.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. We now produce a surplus, and so does Canada, and will not our exports and hers go to the same foreign market?

Mr. PICKETT. That is the difference between the policy of the gentleman's party and mine. We have been trying for 50 years to build up a home market that will consume the products of the farm [applause on the Republican side], and now that we are reaching that point you propose to destroy the home market by putting the farmer in free competition with other countries. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PICKETT. Certainly.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Is it not essential to the welfare of the American farmer that he should be able to reach out and grasp the foreign market for his surplus, and is it not true that the commercial greatness of this country is due to the fact that the American farmer produces a large surplus and sends it abroad? Now, does the gentleman say that we ought to limit the production of the farmers of the United States to home consumption?

Mr. PICKETT. The gentleman does not understand me. I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. SWITZER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PICKETT. Certainly.

Mr. SWITZER. Will the gentleman from Iowa state, if he knows, how many farmers have left the States in the last 10 years and gone to Manitoba?

Mr. PICKETT. I do not know that I can answer the gentleman. I have no figures as to Manitoba alone. I have seen a statement that some 400,000 Americans have removed to Canada within the past five years. The Canadian Government shows that 72,349 settlers came from the United States to Canada during the year 1909. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] calls my attention to an article in Hampton's Magazine, which states that 500,000 Americans have passed over to Canada during the last nine years.

Mr. SWITZER. Will the gentleman from Iowa state how many stayed in Canada?

Mr. PICKETT. I do not have the statistics showing that fact, but the development of western Canada is largely from this country.

Just a word relative to the importation of Canadian cattle. An attempt has been made to show that this bill will benefit our farmers, and before I forget it I want to refer to the remarkable contribution given us on this subject by Mr. Pepper, which, as I have already stated, was ordered printed as a document by the Senate. The gentleman's name does not appear on the document as the author of the article. However, in another publication since issued he is given credit for it. I read from the subdivision of the article entitled "Where the Canadian reciprocity agreement benefits the farmer." It will be recalled that Mr. Pepper was one of the commissioners who were sent to Canada for the purpose of conducting the negotiations which resulted in this agreement. As a fair sample of the fairness with which he discusses the matter, I read from his article as follows:

> The sheep raisers of the United States will be materially benefited by getting their sheep into Canada free. The Dominion, through its department of agriculture, is now taking means to increase the Canadian supply of sheep. Under the present tariff of 25 per cent, sheep to the value of $220,000 imported into Canada from the United States have paid duties in excess of $55,000.

For the year ending March 31, 1910, the United States shipped to Canada 35,844 sheep, of the value of $131,492, with a tariff levied of $32,873; at least, these are the figures submitted by the President in the tables attached to his message. Just where Mr. Pepper secured his figures does not appear. However, he omitted to state that during the same year Canada shipped into the United States 103,519 sheep of the value of $527,087, on which the United States collected a duty of $103,519. Mr. Pepper's statement justifies the application of the old adage of Benjamin Franklin, that "half the truth is often a great lie." [Applause.]

Mr. Pepper also seems to think, and the same argument has been adduced by others, that our farmers will be benefited by the free importation of cattle from Canada.

I do not have the figures on cattle alone, but the Canadian Yearbook tells us that for the year 1909 Canada exported over $51,000,000 of animals and their produce, of which only about $7,000,000 came to the United States. While on this subject, there is another point to which I desire to allude, and that is the treaty entered into between Canada and France just a few years since. The draft of the treaty as originally submitted provided for the import into France at the minimum duty of cattle fattened for slaughter. The French Senate refused to ratify the convention unless cattle fattened for slaughter were excluded, and to this Canada finally acceded. The purpose was to protect the meat-producing interests of France. In brief, the French farmer could replenish his herds for dairy, breeding, or other purposes, but would be protected from competition as to fattened cattle. Will some one tell me why our Government should be less concerned in the protection of the meat producers of this country than the French Government was for the farmers of France? In the one case 3,000 miles of ocean divided the competitors, while in the case before us is the imaginary line we have heard so much about.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the exhaustive debate that has already taken place on this branch of the subject, I will not consume any more time in a further discussion of it.

WHAT DOES CANADA GIVE US?—IOWA—OUR MANUFACTURERS NOT GIVEN ACCESS TO CANADIAN MARKETS—CANADA'S INTERNAL POLICY AN IMPORTANT CONSIDERATION—OTHER COUNTRIES SECURE SAME CONCESSIONS GRATUITOUSLY.

I now turn to another phase of the subject that bears directly on the question of reciprocity. The debate thus far has been confined almost wholly to the effect on the people of this country of the free importation from Canada of agricultural products. The question of what we are getting in exchange has not been discussed. So far as the free admission of Canadian products is concerned, that could be covered by our own legislation, without respect to Canada or the concurrence of Canada therein. Of course Canada would be glad to have the tariff duties removed from all Canadian articles. If the agreement is to be sustained on the theory that it is reciprocal, then we should look to the concessions granted to us by Canada, and this phase of the subject, as I have suggested, has received little, if any, consideration during the debate. While Iowa is an agricultural State, and I regard agriculture as the basis of our prosperity, it is also true that we are developing along industrial lines, and the people of Iowa of all classes, both urban and rural, are beginning to realize the importance of the dual development. Our farmers realize the value of having a better market near their farms, and, on the other hand, our manufacturers realize the importance of the prosperity of the farmers and are interested in promoting agricultural development. The "booster" spirit is abroad in our State. A movement has been inaugurated for the cooperation of our industrial and agricultural interests. "Booster" meetings are being held, and during the recent session of our legislature a law was placed on the statute books providing an official trade-

mark for Iowa goods—"Made in Iowa." "Iowa goods for Iowa people" is the slogan. I am deeply interested, as a citizen of the State, in this movement. I also believe in the same principle for our Nation.

Iowa is strategically located for the manufacture of many articles, and especially of agricultural implements, and this is particularly true so far as the market of western Canada is concerned. Our manufacturers of the Middle West are as accessible to Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta as are the eastern portions of Canada; and if given access to that section of Canada where great agricultural development will take place, we would undoubtedly rapidly develop the manufacture of agricultural implements.

It has been held out that we are given access to Canadian markets, particularly as to agricultural implements, "on advantageous terms." This, if true, would be in accord with the theory of reciprocity, for if we open our markets to Canada for practically all Canada wants—that is, our markets for her farm products—then we in turn should be compensated therefor by access to Canadian markets.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. In that connection, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one more question?

Mr. PICKETT. Certainly.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. The gentleman said that all Canada wanted in our markets was to find a market for her agricultural products. Does the gentleman think Canada would be averse to selling her timber products in this country, and does the gentleman not really think that to get her lumber and wood pulp and paper here is the moving cause for this treaty? Would that not benefit these very farmers in Iowa that the gentleman is talking about—give them cheaper lumber with which to build their barns?

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri has apparently been giving his attention to other things rather than an examination of the facts relative to this subject. With reference to the desire of Canada to give to our country the products of her forests, I remind the gentleman that the various Provinces of Canada impose an export tax on logs, so that we do not get her forest products unrestricted. The Canadian Government, as its representatives point out in their correspondence with our Secretary of State, have "no power and no desire" to interfere with the Provinces in respect to these restrictions, speaking with special reference to pulp, printing paper, etc. I have here a recent report, dated March 24, 1911, from the consul at Owen Sound, Ontario, who reports as follows:

> There is $3,550,000 capital invested in sawmill plants and the equipments necessary to convert the standing timber into lumber. That as much more is invested by each company in timber and lumber land is a fair estimate. This would make the total investment of American capital $7,100,000 in the lumber industry in this part of Ontario. This investment of American capital is largely due to the export duty on Canadian logs. Before the duty was put on the logs were rafted to the American side and then manufactured into lumber, but after that went into force the American firms were obliged to do the manufacturing on Canadian soil so as to save the export duty on their product.

This same condition exists throughout Canada, and if, as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD] suggests, Canada is so anxious to unload the products of her forests on us, why does she not adjust her internal laws so as to permit it?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. In that connection I will say that in five fiscal years Canada shipped into this country $98,000,000 of lumber more than we shipped up there.

Mr. PICKETT. That may be true; but under their internal laws they have forced American capital into Canada, for the purpose of manufacturing the lumber. There is no question about that.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. If our tariff had not been against it they would have shipped very much more lumber here.

Mr. PICKETT. That may be true. I voted for a reduction of the duty on lumber during the last Congress, when the Payne bill was being considered, and the reduction would have prevailed if it had received the support of the Democratic Members of the House.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. We will be prepared for it once more, and on this agreement too.

Mr. PICKETT. Not under this agreement.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. No; but we will get lumber on the free list sure.

Mr. PICKETT. You do not propose it in the present agreement. Rough lumber is on the free list, but farmers do not use rough lumber.

I was speaking on the question of the access given under this agreement to our manufacturers of agricultural implements in Canadian markets. I discussed this question in the last Congress and do not desire to cover the same phase of it again. I will, however, summarize what I then said. I stated that there is no material concession given to our manufacturers of agricultural implements. On a number of more important articles, like traction, portable, and gasoline engines, manure spreaders, pumps, and windmills, there is no reduction in the Canadian duty. As to some others, there is a reduction of 2½ points, and on others of 5 points; the lowest Canadian duty is 15 per cent, and ranging from that up to 30 per cent, and if it be true, as advocates of this measure urge, that there is no substantial difference in the cost of manufacturing in Canada and this country, then it would follow that these concessions are immaterial, and certainly can not be claimed as an equivalent consideration for the concessions which we have given to Canada.

When I addressed the House on this question during the last Congress I referred to the construction given to the favored-nation clause by other countries, and that under such construction Canada would be compelled to give to every country with whom she has such a treaty the same concessions given to the United States under this agreement and *without any equivalent consideration therefor*. That is to say, gratuitously. It will be recalled that this very question was raised by Mr. Blaine and by President Harrison, from whom I have quoted. The statement which I made at that time was questioned. It is, however, no longer in doubt. It has been eliminated from controversy by a very valuable contribution on Tariff Relations with Canada, by Mr. Frank R. Rutter, tariff expert of the Department of Commerce and Labor, and published by said department as Tariff Series No. 26, from which I now quote:

> The commercial relations of Canada with various countries are based, in part, on unconditional most-favored-nation treatment, in part on special commercial agreements, and, in respect to imports from the United Kingdom and British possessions, on preferential treatment which is not applicable to imports from any foreign country. By virtue of the most-favored-nation clause in a number of British treaties which are applicable to the colonies, every concession in duty to any foreign country is immediately extended to the favored nations. To this group of countries all of the concessions made to France by the 1907 convention were at once granted, and a provision to the same effect is contained in the resolution introduced by the Canadian minister of finance on January 26, 1911, in the case of any reductions in duty to be accorded imports from the United States.

Mr. Rutter then proceeds to name the countries that will receive the same concessions as the United States and without any consideration therefor. The countries are Argentina, Austria-Hungary, Bolivia, Colombia, Denmark, Japan, Norway, Russia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and Venezuela. He also names the colonies that will be entitled to the British preferential: Bermuda, British West Indies, British Guiana, British India, Ceylon, Straits Settlements, New Zealand, Union of South Africa, Southern Rhodesia, and other British colonies.

Further, that France, Algeria, and French colonies will receive the lowest rate applicable to articles specified in the Franco-Canadian convention from any foreign country, and that Belgium and Netherlands the rates of intermediate tariff, but not special rates on all articles specified in Franco-Canadian convention.

So that it is now settled beyond controversy that the United States will receive no favored treatment in Canadian markets, but, on the contrary, our country will purchase for all these other countries the same concessions accorded to us and the United States will be entitled to the privilege of meeting the competition of these other countries in Canadian markets.

I will now turn for a few moments to the internal policy of Canada under which Canada has absolute power to render ineffective the concessions granted under the agreement. Thus far in the debate no reference has been made to the Canadian patent laws, to my mind a very material consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DALZELL. I yield 15 minutes additional to the gentleman.

Mr. PICKETT. I now read from the patent act of Canada, Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906:

> 38. Every patent shall, unless otherwise ordered by the commissioner as hereinafter provided, be subject, and expressed to be subject, to the following conditions:
>
> (*a*) Such patent and all the rights and privileges thereby granted shall cease and determine, and the patent shall be null and void at the end of two years from the date thereof, unless the patentee or his legal representatives, within that period or an authorized extension thereof, commence, and after such commencement, continuously carry on in Canada the construction or manufacture of the invention patented in such a manner that any person desiring to use it may obtain it, or cause it to be made for him at a reasonable price, at some manufactory or establishment for making or constructing it in Canada.
>
> (*b*) If, after the expiration of 12 months from the granting of a patent, or an authorized extension of such period, the patentee or patentees, or any of them or his or their or any of their legal representatives, for the whole or a part of his or their or any of their interest in the patent, import or cause to be imported into Canada the invention for which the patent is granted, such patent shall be void as to the interest of the person or persons so importing or causing to be imported.

Canada uses her patent laws for the purpose of protecting her industries, encouraging their development, and securing new industries. Under her patent laws she is able to force American inventors who secure Canadian patents either to sell their patents or manufacture the articles in Canada. To what extent this has been done I can not definitely state. It is a matter of such importance, however, and of such materiality to this agreement that it is strange the State Department has not investigated it thoroughly and given us information thereon. I do know that a number of manufacturing establishments in my State have been compelled to build branch factories in Canada in order to sell in Canadian markets. I hold in my hand letters from gentlemen representing two separate manufacturing establishments in Iowa, each of which has a branch factory in Canada, stating in substance that they were forced to establish their branch factories in Canada because of the Canadian patent laws. I know the same thing to be true of other manufacturing establishments in my State, and the same condition will be found, I am informed, in many other States.

The reports of our consuls found in the Daily Consular and Trade Reports tell the story of American capital being brought into Canada in the construction of branch factories. In a recent report it is stated that 184 American factories have established branches in Canada, with an estimated capital of $233,000,000. I do not say that all of them have been compelled to do so by virtue of the patent laws of Canada; I affirm, however, that it is true of many. It seems to me that it is a proper matter to be considered and carefully weighed in approving this proposed trade agreement. *If we are to enter into an agreement with Canada under which certain concessions are granted, it is our duty to see that the contract will be effective.* What avail the agreement even as to the slight reductions given, when Canada, under her patent laws, can render the concessions absolutely ineffective and can require our manufacturers holding Canadian patents either to sell them or to send their money to Canada for the purpose of manufacturing there?

There is another interesting law in Canada, known as the "dumping clause" of their tariff law, which is as follows:

CUSTOMS TARIFF, 1907.

6. In the case of articles exported to Canada of a class or kind made or produced in Canada, if the export or actual selling price to an importer in Canada be less than the fair market value of the same article when sold for home consumption in the usual and ordinary course in the country whence exported to Canada at the time of its exportation to Canada there shall, in addition to the duties otherwise established, be levied, collected, and paid on such article, on its importation into Canada, a special duty (or dumping duty) equal to the difference between the said selling price of the article for export and the said fair market value thereof for home consumption; and such special duty (or dumping duty) shall be levied, collected, and paid on such article, although it is not otherwise dutiable.

While I do not have time to discuss it, it will be seen that it provides another method by which Canada can protect her industries, and it is susceptible of such administration.

I have called attention to these matters for the reason that they seem to me to be materially related to the question of the consideration the United States is receiving from Canada. Even though the consideration be slight, it should be made effective. How can we justify approving a contract without doing so?

RELATIVE TRADE CONDITIONS.

There is still another phase of the subject to which I desire to allude if this agreement is to be considered from the standpoint of reciprocity. Attached to the special message of the President to Congress on January 26, 1911, and on page 70 thereof, is a table containing an analysis of the import, export, and total trade of Canada by countries, showing that the entire trade of Canada was $655,800,567 for the fiscal year 1910, of which the United States furnished $327,701,484; that the import trade of Canada was, in round numbers, $375,833,016, of which the importations from the United States were $223,501,809; that the export trade of Canada was $279,247,551, of which $104,199,675 was to the United States. These figures of course include the entire trade of Canada without respect to the articles included within the proposed agreement.

For the proper consideration of this agreement, however, the figures pertaining solely to the articles included within the agreement should have been furnished. Fortunately the bulletin to which I have heretofore referred, entitled "Trade relations of Canada," covers this subject. It appears that of the articles included in the agreement more than 80 per cent of the entire Canadian imports come from the United States. The total imports of the articles included in the agreement for the year ending March 31, 1910, were $41,072,185, of which the imports from the United States were $32,913,823, or, as I have stated, 80 per cent, so that of the articles included within this agreement there remains only $8,158,362 as a possible market in Canada for the United States, *and of this there is only the small amount of $683,225 that is not included in the importations from Great Britain and her colonies which have a preferential and the countries with which Canada has a favored-nation-clause treaty.*

The Canadian commissioners were shrewd enough in drafting the agreement to include the articles which would not affect her own markets or her own interests. I have here a British document, with tabulations on the subject, which also gives the importation of articles included in the agreement into the United States. The figures are in thousand pounds, and for the purpose of reducing the figures I have used $5 for the pound. The table shows that of articles included in the agreement the total imports into the United States were $101,415,000, of which the imports from Canada were $34,280,000, leaving a possible increase for Canada of $67,135,000, as against a possible increased trade of the United States with Canada, as above stated, of $8,158,362. Canada, however, will have favored treatment as to these articles in our country, while the United States will not have favored treatment in the markets of Canada.

I will insert in the RECORD tables showing the foregoing facts. The table showing the imports into Canada of articles included in the agreement I take from the bulletin issued by the Department of Commerce and Labor, and the table showing the imports into the United States of the articles covered by the agreement I take from the British tabulation, reduced from pounds to dollars on the basis of $5 per pound:

Table showing imports into Canada of articles covered by the agreement and also total imports for the year ending March 31, 1910.

Imports into Canada from—	Total imports covered by agreement.	Total of all imports.
United States	$32,913,823	$223,501,809
Great Britain	6,394,638	95,350,300
British colonies	290,510	16,448,117
Most-favored nations	789,989	10,275,506
Other countries	683,225	30,257,284
	41,072,185	375,833,016

Table showing imports into the United States of articles covered by the proposed reciprocity agreement both from Canada and from all countries.

	From Canada.	From all countries including Canada.
Articles already free to all countries	$2,535,000	$3,945,000
Dutiable articles on which the rate of duty is unchanged	35,000	45,000
Dutiable articles now made free to Canada	25,915,000	60,565,000
Dutiable articles now dutiable at lower rates to Canada	5,795,000	36,860,000
Total United States imports included under the agreement	34,280,000	101,415,000

The more you examine the agreement the more apparent it becomes that Mr. Fielding was right when he stated to the House of Commons of Canada that they had gained everything they desired, free access to our markets, "without doing any injustice to our manufacturers." I am unable after a careful examination to find wherein the agreement can by any fair construction be termed a reciprocity agreement. It can not be sustained on that theory. No one has attempted to point out what Canada grants the United States, and I challenge anyone to show where our people are given any favorable concession in Canadian markets. The agreement inures wholly to the benefit of Canada. It is unilateral. It should be entitled, as Senator Chandler observed of the treaty of 1854, an act "to encourage emigration from the United States to Canada and to encourage production in Canada instead of the United States."

It is not reciprocal. You do violence to the term to call it so. It is in direct contravention of the express declaration of our last Republican national platform, that we are in favor of a protection that will measure the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad. It is a repudiation of the principle and purpose of the Tariff Board, whose findings are ignored. It is repugnant to the spirit of our institutions which demands that legislation should be applicable and equitable to all classes alike.

Mr. Chairman, mindful of the interests of the people whom I have the honor to represent, and as well the interests of all the people of our country, I can not give my sanction to this measure. [Loud applause.]

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS].

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, the attacks of the Republican dissidents, upon the reciprocity pact, recoil upon their own heads. This is neither a Democratic concept, nor the outcome of a Democratic conference, but is the favorite child of a Republican Executive, who has assembled the Congress in an extraordinary session, in order that a Republican Senate may have another opportunity to put itself in line with the action of the last Republican House. If this agreement is an attack upon the citadel of protection, it is an attack conceived and delivered by the leader of the Republican Party, the man who was elected amid the hurrahs of the standpatters, and the enthusiastic acclaim of the tariff barons.

This measure is not a measure of free trade, unless our Republican friends are willing to admit that their President has become a free trader. The frenzied standpatters assert that reciprocity is a spear thrust into the vitals of protection. If so, go further, and charge that the titular head of your organization is a traitor to the chief tenet of your party faith. This measure is not a cunningly contrived attack upon prosperity, unless such a criticism can be justly directed against the recommendation of a Republican President, who was elected for the alleged purpose of conserving prosperity against the machinations of Democratic conspirators, fatally bent on mischief. So at least, we were informed by various Republican spellbinders, patriotically engaged in saving the country, in the Bryan-Taft campaign of 1908.

If this is free trade, it is Republican free trade, for the President approves it, and insists that his party followers shall indorse his attitude.

If this pact imperils the interests of the farmers, as asserted by its stand-pat opponents, ascribe the responsibility to a Republican administration, and to the Republican Executive who negotiated the agreement with Canada.

Truly Canadian reciprocity is a pent-up Utica, which confines the vituperative powers of our Republican friends within the narrow limits of a temperate, and chastened criticism. It is well that it is a product of Republican statesmanship, and is stamped with the stamp of Executive approbation. Otherwise a copious flow of barbed invective, and bitter vituperation, would be directed against its authors. I sympathize with my Republican friends. They have long misrepresented the Democratic attitude on the tariff, and in terms of general denunciation, assailed every suggestion of tariff reduction, or reciprocal trade, as a menace to prosperity, thus avoiding any discussion of policies on their merits, and befogging the public mind to such an extent, that many sincere and serious Americans have earnestly believed, that in some mysterious and inexplicable, but sufficient fashion, the Republican Party, through its attitude on the tariff, was the country's rock of defense against the economic heresies of the Democrats. But at last, the party of protection, as it is fond of acclaiming itself, is confronted with a dread and awful dilemma. Reciprocity is a measure of tariff reduction. If they approve this pact, and accept this reduction, and the change works well, then they will be plagued by schemes of further reduction. But if they reject the reciprocity pact, or amend it so as to compass its defeat, then they reject and flout their President, who was elected to afford a safe and sane administration, and to furnish policies that would be enthusiastically approved, and blindly followed. Unhappy followers! Unhappy leader! Approve his policies, and you discredit yourselves. Discredit his policies, and you discredit your leader.

If this bill is treason to your party, your President is the traitor. He has inaugurated this movement, nay, pressed it upon the country with superlative vigor, and incredible pertinacity. Your plight is pitiable, your predicament distressing. At last the mills of retribution are grinding you, and the grinding is exceeding fine. But sharper than a serpent's tooth, is the reflection that the author of this measure which you so bitterly assail, is not some wild-eyed Democrat, but one of your household and party faith, your own familiar friend, whom you profess to admire as a man, but reject as a leader. Others before you have been the authors of their own misfortunes, and in the bitterness of your present reflections, prostrate under the stroke directed by the President whom you aided to elevate to his high position, perchance you may recall the lines:

> So the struck eagle, stretched upon the plain,
> No more through rolling clouds, to soar again,
> Viewed his own feather on the fatal dart,
> And winged the shaft, that quivered in his heart:
> Keen were his pangs, but keener far to feel,
> He nursed the pinion, that impelled the steel:
> While the same plumage that had warmed his nest,
> Drank the last life-drop, from his bleeding breast.

I have said that this is a Republican, not a Democratic proposition. The statement is correct. From the first to the last word, it was conceived in secret conference between President Taft, and his party advisers, on the one hand, and the representatives of Canada on the other. In its final form, the President sent it to Congress with his emphatic imprimatur. He has never disowned his child. On the contrary he is proud of its paternity. Some of the Republican standpatters, the Old Guard, which is now engaged in dying, as a preferable alternative to surrender, are seeking to repudiate reciprocity. Vain task! The Republican Party is a house divided against itself. It must fall. On the one hand, ex-Speaker CANNON, Mr. DALZELL, Mr. FORDNEY and their following, representative, as they claim, of Republicanism pure and undefiled, are vociferating against the bill as un-Republican, and un-American. But in its defense is found the President, the balance wheel of the Republican organization, the man to whom the trusts turned in their extremity two years ago, as a sane and safe leader, the antithesis, in all respects, of his predecessor. Standing with him, are our friends, HILL of Connecticut, MCCALL of Massachusetts, and many others, all sturdy Republicans, who unite in saying that if the terms of this agreement are enacted into law—

> It will be in full accord with the practices of the Republican Party in the past, and with the provisions of the national Republican platform at the present time.

So that whatever this reciprocity pact may be, we must view it as a proposition of purely Republican antecedents, which challenges attention, and invokes consideration on its merits. If on the whole, it is mischievous and dangerous, it should be rejected.

But it should be given a respectful hearing, and President Taft and his followers should be afforded the opportunity to make good, in the forum of free discussion. The parentage of the measure compels the standpatters to exercise a repression of utterance which must be most painful to them. To that extent it is a restraint upon free speech. Criticism of its alleged demerits, have come, and will continue to come, from standpat speakers, but they have been, and will be, remarkable for their moderation. A reproduction of what these gentlemen would like to say, if unrestrained by the exigencies of the situation, would be interesting, if lurid reading.

But the embarrassment of our friends, is the opportunity of the Democrats. Tariff reduction, in concrete form, when urged by Democrats, is one thing. Tariff reduction in the guise of reciprocity, urged by the President, is quite another and different thing, in respect of the treatment that it will receive from the standpatters and the country. The one may be whistled down the winds by interested partisans, or dismissed with contemptuous comment as merely another illustration of Democratic vagaries, but the other compels the whole tribe to sit up, and take notice. The cry of wolf will no longer serve. They must produce the wolf. In this time of popular discontent with the present conditions, the President has been quick to perceive that the old-fashioned shibboleths of the Republican Party, will no longer suffice to carry his party to victory. If it is vain to say peace, when there is no peace, and war is flagrant, it is equally vain for the standpatters to seek to stay the growing movement for cheaper living, within the Republican Party, by vociferous claims that all is well in the land. For years the standpatters have pursued the attitude of misrepresenting their political adversaries, and terrifying a timid public, by clamorously asserting that the policies of our party threatened disaster. But it is not so easy to apply this rough and ready method to the recommendations of the President. If his suggested policies spell danger to the national welfare, his opponents must point out that danger by sufficient, and dispassionate analysis of his recommendations. As against attacks from the members of his own household, the President is in a position to enter a general denial, and call for proofs. In this attitude he will be supported by the country.

Now for the evidence of record, to determine who is responsible for the reciprocity pact. In his annual message of December 6, 1910, and in his special message of later date, President Taft writes as follows:

> By my direction the Secretary of State, dispatched two representatives of the Department of State to Ottawa, to confer with representatives of the Dominion Government. These commissioners were authorized to take steps to formulate a reciprocal trade agreement, and the Ottawa conferences thus begun, were adjourned, and resumed later in Washington. In the month of January two cabinet ministers came to Washington, as representatives of the Dominion Government, and the conferences were continued between them, and the Secretary of State. The result of the negotiations was, that on January 21, a reciprocal trade agreement was reached, the text of which is herewith transmitted, with accompanying correspondence, and other data.

So much for the genesis and responsibility for this famous agreement. Many reckless statements, and much misleading matter have been made, and circulated by interested parties as

to the effect of this agreement. Hence the confusion in a portion of the public mind, which does not discriminate between trade with the people of Canada, a like people, living in a like climate to ours, under substantially similar conditions, and free trade with the world. What does the President say in this connection:

It is known of all men that the general conditions that prevail in Canada, are the same as those which obtain in the United States in the matter of agricultural products. It is said that reciprocity will injure the farmers. I deny it.

A man who has anything to sell, is on the lookout for a good customer. The United States has many things to sell. She is seeking markets, and customers the world over. Our neighbor of the snows is a prosperous, progressive, wide-awake, Anglo-Saxon country. She has many things to sell that we need. This country has many things that we desire Canada to buy. Under these conditions a rapprochement between the two countries was inevitable, looking to the establishment of mutually profitable commercial arrangements. In this connection, the President says:

A reciprocal trade agreement is a logical sequence of all that has been accomplished in disposing of matters of a diplomatic, and controversial character. The identity of interests of two peoples, linked together by race, language, political institutions, and geographical proximity, offers the foundation. The guiding motive in seeking adjustment of trade relations between two countries so situated geographically, should be to give play to productive forces as far as practicable, regardless of political boundaries. No yardstick can measure the benefits to the two peoples, of this commercial intercourse. We have reached a stage in our development, that calls for a broad and statesmanlike view of our future economic status, and its requirements. Excluding cotton, which is exceptional, a radical change is already shown in our exports, in the falling off of the amount of our agricultural products sold abroad. A far-sighted policy, requires that if we can enlarge the supply of our natural resources, and especially of food products, and necessities of life, without substantial injury to any of our producing, and manufacturing classes, we should take steps to do so now. We have on the north of us a country contiguous to ours for 3,000 miles, with natural resources of the same character as ours, and in the development of which, the conditions as to wages, and the character of the wage earner, and transportation to market, differ but little from those prevailing with us.

This is a calm and dispassionate statement of essential facts, and it is difficult for the alarmist to find a just occasion of terror in these recitals.

Another citation from the message will be of interest, in view of the fact, that the Republicans who are fighting the policy of their own President, are seeking to place the reciprocity pact before the country in a false light, boldly asserting that it commits this country to universal free trade. Nothing of the sort. It is that form of reciprocal trade, limited to the contracting countries, which both the Democratic and Republican Parties have favored. This pact is not a world-wide policy, but a limited arrangement with a neighbor. If it proves to be mutually profitable, it will be continued, as it ought to be, but if, on the contrary, it proves hurtful to any form of American industry, or destructive to our prosperity, the remedy is in our own hands. We can withdraw from the arrangement at any time, without even consulting the other party to the agreement. The contract is not effectual until it receives the assent of both parties, but either party can compel a new adjustment at any time, by rescinding its approving action.

The plight of the standpatters is both ludicrous, and pitiable. Every argument which they direct against the agreement, is a covert attack on the President. If it is supposed to menace our prosperity, the President is convicted of leading the attack. If it is free trade, then the President is a free trader. If it is an attack upon the principle of protection, then the President is the man behind the gun. If the people are being misled, then the Republican President is misleading them. If the people are following a false light, it is a light in the hand of the Republican leader. If the Republican Party is being wrecked, as the standpatters allege, the President is on the job, as the wrecker. So much for the predicament of the standpatters, who, like the demoniacs of the Scriptures, are ready to rend themselves with rage, at the plight in which they find themselves. But listen to the President, in defense of his recommendation.

This 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. The Dominion has greatly prospered. It has an active, aggressive and intelligent people. They are coming to the parting of the ways. They must decide soon, whether they are to regard themselves as permanently isolated from our markets, by a perpetual wall, or whether we are to be commercial friends. Both countries in their industrial development, have to meet the competition of lower-priced labor in other parts of the world. Both follow the policy of encouraging the development of home industries, by protective duties within reasonable limits.

But the President is not content to point out the advantages in general, of the agreement which he negotiated. He proceeds to point out the advantage to the farmers:—

The benefit to our widespread agricultural implement industry, from the reduction of Canadian duties in the agreement, is clear. My purpose in making a reciprocal trade agreement with Canada, has been, not only to obtain one, which would be mutually advantageous to both countries, but one which also would be truly national in its scope, as applied to our own country, and of benefit to all sections. The imports of Canada in 1910, were $376,000,000, of which amount the United States contributed more than $223,000,000. The reduction in the duties imposed by Canada, will largely increase this amount, and give us an even larger share of her market than we now enjoy. We have secured free entry into Canada for the cottonseed oil of the South, a most important product, with a rapidly expanding consumption in the Dominion. This agreement with Canada, will extend the market for numerous products of the United States, among the inhabitants of a prosperous neighboring country, with an increasing population, and an increasing purchasing power. I therefore, earnestly hope that this measure will be promptly enacted into law.

So much for the message of the President, which is proper to be reproduced in part in this connection. As the man on trial, at the hands of his one-time party friends, he ought to be heard in his own defense. But a Democrat can defend his own attitude toward this measure, without regard to the merry war between the President, and his party. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], who stoutly opposes reciprocity, avers that he would like to see the President demonstrate his case. Well, in the opinion of some at least, the reasoning of the President, as contained in his message, may be fairly set against all the railing accusations that have been brought against his favorite measure, by his quondam followers.

What is reciprocity? Merely an agreement between two countries, to modify their imposts, so as to enlarge a mutually profitable trade. The Canadian duties operate against our products, when sold in Canada. Our tariff operates against Canadian products, when sold on this side of the line. We sell much more largely to Canada, than Canada sells to us. The balance is altogether in our favor. Hence, an enlargement of our trade will increase our balance. Does that spell danger to the United States? Our profit is in that balance. Increase that balance, and you increase our profit.

In the last five years we have bought from Canada goods to the extent of $393,913,673, while we have sold her goods amounting to $886,417,376. Difference in our favor is $492,503,703. Canada is a good customer. It is to our interest to make her a better one. In a nutshell, that is the purpose of this reciprocal agreement. The most frenzied opponent of reciprocity, is the Paper Trust. Most of the misleading statements and specious objections to the measure, can be traced to this source.

Reciprocity would give this country cheaper paper, a matter in which we are intensely interested, for there is hardly a family which does not take a newspaper. Owing to the great advance in the price of the paper on which their issues are printed, the newspapers found themselves in a dilemma from which there were only two exits, one was to secure cheaper paper over the head of the Paper Trust, the other was to submit to its exactions, and raise their subscription rates. It is not difficult to see that the interests of the great newspaper-reading public are on the side of cheaper paper. Not daring to come into the open, and confess the selfish reason for its opposition to reciprocity, the Paper Trust, which controls the prices for plain paper, writing paper, news paper, school books, et cetera, puts its opposition to the measure, on the pretended ground of its interest in the farmers. Let the farmers be of good cheer. They are not interested in preserving the monopoly of this great corporation. On the contrary, the real leaders of the Republican Party have been forced to recognize that the combinations and trusts have exacted unreasonable profits from the consumers. In the latter class, all farmers of every character, large and small, are included. To illustrate:

As far back as August 20, 1910, President Taft saw the handwriting on the wall, indicating the public dissatisfaction with the stand-pat attitude of his party. In his famous Beverly letter he admitted that this dissatisfaction was well founded, and that the interests had oppressed the consumers. He wrote as follows:

The excess of tariff was not regarded as objectionable, because it was supposed that competition between those who enjoyed the high protection would keep the price to the consumer down to what was reasonable, for the manufacturer. The evil of excessive tariff rates, however, showed itself, in the temptation to manufacturers to combine, and suppress competition, and then to maintain prices, so as to take advantage of the excess tariff rate.

Speaking to the farmers, at the National Corn Exposition, at Columbus, Ohio, on February 10, 1911, the President said:

I am a Republican, and the Republican Party has always advocated, and pursued the policy of protection to American products, and manufactures. For a long time that policy had little, or no limitation. It was thought that tariffs on protected products could not be too high,

and that if all foreign products were excluded, competition would stimulate production, and reduce its cost, and its price. The temptation to destroy competition by combinations became so great, however, that the party in its platform modified its policy.

Again on February 11, 1911, speaking at Springfield before the General Assembly of Illinois, the President repeated his statement to the effect that an excessive tariff had bred monopolies and trusts, to the prejudice of the general public. The main thought of the Columbus speech is presented in slightly different phraseology as follows:

There was a time when leading Republicans thought there was no danger in having a tariff higher than necessary to protect an industry.

The Democrats have never entertained this economic heresy, so, having nothing to recant, they welcome the President as a convert to the truth which, in time, will make him free. Proceeding, the President declared that—

it was thought—

By the Republicans only, I may say—

that if the country was made dependent on manufactures, behind the tariff wall, the competition between the manufacturers would stimulate the reduction in the cost of production, and thus reduce the cost of the product.

Not at all. The Democrats have always insisted, that once given control of the situation, the trusts would not put their prices at the lowest figures consistent with a reasonable profit, but on the contrary would fix those prices at the very highest level that the trade would carry. This has been the result in the case of every product controlled by a trust. In buying, they fix the price without competition, at the lowest figure that will keep the producer going, for they are careful not to put him out of business, though in the case of the burley tobacco raisers, they almost accomplished this result. In selling, they are equally the masters of the situation, for there is no one to say them nay. At last the abuses which others have long since perceived, have opened the eyes of the President, for at Springfield, as at Columbus, he concluded by saying:

The temptation to combine, by which the prices could be controlled, and thus the excessive tariff taken advantage of, has led to a modification of the protection theory.

I have been careful to reproduce these statements of the President, for they indicate an interesting evolution of attitude, in the case of one Republican, at least. As a Democrat, I am tempted to say to him and to all like him, who at last have seen the light: "I told you so." In the theory of the standpatter, the rule of the trusts is a benevolent despotism. The fundamental theory of Democracy is opposed to despotisms, benevolent or otherwise. No combination of capital, large enough to control the market, may be trusted to handle such a situation with an eye single to the public interests.

Such an anticipation is inconsistent with our knowledge of, and experience with, the selfishness of human nature. Hence the Democrats have always insisted, that the interests of the consumer must be secured, either through the control of the trusts by the Government, or by the application of domestic, or foreign competition to the situation. No Democrat, no matter what his political adversaries may say, would knowingly support any policy that would bank the fires of a single furnace, or interrupt the musical whir of the spindles, in a single factory. If a great trust, like the Paper Trust, insists that it is entitled to control the market, and fix the prices of its product to secure a reasonable profit, the consumers who pay those prices, are entitled to a look in upon its books, in order that it may ascertain what the trust calls a reasonable profit. Failing to secure this inspection, it may well conclude that the profit is unreasonable, and go elsewhere for a cheaper product. This is what reciprocity proposes to do, to give us cheaper paper, and cheaper agricultural implements, and cheaper many other things, at the same time increasing the profits of our commerce with Canada, by enlarging the markets for our products in that country. The suggestion that Canadian wheat, or hay, or sheep, or horses, will flood this country, and depress the home market is absurd. We sell Canada more cattle than she sells us. We sell Canada six times as many horses, as she sells us. We sell her 17 times as much meat, and dairy products, as she sells us. We sell her almost five times as much breadstuffs, as she sells us. The danger from Canadian sheep is even more remote. Canada specializes on them, and raises only a comparatively small quantity of high-grade stock. The price of sheep in the United States runs from $2.90 a head, to $5.30, while in Canada the price runs from $4 to $7. We need the sheep of that country to cross with our sheep, and produce a better grade of domestic animals. The Government statistics to support the assertions which I have made, are as follows, for the last five years:

Horses:	
Sold to Canada	$14,172,075
Bought from Canada	2,549,201
Cattle:	
Sold to Canada	1,578,179
Bought from Canada	1,193,796
Meat and dairy:	
Sold to Canada	17,011,017
Bought from Canada	904,191
Breadstuffs:	
Sold to Canada	31,596,556
Bought from Canada	6,678,884

Now if these are the figures of our trade with the present restrictions on our intercourse, it is perfectly plain that with the impediments removed, this trade will be enormously increased in the existing ratio, which is altogether in our favor. This trade is either desirable, or undesirable, either to our advantage, or to our disadvantage. If it is the latter, then shut it out by erecting the tariff wall favored by the gentleman from Michigan, which has no top, save the blue vault of heaven. But if it is the former, should a Democrat be criticized for favoring a policy which will enlarge our commercial intercourse with a friendly country, a policy which has received the distinct approbation of both the Democratic, and Republican Parties. In the Democratic platform of 1892, it is declared that:

Trade interchange on the basis of reciprocal advantage to the countries participating, is a time-honored doctrine of the Democratic faith.

In the Republican platform of 1892, we find our friends pointing with pride to—

the success of the Republican policy of reciprocity, under which our export trade has increased, and new and enlarged markets opened for the products of our farmers, and workshops.

We are not without the lamp of experience in this matter. Reciprocity has been tried out, under a former treaty with Canada, under conditions that in all respects parallel those of the present time. In addition the treaty of 1854 was, if anything, more far-reaching in its provisions, than the agreement negotiated by the President. Under the beneficial operation of that treaty there was an enormous increase of profitable traffic between this country and Canada. But for the intervention of the Civil War, and the temporary friction which it caused between this country and Great Britain, the treaty of 1854 would not have been repealed. As it was, its repeal was justly regarded as a public calamity. The continuous pressure of public opinion favorable to its restoration, is the impelling cause of the present agreement. After the fashion of the cuttle fish, the standpatters have ejected so much obscuring matter into the waters of this controversy, that at times we lose sight of the main proposition, which is to build up, not destroy, our prosperity by the simple and familiar process, of expanding our commerce, and enlarging our markets, through a reciprocal commercial agreement. Commerce and prosperity have gone hand in hand from the time of King Solomon, who sent his fleets and caravans to the uttermost parts of the known world, and by this wise policy raised his country to an unexampled pitch of glory, and riches.

But we should not limit our contemplation to the consideration of the pending measure, though technically it is the only one before us. The companion bill to this measure, admits free of duty, agricultural implements, sewing machines, fence wire, and many other products of daily consumption on the farm. This bill will afford the standpatters an opportunity to illustrate the sincerity of their attitude, in seeking to amend the present bill. If they favor the principle of their amendments, they will soon be afforded an opportunity to square their professions, by their acts. On many articles of essential interest to the farmers, the present tariff is prohibitive, or so nearly so, that the revenue raised is negligible. This situation has resulted in the formation of those rapacious trusts, whose sinister operations finally opened the eyes of President Taft to the mischief of their existence in the body politic. Prominent among these combinations is the trust in agricultural implements, which dominates the whole domestic market. For a number of years this combination has sold many of its products in foreign countries, at a lower price than at home, and impudently justified this practice, to the agricultural associations that protested against its obvious unfairness. Agricultural implements of every kind are placed on the free list in the companion bill—

in order to remove, or prevent, any possible discrimination against our farmers in the prices of these necessary articles, and to place them on an equal footing with their competitors elsewhere in the world. Our domestic manufactures of agricultural implements, tools, and vehicles, have grown to great proportions, and are largely organized into great trusts, and combinations. These organizations are selling their products all over the world, meeting and overcoming all opposition. They need no protection. Our imports of agricultural implements are insignificant. The value of all such imports, free and dutiable, amounted to $122,302

in 1910. The export of these implements has become a matter of more importance, than the domestic trade, the figures indicating an increase from $3,859,184, in 1890, to $28,124,033, in 1910.

Another item of great value to the cotton farmers of the South, is bagging, and bailing materials controlled by the "Bagging Trust." These materials are placed on the free list. The Payne-Aldrich bill, put hides on the free list, for the benefit of the leather industries, particularly the tanners. Leather boots, shoes, harness and saddlery are put on the free list in the companion bill, for the benefit of the farmers, and the consumers generally. The sewing machine is a machine of universal necessity. The American consumer is entitled to a price on these machines, as favorable as that given to foreigners. Sewing machines can be made here as cheaply, as in any quarter of the globe, but for years it has been a notorious fact, that the concerns making these machines in the United States, have sold them at lower prices to foreigners, than to the domestic consumer. These machines have been properly placed on the free list. The passage of this bill, as a companion measure to the reciprocity pact, will mark a long step forward in the battle of the people, with the special interests. The long lane of Republican triumphs, had a sudden turn in the election of last fall. That election was an upheaval, a cataclysm, that shook from place and power many men who constituted a reactionary element in public life, men who had heard, but had not heeded, the voice of the people during the sessions of the Sixty-first Congress. It has brought into this Chamber many new faces, and much young and aggressive blood, consecrated to the uplift of the men and women who by the way of bitter travail, produce the wealth of this country. The Democratic Party in the present House, has already made good, and by its initial acts, justified the hopes of its supporters, and brought confusion to its adversaries. The time is at hand when the obscuring mists will roll away from the political skies, and the party of Jefferson, and of Jackson will come into its own again, as a controlling force in national affairs. That time will be the dawning of the morning, of a more glorious day of greater opportunity, and more abounding prosperity.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask now that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL] will consume some of his time.

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOWLAND]. [Applause.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all gentlemen who speak on this subject may have the right to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say to the gentleman that that is a motion that can not be put in committee. The House only can give such leave. In committee leave to extend may be given only to separate gentlemen.

Mr. DALZELL. The Chair is right, and I was in error about that.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask that that right be granted for myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. PICKETT] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CANNON. But, Mr. Chairman, wherein is that competent in Committee of the Whole, and not competent to apply to more than one?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman that there are a number of precedents, running over a series of years, that a Committee of the Whole can grant leave only upon the individual request of Members, whereas the House can grant general leave.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to be allowed the privilege of revising my remarks and extending them in spots where necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HAMILTON] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HOWLAND. I trust, Mr. Chairman, that this time will not be taken out of my allotment. It is suggested to me that it is now an opportune time to ask leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HOWLAND. Now, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request—that I may be allowed to extend the remarks I have made in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] makes the same request. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. HOWLAND. Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding the fervid rhetoric to which we have listened to-day, I propose to give my cordial support to the pending bill. [Applause.]

I do not know whether my action in this respect will meet with the approval of my constituents or not, but I am absolutely satisfied that that action is eternally and everlastingly right, and on that ground I take my stand. [Applause.]

Every discussion that has come up which touches on the question of reciprocal agreements has always aroused on this floor the bitterest antagonism. This antagonism was encountered at the time of the adoption of the Hawaiian treaty. The same fight was had over the Cuban differential. Members became hysterical, and charged that ruin stared our industries in the face. But those storms came and passed away, and we proceeded serenely on our career of prosperity.

Every piece of progressive legislation, every departure from the beaten path always meets with bitter opposition.

It is indeed interesting, when these questions arise, to note the alignment and the position taken by Members upon the floor and their attitude upon these questions.

I was indeed interested yesterday as I listened to the labored and strained effort of the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] in the long apology which he presented to the House and to the country for his position on this bill. No measure presented to the Congress by the Administration has ever received anything at his hands but carping criticism. The reason is perfectly patent to those who are familiar with political conditions. No man inveighed more severely against the Payne-Aldrich bill and its iniquities than the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin. He pleaded for the common people—oh, how he loved the dear common people!—and told about the iniquitous prohibitive tariffs in the Payne-Aldrich bill. He told what he would do for the common people if he got a chance to vote for lower duties on the necessities of life. Now that chance is presented to him to do the very thing he was talking about then, and he takes an hour to tell the country why he does not propose to do it. No one has advocated more earnestly the conservation of our natural resources, yet when in the pending bill the natural resources of all Canada are offered us and we are to be permitted access to the mineral and forest wealth of half a continent, the gentleman from Wisconsin proposes to vote against it.

It is easy to stand up on the floor and name yourself a progressive Republican. I claim that privilege, reserving the right of writing my own definition; but when the Payne-Aldrich bill was before the House, with its maximum and minimum provisions, with its enlarged free list, with many lowered duties, with its corporation tax, and improved administrative features, he voted against that bill, and thereby voted to continue the higher duties of the Dingley bill in force; and now, when the opportunity is presented to the gentleman to vote for free food products and lower duties on many manufactured articles, he proposes to vote in favor of continuing those duties on foodstuffs in force as they are in the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill. Oh, progress! The gentleman from Wisconsin stands with his face toward the rising sun and marches steadily backward toward the camp of the reactionaries and standpatters; and as I listened to the sinuous, devious argument of the gentleman from Wisconsin I was reminded—I say it all in good nature—of that old couplet, which runs something like this:

It wiggled in, it wiggled out,
And left the people all in doubt,
Whether the bird that made the track
Was going north or coming back.

[Laughter.]

I listened with a great deal of pleasure to the distinguished gentleman from Maine [Mr. HINDS], and I give my most cordial indorsement to the brilliant tribute which he paid to the yeomanry of our country. Yes, the home on the farm is an institution and not a factory; but, Mr. Chairman, there are millions of homes of wage earners and salaried men in this country that are just as much institutions as the home on the farm. And it makes no difference, sir, whether that home is included within the four narrow, bare walls of a tenement house in the great city, it incloses all that is dear to the hopes and aspirations of the human soul; and while I speak for the yeomanry of my country, in my legislative action I shall not limit it to the consideration of any particular class. If I believed that this legislation would sacrifice or damage the farmers of my country I would not give it my support. Neither would I give it my support if I believed it would injure any class of citizens in this country. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, it is very true that the home on the farm is an institution, and when hard times come the farmer can not sell his produce; but the gaunt wolf of hunger never looks in at his window. But when dividends stop and the factory shuts down and the pay envelope does not come around, the wage earner must starve or steal.

Oh, some gentlemen are unduly exercised upon this subject of the agricultural interests. Why, from Nova Scotia, from New Brunswick to British Columbia, there is one long wail going up from the Canadian agriculturists, protesting against the enactment of this law by the Canadian Parliament, on the ground that it will destroy the agricultural interests of Canada. The distinguished gentleman from Maine [Mr. HINDS] called attention to the fact that the legislative assembly of New Brunswick had passed a resolution against the adoption by the Canadian Parliament of this reciprocity agreement. And a peculiar manifestation developed here yesterday. A long telegraphic communication was received here on the floor and put in the RECORD by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER]. It was a copy of a statute that had just been passed by the legislative assembly of New Brunswick. It strikes me we are in pretty close connection with the provincial legislative assembly of New Brunswick to get telegraphic communications here immediately of adverse legislation of foreign Governments.

Is the parliament of the Canadian Province of New Brunswick, which is bitterly opposed to the ratification of the pending bill in the Dominion Parliament at Ottawa, attempting to play big politics with the Congress of the United States by passing a law the effect of which would be to irritate the American people and have a tendency to defeat this legislation? I ask the question.

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

Mr. HOWLAND. I have declined to yield, but under the circumstances I think I ought to.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I want to assure the gentleman from Ohio that I am not a secret agent of New Brunswick.

Mr. HOWLAND. I will relieve the gentleman from the necessity of defending himself against that imputation. I did not intend to cast any imputation upon anyone. The gentleman was merely the agency through which the telegram was put in the RECORD. The fact that the parliament of New Brunswick is adverse to this legislation suggested the thought that they might think it would help to defeat the reciprocity bill in the Congress of the United States if they passed a law to which we would naturally take exception.

Mr. Chairman, it might be interesting, after all the eulogies which have been paid and all the tears that have been shed in behalf of the agricultural interests in this country by gentlemen representing agricultural constituencies—and I represent one myself—to take up just briefly and read a few extracts from the debate in the House of Commons at Ottawa on this subject:

DEBATES IN HOUSE OF COMMONS.

[Mr. W. W. German (Welland), March 2, 1911, column 4582.]

It is said that the farmers will be benefited. So far as the county of Welland is concerned, there are two townships in the county which grow quantities of fruit, but they also grow large quantities of ordinary farm products, and it may be said that the people of the county are almost exclusively a farming community. In 1891 the farmers of that county were anxious to get into the Buffalo market, but in view of the home market we have established since then, they are not now so anxious. I doubt very much, sir, if the farmers of my county or any other county in Canada will be very considerably benefited, if benefited at all, by this agreement. Why, sir, the whole argument of the statesmen of the United States in favor of this proposition is that it will decrease the cost of living in the United States; and how, in the name of all that is sensible, is it going to decrease the cost of living in the United States and at the same time give a higher price to our farmers for their farm products? I certainly can not reconcile these two things. But I do not think it will give any considerable benefit to the farmers of this country, and even if it did give them some small benefit, I think that benefit may be obtained at a cost too high for the general welfare of this country. Now, sir, let me say that in my own county there is at least one-third of it (comprising the townships bordering on the Niagara River) contiguous to the Buffalo market. The Buffalo market would be a natural market for the agriculturists there, and they might in some instances get a higher price for their commodities on the Buffalo market, and it might be more convenient for them than to go to the town of Welland, where they would get nearly the same price.

But, sir, what would happen—the same vehicles that carry the Canadian farm products to the Buffalo market for sale will bring back from Buffalo the merchandise required by the farmers to carry on their farming operations, and which will be purchased from the United States merchants. It has already been said what the effect will be, and I believe it, that British Columbia will trade with the Pacific Coast States, that the western Provinces will trade with the States to the south of them, and so on from the Pacific to the Atlantic, our people will be trading with the American people north and south, instead of trading east and west, among themselves.

[Mr. Broder, Apr. 5, 1911. Column 6877.]

What effect is this treaty to have on the interests of the farmer? After all, it is the cold question of business. There are localities in the country which it will no doubt help. It will help the country in spots. How is the farmer in Ontario to be affected? It will affect four large industries adversely—the hog market, the horse market, the egg market, and the apple market. These are four principal products of Ontario and Quebec. There are others, but these I will deal with. Why do I say that it will affect the hog market? There are in the United States 49,000,000 hogs, and there are something less than 3,000,000 in Canada. That is 16 to 1, and it is worse than Bryan's. I intend to make a comparison of the average price for five years in Montreal and Chicago. Some people take Buffalo, but it is not a center, compared with Chicago, which is the principal center for hogs. Here are the yearly average prices of the hogs for five years in Montreal and Chicago:

Years.	Chicago.	Montreal.
1906	$6.20	$7.77
1907	6.10	7.43
1908	5.70	7.10
1909	7.35	8.64
1910	8.90	9.60
Average for the five years	6.85	8.10

What about horses? There are 21,000,000 horses in the United States. There are 12 States lying along either side of the Mississippi River which are adjacent to our western country, and in those 12 States, one-quarter of the whole United States in number, you find 11,600,000 horses. Does any one pretend to say that our western market, which is our best market for heavy horses, will not be supplied from those States? In the first place their horses are more easily got into the market, and with less risk to the buyer. What is the average price given to the American farmer—$108.19 on the farm, old and young and all. Again, the American authority gives the average of the Canadian horses on the farm at $133, almost $25 difference in favor of the Canadian.

I will now quote from the remarks of the Hon. George E. Foster in the Canadian House of Commons on February 9, 1911, and I commend the attention of the House to this line of argument:

In the United States what was the condition of things? A high tariff from time immemorial, growing higher through the Dingley bill and the McKinley bill and at last coming to a height of 45 per cent on an average on dutiable goods; against that a revolt broke out, a campaign was waged, and the slogan of the campaign in the Republican Party was a downward revision of the tariff in the United States. The Republican Party promised it; they were elected; they brought down their measure and the Payne-Aldrich bill ended not in any downward revision that was worth mentioning. What happened? They were defeated in the country. The insurgent force that swept the Republican Party out of power was pledged to downward revision. It was known by all men that the coming Congress would deal with that matter and it was known that they would deal with it in the line of taking off and diminishing duties especially on foodstuffs and natural resources. Canada would have secured these markets anyway, without reciprocity and without giving up her own.

It sounds to me, in view of the well-known attitude of the Democratic majority here, as though there might be some force in an argument of that kind addressed to the Canadian Parliament. I quote now from the remarks of Hon. Mr. Borden, of Halifax, leader of the opposition, on February 9, 1911, where he presents an argument about the money expended by Canada in building her railway transportation system from East to West, running into something like $700,000,000, and he continues:

We know how immensely important forests are to this country. Important not only in respect to their values as timber, but in their relation to the great waterway systems of this country. Important to the people of this country in every sense, and when we observe that the President of the United States over and over again directs the attention of Congress to the importance of giving to the people of the United States access to the forests of Canada, in order that their own may be preserved, surely that suggestion in that argument affords ample room for thought to the people of this country as to whether or not they should accept these proposals.

Hon E. D. Monk, on February 9, 1911, said in opposing ratification of treaty because "it tends to invade our forest wealth and other natural resources:

"We have constituted a commission of conservation. We have spent a great amount of time in the study of those resources and the means of conserving them, and we have just had a meeting at which it has been made apparent that we must change our course and in the future bring to the conservation of those great natural resources all that care which has been found wanting in other countries and which is necessary to prevent the waste of what constitutes the real strength of a nation."

Second argument—

"The tendency of the reciprocal agreement is admittedly to make our trade north and south, after they have been working 20 years to get lines of transportation east and west."

Mr. Foster, on February 14, 1911, further said:

What else have you done? You have reduced the meat duties. You have reduced the preserved and cured meat duties. In the northwest Provinces millions of dollars worth of these cured products have been going and a large trade has been carried on during the last seven years. Under this arrangement, if it comes into force, the northwest Provinces will be supplied absolutely from the packing establishments of Chicago, Milwaukee, and the near-by places in the United States. You take

away from the packing industry of this country a part, and a valuable part, of its local market, the domestic market in the northwest, and you transfer it to the United States market.

Mr. Martin Burrell, on February 14, 1911, 3656 et seq., protests bitterly against the agreement as ruinous to fruit growers and market gardeners.

Mr. J. E. Armstrong, on February 16, 1911, said:

My good friend from Prince Edward Island spoke of the wonderful advantages the people of Canada would have in farm and dairy products by this arrangement. Does he know that we imported into Canada from the United States last year $52,597 worth of poultry and exported only $3,526 to the United States; imports of potatoes $213,554, exports to United States $36,770; imported $177,577 worth of eggs and exported to the United States $12,596; that 6,604 horses came in from the United States and we sent them 2,615?

He continues the argument and takes a strong stand against the treaty as injurious to farming interests on the ground that the United States is a great exporter to Canada.

Mr. Lemieux, on February 21, 1911, said:

We are told by my honorable friend (Mr. Sproul) that it is a one-sided agreement, but we also have one of the highest protectionists on this continent, Mr. JOE CANNON—Uncle Joe—prominent in American public life, who objects to this agreement because it is one-sided. It is, indeed, strange to find protectionists on both sides of the line agreeing that it is a one-sided agreement to the prejudice of each.

[Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, judging from the anxiety of our Canadian friends, I think our friends, the agricultural interests on this side of the line, as I said before, are unduly alarmed. The distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. PICKETT] referred at some length to the old treaty which was in force, and I have been surprised in the course of this discussion, when it is claimed that this legislation will ruin the prosperity of our farmers, that we have not been referred to the ruin and privation that fell upon them during the 11 or 12 years that the treaty was in force. But no; no such figures have been presented, and no such figures can be presented, for everyone who has investigated that situation knows that during the time that that treaty was in force agriculture flourished as it never had flourished before in this country, and I say, without fear of successful contradiction, that if it had not been for the sympathy which the Canadian people manifested for the Southern Confederacy during the Civil War that treaty never would have been abrogated. No one would ever have conceived the idea of abrogating that treaty.

Oh, you can cite extracts in the discussion by partisan men in the Congress, made up entirely of Republicans just returned from the bitter conflicts, ready to take action in any direction where some hostile influence existed; but I want to cite as authority for the position which I have taken Mr. Stanwood, in his Tariff Controversies of a Hundred Years (vol. 2, p. 138). Mr. Stanwood is an impartial witness, though biased strongly in the interest of a protective tariff, and this is the language he uses in speaking of this very subject:

All through the North a feeling of resentment had been growing steadily on account of the apparently strong sympathy of the Canadians for the Confederate cause, and in the end it seemed to become the chief reason for abrogating the treaty.

It seems to be fashionable, Mr. Chairman, to call attention to the names of distinguished men and the positions which they have occupied upon this question. There has been a studied effort during this discussion to try to carry the impression that those of us who are favoring this legislation are departing from the time-honored principles of our party. There has been a studied effort to make it appear that the President of the United States in negotiating this treaty and recommending is passage by the Congress has violated the principles of his party.

At the time this old treaty was abrogated James A. Garfield was a Representative in Congress from the State of Ohio, and, as a Representative from the old nineteenth district of that State, a district loyal to the core, where secession sentiment was barely tolerated and where the agricultural interest at that time was by far the most important, was big enough and broad enough to vote against the abrogation of that treaty. He did not think that its operation for 12 years had been adverse to the interests of his agricultural constituents, and it was not. They cordially returned him to Congress term after term, then sent him to the Senate, and finally he was elected President of the United States.

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make this suggestion to the gentleman, and that is that President Grant in his administration negotiated a treaty, or his Secretary of State negotiated a treaty, on the general lines of the Elgin treaty and on the lines of this treaty negotiated by President Taft.

Mr. HOWLAND. I am glad to have that; I did not have it in my list, and I am very glad to have the information.

Mr. DALZELL. It did not go very far.

Mr. HOWLAND. No; it was stopped just the same as all legislation that affects or seems to affect any protected interest is stopped. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. McCALL. The Senate stopped it.

Mr. HOWLAND. Yes; the Senate stopped it. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa a short time ago attempted to appeal to the loyalty which every Republican has for the name of James G. Blaine. It is true that Mr. Blaine voted in favor of the abrogation of the treaty in 1865, but I propose to call the attention of this House to Mr. Blaine's attitude in 1890 on the question of reciprocity. Did anybody ever hear that reciprocity was good Republican doctrine? You would think, to hear the discussions in this Chamber, that reciprocity was heresy. Why, we used to hear gentlemen talk glibly about reciprocity as the handmaiden of protection; but what has happened to that handmaiden of protection at the hands of the standpatters in this debate is simply awful.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. This is another girl; this is a different girl.

Mr. HOWLAND. It seems to be difficult for the standpatters to locate any girl by the name of Reciprocity. At the time the McKinley bill was under consideration in the Senate James G. Blaine was Secretary of State. He sent to Senator Hale an amendment which he had drafted. Before I take up that amendment I want to make this preliminary statement. I am aware of the position taken by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] on this question. He claims that the Republican doctrine of reciprocity is a mutual trade convention or agreement between this country and a foreign country in noncompeting products only.

Where does the distinguished gentleman get his authority for such a definition? I propose to show that it is not a correct statement of the Republican doctrine of reciprocity as understood and advocated by the most illustrious of our leaders and about which we have harangued and argued and talked so glibly. This amendment which Mr. Blaine sent to Senator Hale in 1890, when the McKinley bill was in the Senate, is as follows:

And the President of the United States is hereby authorized, without further legislation, to declare the ports of the United States free and open to all products of any nation of the American hemisphere upon which no export duties are imposed whenever and so long as such nation shall admit to its ports, free of all national, provincial (State), municipal, and other taxes, flour, corn meal, and other breadstuffs; preserved meats, fish, vegetables, and fruits; cottonseed oil, rice, and other provisions, including all articles of food; lumber, furniture, and all other articles of wood; agricultural implements and machinery, mining and mechanical machinery; and structural iron, steel rails, locomotives, railway cars and supplies, street cars, refined petroleum, or such other products of the United States as may be agreed upon.

There is the amendment offered by Mr. Blaine. Is there any distinction in that amendment between competitive and noncompetitive articles? [Applause.] None whatever. The Republican doctrine of reciprocity that has been advocated by our leaders is that we will concede limited access to our markets on more favorable terms to a given nation provided that nation gives us a substantial equivalent in her markets.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will my colleague yield for a brief suggestion?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOWLAND] has expired.

Mr. McCALL. I will yield 5 or 10 minutes more to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL] yield further time?

Mr. McCALL. I yield 10 minutes further.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOWLAND] yield to his colleague [Mr. LONGWORTH]?

Mr. HOWLAND. I do.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I simply want to ask my colleague if, in his judgment, it would be possible to have any reciprocity whatever with Canada except in competing articles?

Mr. HOWLAND. In reply to that I would say that even the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] admits that on the doctrine of noncompeting products reciprocity with Canada is impossible. The doctrine of reciprocity in noncompeting articles is simply a weapon used to kill off commercial trade agreements when they are brought forward and contain substantial mutual concessions. [Applause.] Why, what is a noncompeting product? Every pound of foodstuff that is imported into the United States, whether it can be produced here or not, competes with every domestic foodstuff that we have.

Would anybody say that tropical fruits imported into this country do not compete with domestic fruits? Take the manufacturing proposition. We can manufacture everything under the sun that we want that has a dollar in it to pay us a profit on the investment. And you can go down the line, and when you go down the line where are you? We are down to tea and coffee. Tea and coffee are necessities of life, and it was proposed in the Payne bill—but it did not get very far when the

country found out what the proposition was—to put a tariff on tea and coffee, so that we could have a club with which to knock coffee and tea exporting countries in the head if they discriminated against us in their customs duties. That is to say, tea and coffee being noncompetitive, the tariff would, of course, under all constructions, be added to the retail price, and the consumer would pay it. In other words, it was proposed to tax our own people for the sake of punishing a foreign commercial nation. To punish ourselves in order to make a commercial rival be good. What would Brazil care how much of an import tax we put on coffee? She did not have to pay it; we paid it. Why, that reminds me of the man who committed suicide in order to make his enemy regret it.

I was diverted just a moment from a consideration of the position of ex-Secretary Blaine upon this question. In his letter to Senator FRYE, referring to his amendment to the McKinley bill—I know everyone is familiar with this celebrated letter, and I want to have it in the RECORD, at least a few sentences from it—he said:

> It furnishes an opportunity where the farmer may be benefited primarily, undeniably richly benefited. Here is an opportunity for a Republican Congress to open the markets of 40,000,000 people to the products of the American farm.

And in discussing the McKinley bill, then under consideration in the Senate, he said, in the same letter:

> There is not a section or line in the entire bill that will open a market for another bushel of wheat or another barrel of pork.

This amendment which Secretary Blaine advocated was the method by which he proposed to benefit the farmer and enlarge his market for agricultural products. Oh, but you say, this was not adopted. Before I pass to the consideration of that question I want to say to the House that Secretary Blaine was so anxious to have this amendment adopted that he sent Mr. William E. Curtis, who was secretary, I believe, of the Pan American Congress in session here at that time, to Maj. McKinley and asked him if he would not introduce the amendment and try to get it adopted in the House. Mr. Curtis, in the National Reciprocity Magazine of August 15, 1902, says that the amendment met the approval of Maj. McKinley, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee; that he submitted it to the consideration of that committee and advocated and voted for it in the committee. [Applause.] Maj. McKinley's vote was the only vote in favor of it in the committee. After it had been defeated in the committee, Mr. Curtis says "That Maj. McKinley, Mr. Blaine, Mr. Windom, who was then Secretary of the Treasury, and other members of the administration worked hard to bring the committee to their senses. There was a meeting one night at the Ebbitt House, at which Mr. Blaine spoke with greater force and earnestness than he had ever heard him before or since. He finally got an amendment attached to the bill. It was not what he wanted. His negotiations were very much restricted. He had asked for bread, and they gave him a stone."

Mr. Chairman, the amendment which was finally adopted in the Senate was offered by Senator Aldrich, of Rhode Island, and authorized the President to place a duty on sugar and molasses, coffee, tea, and hides, raw and uncured, when any nation discriminated against us, these articles being placed on the free list in the bill.

But even in the Aldrich amendment, which is called a reciprocal amendment, the distinction between competitive and noncompetitive products is entirely lost sight of, for no one would contend for a moment that sugar and molasses and hides, raw and uncured, were not competitive products.

Mr. Chairman, I could go on down and take up the Dingley bill, sections 3 and 4, even down to the Payne tariff bill, if you please, which contains some reciprocal provisions; but nowhere in these laws do you find the distinction between competitive and noncompetitive products. The nearest intimation that you have of it is in section 4 of the Dingley bill, where it is provided that certain items may be transferred to the free list for a limited time by the President, provided "the products are the natural products of the foreign country and not of the United States." But even there the distinction is not drawn between competitive and noncompetitive products.

And so I take it that you will look long and far before you will find anything that will authorize you to lay down the distinction as accepted political Republican doctrine that reciprocal trade agreements must be in noncompeting products only. [Applause.]

Mr. McKinley was elected President in 1896, and immediately proceeded to carry out his campaign promises to the American people, and insisted upon legislation which would open up the mills of the country rather than the mints.

The Dingley bill was passed, and an era of prosperity came upon the country unparalleled in its history; and we soon came to the question of whether or not our agricultural interests, which were prospering, and our manufacturing interests, which were prospering, would not produce a surplus and a glut in the market, with its consequent business depression and hard times. President McKinley, to whom it was given to look further into the future than falls to the lot of most men, grasped that proposition thoroughly, and immediately commenced to cast about for ways and means to obtain larger foreign markets, in order that our industries might continue prosperous and the surplus of our agriculturists and manufacturers might find a profitable market.

Under the authority contained in section 4 of the Dingley bill he authorized and instructed Mr. Kasson to negotiate certain commercial trade agreements with foreign countries. You can examine those treaties—the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] can examine those treaties—as carefully as he likes, and if he can find the distinction there between competitive and noncompetitive products as the line of discrimination along which President McKinley negotiated those treaties, I would be obliged to him if he would point it out, because I have not been able to find it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOWLAND. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have five minutes more, if possible.

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Chairman, I will yield five minutes more to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. HOWLAND. I thank the gentleman for his courtesy, as I am very anxious to call specific attention to a few of the provisions of the Kasson treaties. In consideration of substantial equivalents in her markets the convention for Barbados admitted into the United States cane sugar and molasses, fresh fruit, fresh vegetables, and asphalt at a reduction of 12½ per cent. In consideration for substantial equivalents in her markets the convention for Turks and Caicos Islands gave salt the benefit of a 12½ per cent reduction on the Dingley rates. For Jamacia cane sugar and molasses were given a reduction of 12½ per cent from the Dingley rates. Citrus fruits, pineapples, fresh vegetables, including potatoes and onions, and rum were given a reduction of 20 per cent of the Dingley rates. The convention for Bermuda gave potatoes, onions, tomatoes, and other fresh vegetables, bulbs, and natural flowers a reduction of 20 per cent of the Dingley rates. The convention with the Argentine Republic gave a reduction of 20 per cent on hides, wool, and sugar for substantial equivalents in our markets. Many other instances might be cited, but I have called attention to a sufficient number to demonstrate conclusively the correctness of my position.

The Kasson treaties were not ratified by the Senate, and the only reason why I call attention to them is to establish the fact that they did not discriminate between competitive and noncompetitive products. President McKinley indorsed and approved those treaties, and we thus see clearly that he did not recognize the doctrine of noncompeting products as the correct basis on which to negotiate reciprocal trade agreements.

Mr. Chairman, President McKinley was not discouraged by the failure of the Senate to ratify the Kasson treaties. In his second inaugural he called attention to the necessity for larger markets in the following language:

> Our diversified productions, however, are increasing in such unprecedented volume as to admonish us of the necessity of still further enlarging our foreign markets by broader commercial relations. For this purpose reciprocal trade arrangements should in liberal spirit be carefully cultivated and promoted.

In the tragic speech at Buffalo, which I will once more call to the attention of the House—"lest we forget"—he said that reciprocal trade agreements must be enacted; that we must yield something to our competitors, something of our markets, of our tariff rates, in order to get concessions from them, agreements founded upon a valid consideration. And so I say here this afternoon that when the name of McKinley is used as opposing treaties of this character it is erroneously used, and the language at Buffalo, prophetic as it would seem to me, carries an absolute refutation of such statements. In speaking on this subject at Buffalo on the day of his assassination President McKinley said:

> We have a vast and intricate business, built up through years of toil and struggle, in which every part of the country has its stake, which will not permit of either neglect or of undue selfishness. NO NARROW, SORDID POLICY WILL SUBSERVE IT. The greatest skill and wisdom on the part of the manufacturers and producers will be required to hold and increase it. Our industrial enterprises, which have grown to such great proportions, affect the homes and occupations of the people and the welfare of the country. Our capacity to produce has de-

veloped so enormously and our products have so multiplied that the problem of more markets requires our urgent and immediate attention.

Only a broad and enlightened policy will keep what we have. No other policy will get more. In these times of marvelous business energy and gain we ought to be looking to the future, strengthening the weak places in our industrial and commercial systems, so that we may be ready for any storm or strain.

By sensible trade arrangements which will not interrupt our home production we shall extend the outlets for our increasing surplus. A system which provides a mutual exchange of commodities is manifestly essential to the continued healthful growth of our export trade. We must not repose in fancied security that we can forever sell everything and buy little or nothing. If such a thing were possible it would not be best for us or those with whom we deal. We should take from our customers such of their products as we can use without harm to our industries and labor.

Reciprocity is the natural outgrowth of our wonderful industrial development under the domestic policy now firmly established. What we produce beyond our domestic consumption must have a vent abroad. The excess must be relieved through a foreign outlet and we should sell everything we can and buy wherever the buying will enlarge our sales and productions, and thereby make a greater demand for home labor.

THE PERIOD OF EXCLUSIVENESS IS PAST. The expansion of our trade and commerce is the pressing problem. Commercial wars are unprofitable. A policy of good will and friendly trade relations will prevent reprisals. Reciprocity treaties are in harmony with the spirit of the times; measures of retaliation are not. IF PERCHANCE SOME OF OUR TARIFFS ARE NO LONGER NEEDED FOR REVENUE OR TO ENCOURAGE AND PROTECT OUR INDUSTRIES AT HOME, WHY SHOULD THEY NOT BE EMPLOYED TO EXTEND AND PROMOTE OUR MARKETS ABROAD?

And now, Mr. Chairman, I would call attention to the message to Congress, December 3, 1901, of President Roosevelt upon this subject squarely in line with McKinley, but my time is almost exhausted; therefore in conclusion I say to this committee that President Taft, in negotiating and sending to the Congress the pending treaty, is acting in accordance with the best Republican doctrine [applause]; he is acting in accordance with the doctrines of Grant, of Garfield, of Blaine, of William McKinley, and of Theodore Roosevelt; and if anybody can question the Republicanism of those men, I should like to hear him do it. Certainly it can not be done in this presence. [Applause.]

I give my support to the pending measure, in the full faith that it makes for national progress, and will promote the common welfare of our people. "No narrow, sordid policy will subserve it. The period of exclusiveness is past." [Applause.]

Mr. McCALL. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT].

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I believe thoroughly in the principle and practice of protection, and I have been asked how I can consistently with that belief support this bill. My answer is that against the people of Canada we need no protection. The principle does not apply. They are a people composite like us, of many different races, but with the resultant dominant type very much like ours. They have similar ideals of public and private life and much the same standards of living. They have the same environment, are planted in a land with the same resources and products, where nature has spread for them the same obstacles, and by conquering them they have developed the same self-reliance and enterprise. [Applause.]

They have the same diversities of religion and blood and traditions which complex and perplex us. For thousands of miles there is no natural or artificial boundary between the two countries, and a wanderer without inquiring would never know with which nation he was sojourning. Their people have overrun the invisible boundary line in swarms and made their homes with us, and our people have returned the flattering compliment and in great multitudes taken up homes with them. No cannon frowns from either side against the other, and by reason of a most auspicious convention the inland seas between us are unvexed by any of the ships of war which nowadays are claimed as the necessary instruments of peace.

It would be difficult to imagine two countries more alike. To be sure, they preserve a monarchy and aristocracy while we maintain "a church without a bishop and a State without a king," but this superficial difference only illustrates the truth of Pope's hackneyed couplet:

> For forms of government let fools contest;
> Whate'er is best administered is best,

for in aspiration and enjoyment of personal and political liberty, in deep-rooted hostility to tyranny and persecution, and in legal guaranties against them, it would be hard to detect any difference in the two nations. And it is the spirit of the people and not administration or laws that keeps alive freedom. The laws may be of ideal excellence for preserving true democracy, but a reckless or torpid population will nullify them.

Their industries are stimulated by the same protective policy we have found so successful. Both nations are developing along exactly the same lines, and if there are differences in standards and modes of life, they indicate only different stages of development. Equal differences exist between different parts of our own country.

Against such a country with such a population I see no reason to invoke the principle of protection.

I think it would be to the advantage of both countries that mutual trade and intercourse should be unfettered, that business and personal relations should be intimate, and that together we should spread over the continent a uniform and identical civilization. Certainly as the larger, richer, more highly developed neighbor, we ought not to find it to our disadvantage. The difference in the cost of production on the two sides of the line is too wavering and inconsiderable to be calculated, and under full reciprocity would quickly disappear. And so I think it is desirable that all tariff walls should be broken down between two countries so akin in everything which goes to make up their industrial life, and then production and trade may develop along whatever lines the unerring laws of mutual advantage shall determine. [Applause.]

Neither nature nor laws nor habits of life have given them any permanent advantage over us in the contest. We start on fair terms, and we ought not to shrink from the test. I should like to see unrestricted reciprocal trade in everything, and I welcome this pact not so much for itself as for the promise it gives of closer union and broader pacts. The important argument to my mind is not so much whether by fine calculations of probable imports or exports you can figure out a profit to us as it is that this is an initial step toward a greater trade movement and intimacy between these two related neighbors which will stimulate and modulate and steady their mutual development. Momentary local losses, which are likely to accompany any change of policy, will soon be swallowed up and forgotten in the general gain. Like the quality of mercy, it will be "twice blessed—it blesseth him that gives and him that takes."

Dr. Johnson said at the sale of Thrale's brewery:

> We are not here to sell a parcel of boilers and vats, but the potentiality of growing rich beyond the dreams of avarice.

And so the value of this pact is not the mere exchange of a few specified articles, but it is the opening of a new era in the relationship of two kindred and sympathetic nations.

The question of annexation has occasionally been brought up for the purpose of embarrassing this bill. Doubtless many persons on both sides of the line regret that when the original United States was formed Canada, whose destiny nature had apparently joined with ours, was not included in the Union. But no sane man believes that there is any purpose here, direct or indirect, ever to annex Canada against her will. It may happen generations from now that the countries will have so grown together that our descendants will mutually agree peacefully to unite their fortunes in one government. But that at present is only the vision of the dreamer and not the plan of any statesman.

And it is safe to say that there will never be any hostile action by this people to annex our friendly neighbors. Any such demonstration is meant as a bugaboo or a sensation, not as a serious purpose.

The far-seeing President who had the courage to negotiate the pact against the remonstrance of many of his own party and against the advice of astute calculators of political results has won for himself lasting fame. Whether it now becomes a law or not, whatever the immediate result on his fortunes, he has linked his name with a great step forward in our international relations. His policy may not win approval now, but it will never be retraced. If he can not complete it he can not be robbed of the honor of beginning. I am reminded of one of the finest passages in one of Schillers best tragedies, Don Carlos, where the Marquis of Posa says to the Queen:

> Er lege
> Die erste hand an diesen rohen stein.
> Ob er vollende oder unterliege
> Ihm einerlei, Er lege hand an. Wenn
> Jahr-hunderte dahin geflohen, wird
> Die vorsicht einen fuerstensohn wie er
> Auf einem thron wie seiner wiederholen,
> Und ihren neuen liebling mit derselben
> Begeisterung entzuenden.

The translation of it into prose takes away all of its beauty and much of its force.

> Let him begin the work on this unshapen stone. Whether he succeed or fail all alike to him—let him begin the work. And when centuries have rolled away Providence shall again raise a prince like him upon a throne like his and inspire her new favorite with the same noble purpose.

And I believe the President when he made this pact acted in that spirit and did not stop to weigh on pigmy scales the immediate party or local or personal advantage. His horizon

was broader. He was but beginning a great work. He acted for what he thought was the ultimate permanent gain of both party and country. He offered to Canada that full reciprocity which between such kindred, intelligent, similar neighbors is bound to come. And whether it succeed or fail now, I believe this policy is certain of ultimate triumph and certain to bring honor to the courageous President by whom it was inaugurated. [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 bill H. R. 4412, the Canadian reciprocity bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE TO PRINT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all gentlemen who speak on this bill may have leave to print for five legislative days on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that all gentlemen who speak on this bill may have leave to print in the RECORD for five legislative days on the subject of the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

By unanimous consent reference of the bill (H. R. 4704) making appropriations and providing for continuing contracts for the construction, repair, and preservation of public works on the Missouri River between Kansas City and the mouth be changed from the Committee on Appropriations to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

ADJOURNMENT.

Then, on motion of Mr. UNDERWOOD (at 5 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until Wednesday, April 19, at 12 o'clock meridian.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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 Waupaca River, Wis. (H. Doc. No. 20); 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 of Stilaguamish River, Wash. (H. Doc. No. 19); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Great Kills Harbor, N. Y. (H. Doc. No. 18); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Appropriations was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4704) making appropriations and providing for a continuing contract for the construction, repair, and preservation of public works on the Missouri River between Kansas City and the mouth, and the same was referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

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

By Mr. HARDWICK: A bill (H. R. 5948) to prohibit in the District of Columbia the intermarriage of whites with Negroes or Mongolians; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 5949) to fix the term of enlistment in the Army and to reduce the expense of the military establishment; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5950) to repeal all laws and parts of laws authorizing increase of the pay of commissioned officers and enlisted men of the Army serving beyond the limits of the States comprising the Union and the Territories of the United States contiguous thereto; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SIMMONS: A bill (H. R. 5951) for the erection of a public building at Batavia, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 5952) authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish two condemned bronze or brass cannon or field pieces and cannon balls to the George W. Spencer Post, No. 489, Grand Army of the Republic, city of Dolton, State of Illinois; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 5953) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 5954) to amend section 3716 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERS: A bill (H. R. 5955) providing for the regulation, identification, and registration of automobiles engaged in interstate commerce, and the licensing of the operators thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5956) to fix the sizes of baskets or other open containers for small fruits or berries; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. HANNA: A bill (H. R. 5957) making drunkenness in the District of Columbia a misdemeanor, and to provide a hospital for inebriates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 5958) authorizing all tribes or bands of Indians of Oklahoma to submit claims to the Court of Claims which have not heretofore been determined by the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 5959) dividing the eastern judicial district of Oklahoma into three divisions, fixing the time and place for holding court therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAMMOND: A bill (H. R. 5960) for the erection of a public building at Fairmont, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5961) authorizing national banking associations to make loans upon improved agricultural land; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 5962) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Tullahoma, in the State of Tennessee; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5963) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Lewisburg, in the State of Tennessee; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5964) to establish a fish-cultural station in the county of Lincoln, in the State of Tennessee; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5965) to establish a national military park at the battlefield of Stones River; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: A bill (H. R. 5966) authorizing the President to appoint a commissioner to supervise the erection of monuments and markers and locate the general route of the Oregon trail; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 5967) authorizing an investigation with a view to securing allotments for the Choctaws of Mississippi; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5968) to authorize a survey of Tchula Lake, Miss.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 5969) renewing a franchise, as originally granted, to the South Mobile Terminal Co. to construct wharves, docks, and piers at or near Alabama Port; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. LLOYD: A bill (H. R. 5970) relating to the removal of employees of the Government in the classified civil service; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. CANDLER: A bill (H. R. 5971) to prevent the sale of intoxicating liquors in any ship, naval station, or building used, controlled, or owned by the United States Government; to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 5972) to establish at Atlanta, Ga., a subtreasury; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROUSE: Resolution (H. Res. 104) requesting the Postmaster General to furnish certain information; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Resolution (H. Res. 105) requesting the Secretary of the Interior to furnish certain information; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

By Mr. GARRETT: Resolution (H. Res. 106) authorizing and directing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to make inquiry into the condition of turbulence alleged to prevail in the Republic of Mexico and to report thereon; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FLOOD of Virginia: Resolution (H. Res. 107) directing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to make inquiry into the condition of turbulence prevailing in the Republic of Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

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. 5973) granting an increase of pension to Caleb Ackerman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5974) granting an increase of pension to Henry Bilsing; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5975) granting an increase of pension to Mahlon C. Bennett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5976) granting an increase of pension to John Cotner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5977) granting an increase of pension to John Cook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5978) granting an increase of pension to John Fralick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5979) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Jump; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5980) granting an increase of pension to Emma E. Kanzleiter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5981) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Kieffer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5982) granting an increase of pension to Harry W. Leitz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5983) granting an increase of pension to Adam Lichty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5984) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Mesnard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5985) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5986) granting an increase of pension to Sarah L. Mount; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5987) granting a pension to Barbara Pifher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5988) granting an increase of pension to George W. Shreckengaust; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5989) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5990) granting an increase of pension to Jacob C. Utz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5991) granting an increase of pension to John Whittaker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5992) granting an increase of pension to Rowland J. Welch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5993) granting an increase of pension to David W. Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5994) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Zink; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 5995) granting a pension to Francisquita Chaves de Peña; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOOHER: A bill (H. R. 5996) granting an increase of pension to John Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5997) granting an increase of pension to William M. Deaton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMERON: A bill (H. R. 5998) granting a pension to Mary Jane Tillman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 5999) for the relief of Charles A. Davidson and Charles M. Campbell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 6000) granting an increase of pension to William O. Sutherland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 6001) granting an increase of pension to John Compton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6002) granting an increase of pension to James F. Buckley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6003) granting an increase of pension to James M. Collier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6004) granting a pension to Susan Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6005) granting a pension to Marion Southern; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 6006) for the relief of John C. Farrell; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6007) for the relief of the Turner Hardware Co.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 6008) granting an increase of pension to Christian Koppelman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 6009) granting an increase of pension to Sanford Glass; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6010) granting an increase of pension to David C. Morgan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6011) granting an increase of pension to Robert Sutor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAUGHERTY: A bill (H. R. 6012) for the relief of Addison Baker; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6013) for the relief of Adolph Hartiens and others; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6014) for the relief of the heirs of Sarah West, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DIXON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 6015) for the relief of the legal representatives of Wilson Parker, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FOSTER of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 6016) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Zimmermann; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6017) granting an increase of pension to William A. Hope; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6018) granting an increase of pension to Alvin Lewis; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6019) granting a pension to Joseph W. Wightman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6020) for the relief of Charles Snyder; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6021) for the relief of James Wiley; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6022) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Thomas G. Warner; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6023) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Jesse W. Jackson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FRANCIS: A bill (H. R. 6024) granting an increase of pension to Ebenezer Blanchard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6025) granting an increase of pension to Thomas C. Dunnaway; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6026) granting an increase of pension to Joshua Dewees; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6027) granting an increase of pension to Nixon B. Stewart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6028) granting an increase of pension to Joseph V. Gillespie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6029) granting an increase of pension to J. C. Haverfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6030) granting an increase of pension to John J. Burtsfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6031) granting an increase of pension to James Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6032) granting an increase of pension to George L. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6033) granting an increase of pension to William H. Vasbinder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6034) granting an increase of pension to Ludwell Tinsman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6035) granting an increase of pension to John D. Tidrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6036) granting an increase of pension to George W. Pitner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6037) granting an increase of pension to James Creighton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6038) granting an increase of pension to Hiram Mushrush; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6039) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Seals; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6040) granting an increase of pension to Frank Grove; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6041) granting a pension to Mary I. Gregg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6042) granting a pension to James McNulty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6043) granting a pension to Thomas C. Acton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6044) granting a pension to William McGrew; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6045) granting a pension to John M. Poplin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6046) granting a pension to Benjamin Gallaway; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6047) granting a pension to Annie M. Gladfelter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6048) granting a pension to Serena Fink; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6049) granting a pension to Anna C. Foulke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6050) granting a pension to Francis W. Leeper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 6051) granting a pension to Mary A. Malosh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6052) granting an increase of pension to Lewis F. Beck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6053) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Varner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6054) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of John Kreiser and grant him an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARTMAN: A bill (H. R. 6055) granting an increase of pension to Paul G. Morgan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 6056) 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 the Public Lands.

By Mr. KOPP: A bill (H. R. 6057) granting an increase of pension to Randall Kinnie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6058) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Edwards; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINDSAY: A bill (H. R. 6059) granting an increase of pension to John F. Sias; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6060) granting an increase of pension to George W. Keighler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6061) granting an increase of pension to William P. Kimball; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6062) granting an increase of pension to John Langan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MATTHEWS: A bill (H. R. 6063) granting an increase of pension to William Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6064) granting a pension to William F. Douds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORRISON: A bill (H. R. 6065) for the relief of the heirs of Jacob Claypool; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. NORRIS: A bill (H. R. 6066) granting an increase of pension to Napoleon C. Foy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PATTEN of New York: A bill (H. R. 6067) for the relief of Edward Byrne; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 6068) granting a pension to Thomas Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6069) granting an increase of pension to John Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6070) granting an increase of pension to William A. Holmes; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6071) granting a pension to Nannie Eckert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 6072) granting an increase of pension to Jacob S. Plunk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMALL: A bill (H. R. 6073) granting a pension to Cecil R. Berry; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 6074) granting a pension to Chappel Q. Fossett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6075) for the relief of Alfred J. Drake; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6076) for the relief of Samuel E. Howell and James H. Howell in their own right and as sole heirs of Mary Ann Thomas, deceased, and William T. Howell, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: A bill (H. R. 6077) granting an increase of pension to Catherine T. M. Bachman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIS: A bill (H. R. 6078) granting a pension to Mary B. Oder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6079) granting an increase of pension to George F. Wonder; 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. ANSBERRY: Resolution of New Orleans Cotton Exchange, against tariff on all bagging and ties used in the baling of cotton; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of T. R. Morris and 91 other citizens of Tuscarawas County, Ohio, favoring establishment of a national department of health; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

Also, petition of Congress Grange, No. 1726, Wayne County, Ohio, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of D. S. Creamer, treasurer of the State of Ohio, recommending the passage of an act making it compulsory for the Secretary of the Treasury to deposit the surplus Government funds in national banks that offer the highest rate of interest; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. AYRES: Papers of Walter H. Storm, of New York, and H. U. Singhi, favoring parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BUTLER: Petitions of Brandywine Grange, No. 60, West Chester; East Lynn Grange, No. 1263, Unionville; and Goshen Grange, No. 121, West Chester, Patrons of Husbandry, all in the State of Pennsylvania, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CALDER: Petition of Local No. 320, International Association of Machinists, New York City, favoring the enactment of the reading or illiteracy test; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolutions of Paper Makers' Local No. 57, of Niagara Falls, N. Y., against the Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of Irish-American and German-American societies of New York, indorsed by their divisions in Kansas City, Mo., against new arbitration treaty with Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution of citizens of Buffalo, favoring the Canadian reciprocity agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of New Orleans Cotton Exchange, favoring that all bagging and ties used in the baling of cotton be placed upon the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of Local No. 51, International Brotherhood of Papermakers, against the Canadian reciprocity agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CULLOP: Resolution to investigate the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department.

By Mr. DALZELL: Resolution of Irish-American and German-American societies of New York, indorsed by same societies of Kansas City, Mo., opposing the establishment of any closer relations with Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DANFORTH: Petitions of Honeoye Falls Grange, Honeoye Falls, Monroe County; Webster Grange, Monroe County; Brockport Grange, Brockport; Riga Grange, Churchville, Monroe County; Mendon Grange, Mendon, Monroe County; Penfield Grange, Penfield, Monroe County; and Gates Grange, Gates, Monroe County, all in the State of New York, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESCH: Resolution of Paper Makers Local No. 51, Niagara Falls, N. Y., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Petitions of International Brotherhood of Paper Makers and Paper Mill Workers, of Niagara Falls, N. Y., against Canadian reciprocity bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOOD of Virginia: Petition of citizens of State of Virginia, favoring the establishment of a national health department; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

By Mr. FRENCH: Petition of business men, State of Idaho, against parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions from Gorham Mercantile Co. and others, Payette; Lincoln Hardware & Implement Co. (Ltd.), and others, Kendrick; Jones & Dillingham Co. and others, Lewiston; Nuineman Hardware Co. and others, Lewiston; O. E. Bell and others, Moscow; Empire Hardware Co. and others, Moscow; Olson Johnson & Co. and others, Troy; J. C. Hamil and others, Juliaetta; F. M. Remington and others, Culdesac; F. H. Bowen and others, Caldwell; W. C. Dyer, manager, Jones Furniture Co. and others, Caldwell; W. A. Fulkerson Lumber Co. and others, Weiser; Taylor Hardware Co. and others, Weiser; Russell Department Store and others, Payette; and H. P. Kizer and others, Weiser, all in the State of Idaho, bearing upon the question of parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of International Paper Co., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Irish-American and German-American societies of New York, against arbitration treaty with Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of New Orleans Cotton Exchange, favoring placing on the free list bagging and ties used in the baling of cotton; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan: Petition of citizens in the city of South Haven, county of Van Buren and State of Michigan, requesting appropriation by Congress for the purchase of a site for a post office and the erection thereon of a proper building; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HANNA: Petition of citizens of State of North Dakota, favoring passage of H. R. 26791, known as the Hanna bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of farmers of the State of North Dakota, protesting against Canadian reciprocity agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of John J. Keen, Wahpeton, N. Dak., protesting against the parcels-post bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HARTMAN: Resolution of citizens of New York, protesting against any alliance with Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens of Bedford, State of Pennsylvania, against parcels-post service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: Resolutions of Wethersfield Business Men's and Civic Association, of Wethersfield, Conn., opposing the passage of the reciprocity treaty with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOULD: Resolution of Chelsea (Me.) Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, in relation to a measure pertaining to reciprocity with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KENDALL: Petition of Local No. 51, International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey: Resolution of Local No. 51, International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, Niagara Falls, N. Y., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of Seward Republican Club, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring reciprocity with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of International Brotherhood of Paper Makers of Albany, N. Y., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce and Manufacturers' Club of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring reciprocity with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of New Orleans Cotton Exchange, favoring the placing on the free list of all bagging and ties used in the baling of cotton; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of New York Cordage Co., favoring the placing on the free list of jute cotton bagging and russia rope, tarred and untarred, for marine use, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOUD: Petition of Anson F. Love and 14 other residents of Hubbard Lake, Mich., favoring parcels-post bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MAHER: Petition of New York Cordage Co., favoring the placing on the free list of jute cotton bagging and russia rope, tarred and untarred, for marine use, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce and Manufacturers' Club, of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring reciprocity with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of New Orleans Cotton Exchange, favoring the placing on the free list of all bagging and ties used in the baling of cotton; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Niagara Falls Local No. 51, International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, of Niagara Falls, N. Y., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, of Albany, N. Y., against reciprocity with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MANN: Petition of Local No. 51, International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, of Niagara Falls, N. Y., against reciprocity bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATTHEWS: Paper to accompany bill for relief of William F. Douds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MONDELL: Telegraphic petitions by J. A. Delfelder, president Wyoming Wool Growers; Sweetwater County Wool Growers' Association; Eastern Wyoming Wool Growers' Association; Lewis Barker, commissioner central district; J. J. Bentley, commissioner northern district; J. S. Atherly, secretary board of sheep commissioners, State of Wyoming; and F. S. King, commissioner southern district, protesting against a reduction of the wool schedule or any action relative thereto until after the Tariff Board shall make their report; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Petition of employees of Keystone Paper Mill & Paper Manufacturing Co., Upper Darby, Pa., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOTT: Petition of Charles E. Vrooman & Co., of Carthage, N. Y., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce of Oswego, N. Y., in favor of Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UTTER: Resolution of Lime Rock Grange, No. 22, Patrons of Husbandry, of Rhode Island, against Canadian reciprocity bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of Central Labor Union, of Woonsocket, R. I., favoring the construction of the battleship *New York* in a Government navy yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: Petitions of farmers of Clarkfield; voters of the county of Yellow Medicine; citizens of Balaton; Tracy Farmers' Elevator Co.; legal voters of Lone Tree, county of Chippewa; and residents of Yellow Medicine County, all of the State of Minnesota, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition against removal of duty on barley; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: Petition of New Orleans Cotton Exchange, favoring placing cotton ties and bagging on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Edward Olmsted, captain, in favor of militia pay bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, Albany, N. Y., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce and Manufacturers' Club, Buffalo, N. Y., favoring Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Niagara Falls Local, No. 51, International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, *April 19, 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, help us to appreciate Thy goodness and Thy wonderful works unto the children of men, that we may think nobly, feel deeply, and act worthily in the vocation whereunto Thou has called us, and thus hallow Thy name. In the spirit of the Lord, Jesus Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CORRECTING ERRORS IN ENROLLMENT OF APPROPRIATION ACTS.

Mr. FITZGERALD, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations, reported House joint resolution 1, to correct errors of certain appropriation acts, approved March 4, 1911, which was read a first and second time and, together with the accompanying report (H. Rept. 5), referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I shall not make the point of order, but I desire to say that this is not in order as a privileged matter on this holy day—Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I understand that some of the matters I wish to report are not privileged, but I desire to call them to the attention of the House.

Mr. MANN. I understood that the gentleman from Alabama would like to make a motion to suspend with proceeding under that calendar.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Illinois makes the point of order, the point of order will be sustained.

Mr. MANN. No; I do not make the point of order.

The SPEAKER. There is no business for what is called Calendar Wednesday, anyway.

EXPENSES OF FIRST SESSION SIXTY-SECOND CONGRESS.

Mr. FITZGERALD, by the direction of the Committee on Appropriations, also reported House joint resolution 2, making appropriations for the payment of certain expenses incident to the first session of the Sixty-second Congress, which