HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *April 20, 1911.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

O Lord, our Lord, how excellent is Thy name in all the earth, who hast set Thy glory above the heavens. Open Thou our spiritual eyes, that we may behold the light of Thy countenance. Unstop our spiritual ears, that we may hear the music of Thy voice. Make more sensitive our hearts, that we may feel the fructifying influences of Thy love; that as we pass on we may strew our paths with the flowers of golden deeds, and at the end hear the words, which will be sweeter than all music, "Well done, good and faithful servant, enter thou into the joy of Thy Lord." For Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

INVESTIGATION OF THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit the following privileged report from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas, chairman of the Committee on Rules, submits a privileged report (H. Rept. 9), which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 103.

Resolved, That the Committees on Expenditures in the State Department, in the Treasury Department, in the War Department, in the Navy Department, in the Post Office Department, in the Interior Department, in the Department of Justice, in the Department of Agriculture, in the Department of Commerce and Labor, and on Public Buildings be, and they are hereby, instructed to proceed to examine into all the affairs of said departments as fully as is permitted to them and made their duty to do by the Rules of the House relating to said committees, respectively. And the investigations of said committees may cover such period in the past as each of said committees may deem necessary. And said committees, or any subcommittees thereof, shall have power to subpœna and compel the attendance of witnesses and to examine them under oath, and send for records, books, and papers and all other evidence that may be necessary to make the investigation full and complete, and that the Speaker shall have authority to sign and the Clerk to attest subpœnas during the recess of Congress. Said committees or any subcommittees thereof shall have authority to sit during any recess of this Congress.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman from Texas if this resolution is in the form in which it was submitted to the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and in reply to his question I will say that it is in the exact form which we agreed upon. The gentleman understands why I submit it at this time, and I ask for the adoption of it.

Mr. MADDEN. As the Clerk seems to have had some difficulty in reading the resolution, I ask unanimous consent to authorize the Committee on Rules to employ a stenographer, so that resolutions may be presented in such form that the Clerk may be able to read them readily.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's request is out of order. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. Those in favor of it——

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Tennessee rise?

Mr. AUSTIN. I rise for the purpose of asking the gentleman in charge of this resolution a question.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. AUSTIN. Does the resolution provide for the necessary expenses of this investigation?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. It does not include that, because that is left to the Committee on Accounts. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Illinois rise?

Mr. MANN. I ask for recognition.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas has the floor.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. The Speaker started to put the question.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Texas must either fish or cut bait. He can move the previous question or yield the floor.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I did not understand that the gentleman desired any time. If he wants it, I will be glad to yield him some. There is no controversy, as I understand, about it.

Mr. MANN. All I wish to do is to ask a question.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I shall be glad to yield for a question.

Mr. MANN. But when the Speaker starts to put the question, and the previous question has not been ordered, of course any gentleman is entitled to recognition. Does this resolution do anything that is not now authorized by the rules, except the matter of subpœnaing witnesses?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. And authorizing the committees to sit during the recess of Congress and to go as far back in time as they may deem proper. I suppose they have that authority now.

Mr. MANN. I think they have that authority under the rules.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I think so; but we thought there might be some question about it and we put it in the resolution. It is a unanimous report of the Committee on Rules, and we think we have got about all the matters in that should be included.

Mr. MANN. Is one of the purposes of the resolution to lay a preamble for the bringing in of further resolutions for the appointment of clerks for these committees and to give them the power to print at the Government expense?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. There is no purpose in view except what is expressed in the resolution; that is all that is intended by it. The committees have certain power to print now.

Mr. MANN. I apprehend that it will be followed shortly by a resolution to provide clerks for these committees.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I am not advised as to that.

Mr. MANN. I suppose that is a part of the economy program.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I do.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Does the gentleman from Illinois imagine that these committees will be able to do any great amount of labor in investigating these departments for the last 15 years without several clerks to do the work? In the last Congress, although these committees did no work at all, they all had session clerks.

Mr. MANN. I notice that the gentleman from New York reported a resolution yesterday authorizing the appointment of seven or nine session clerks, some of which were employed heretofore by committees that are now abolished. I suppose that is a part of the economy program.

Mr. FITZGERALD. If the gentleman from Texas will yield we will discuss that question when it is reached.

Mr. MANN. If we get a chance.

Mr. FITZGERALD. And we will be able to satisfy the country, if not the gentleman from Illinois, of the propriety of these clerks. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MANN. You probably will be able to satisfy that side of the House that a little more patronage is to be distributed, but not the country that it is economy. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Does the gentleman from Illinois desire to ask any further question? If not, Mr. Speaker, I will ask a vote on the resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. HENRY of Texas, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON INDUSTRIAL ARTS AND EXPOSITIONS.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. HEFLIN. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 112.

Resolved, That the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions be authorized to have such printing and binding done as may be necessary for the transaction of its business during the Sixty-second Congress.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution just reported. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, my recollection is that this committee has enjoyed this privilege heretofore.

Mr. HEFLIN. It has.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The resolution was considered and agreed to.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. GRAY, by unanimous consent, was given leave of absence on account of sickness.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. WICKLIFFE, by unanimous consent, was given leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, papers in the case of Robert L. Pruyn, Sixty-first Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

RECIPROCITY WITH CANADA.

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

The motion was agreed to.

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

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

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, this measure should be adopted for two general and fundamental reasons. First, because it is in line with evolution, with the laws of progress, and the spirit of the times. Secondly, because it is a step in the reform of our fiscal and economic policies.

Our generation has witnessed unprecedented progress in mechanical science and in the mechanic arts, and the greatest progress of all has been in the domain of transportation. This progress has largely removed the physical barriers which separate the peoples of the earth. In every case the bringing of peoples closer together, whether within the same nation or of different nations, has proved beneficial to all concerned, verifying the lesson of all history that anything that promotes the friendly intercourse of peoples has been of general benefit. The full control of nature's forces through science can only come from the full cooperation of man. The widening realization of this great fact is speedily undermining the destroying spirit between men and nations and is bringing forth a new era for the whole world. In this era it will be realized by all that it is not necessary to harm others in order to help oneself; not necessary to kill others in order to live. The bird of prey is fast disappearing; the beast of prey has seen his day; the man of prey is fast being crushed; the business of prey is being uprooted; nations of prey are losing their commerce and their colonies. The real test for fitness to survive is no longer the might and brute force to destroy, but the capacity and willingness to cooperate and to serve. The greatest among men is to be no longer the conqueror, but the servant of all.

This great principle of cooperation and service should more and more dictate the policies of nations in their relations with each other. A nation should desire the prosperity and seek to promote the happiness of its neighbors, and the service rendered in such a spirit is sure to come back manyfold like bread cast upon the waters. It sounded like a chapter from medievalism when the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] read from the speech of the Canadian premier of the advantages that would accrue to Canada from reciprocity, and urged the advantages to Canada as a reason why this bill should not be adopted by America. It indicated the baleful effect of our high-tariff wall policy upon the political education of our people, that this semi-savage argument should have received even the limited applause it did receive from Republicans. America, of all nations in the world, should be the first, and not the last, to adopt toward other nations the policy of commercial as well as political good will. As every other nation prospers, just so it will be able to afford and will consume more and more of the great world staples of which we are the foremost producer; "prosperity and progress for all other nations" should be the very foundation maxim for our foreign relations. It is not only true moral ethics, but also sound business policy.

The Dominion of Canada and the United States have the longest contiguous frontier of any two peoples in the world—a frontier offering less of physical barrier than that offered by the Mississippi River between the peoples on its east and west banks. The two peoples are more closely bound by ties of blood and ties of institutions than any two peoples of the world. The sociological barriers are about as invisible as those between our peoples east of the Mississippi River and those west of it or those north of the Mason and Dixon line and those south of it. Both peoples look across the Atlantic to the nations of Europe and across the Pacific to the nations of Asia. Both are marching along parallel paths of destiny, and it was decreed at the foundation of the world that they should march hand in hand.

Whom God and nature have joined together would blinded man put asunder. The thought of maintaining a permanent artificial wall between these people is abhorrent. This treaty does not go far enough, but it does begin the work of demolition, and should be ratified.

The second fundamental reason why this measure should be adopted is that it starts us in the direction of placing our industries on a sound economic basis and of readjusting our fiscal policies. I will not at this juncture discuss the question of taxation, but will enunciate for the purpose of suggestion this proposition—that the indirect system of taxation in this country must progressively give way to the direct system. The indirect system is fundamentally out of accord with republican institutions, for it practically eliminates the people from the control of taxation, as they never know or realize when they are being taxed, or how much they are being taxed, or who amongst them is being most or least taxed, or who is getting the tax money, whether the Government or special individuals or interests. It is true the indirect method is the easiest method of getting tax money, and all the monarchical governments of the world resort to it, as they raise money without the people realizing it. But the very fact that the money comes easy and without the consciousness of the people, makes the governments less accountable to the people and tends to extravagance and even the use of the people's money to keep the yoke upon the people's neck. It is untenable to hold that the money necessary to maintain the Federal Government could not be raised by direct taxation. A patriotic people are willing to pay the money needed for a just and economical administration of a government which they themselves control.

The question of taxation lies deep in the body politic of every Nation. The power to tax becomes the power to govern, and is the greatest source of gain the world has ever seen. Such a power should rest in the hands of the people. In a republic the people must regulate and control it, or special interests will seize it and threaten the Nation's prosperity and its liberties. Heretofore America has adopted the indirect system for its Federal taxation, and as a consequence to-day we have a condition of Federal taxation about which the American people are ignorant behind our tariff wall. For every dollar of customs revenue that the Government collects to-day, it is estimated that private interests collect $7. No people would submit to such a system of taxation if they knew about it. This reciprocity bill is the first step along the path that will lead to the needed change in our system of taxation, and it is a step toward placing our industries on a more permanently sound basis.

The foundation for prosperity and greatness for a people of high industrial capacity is close access to nature's resources, from which to supply the means for subsistence and the materials for manufacture. Throughout the opposition to this measure and to all reform of the tariff runs the fear that we can not compete with the people of other lands.

Who are the American people that we should fear to accept competition with the world?

The eloquent remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, lately the Speaker of this House [Mr. CANNON], on this floor yesterday give a complete answer. He stated that the people of the United States, about 92,000,000 in number, produce in agricultural products and in manufactured products, constituting the two great classes of products, about as much as the 350,000,000 of the peoples of Europe. He also stated that we spend for the education of the American people four and one-half tenths, nearly half the money spent for education in all the world.

Prof. William G. Clark, a noted economist, estimates that the annual output of the average American producer is $2,450 worth of wealth a year; the average for the Canadian is $1,456; the average for the Australian is $900; for the Frenchman, $640; for the Englishman, $556; for the German, $460; which gives the American a ratio of more than five times the productiveness of the average German, more than four times the productiveness of the average Englishman, more than three and a half times the productiveness of the average Frenchman, two and a half times the productiveness of the average Australian, and more than one and a half times the productiveness of the average Canadian.

To maintain and even increase this relatively great industrial capacity of our people we should not only continue to develop our educational system, particularly for the masses of our people who only reach elementary grades, turning our atten-

tion in these grades to industrial instruction, but we should bring in a wider market and keener competition. Our great industries should no longer be confined to the home market and relieved of competition, but should get the discipline of universal competition and should conquer the great markets of the whole world and escape the wide fluctuations of booms and depressions that are inevitable with a single market. Being sure of the industrial capacity of our people, the supreme consideration for our statesmen is to furnish them access to the natural resources of the world. For the undeveloped lands of the world our true policy is equal opportunity guaranteed by the "open-door policy," fair chance for all, colonization and political control by none. Toward the occupied and developed lands of the world our true policy is reciprocity. The most important people of all with whom we should have reciprocity are the people of Canada, whose products are largely supplemental to our own, who possess boundless resources within the shortest distances along natural lines of communication.

It seems almost incredible that any sensible man could maintain that having access to these vast and new resources would harm the American people. Under such a theory the great domain of the Western Reserve should never have been opened up for fear of adverse effects upon New England and the Atlantic seaboard. Under such a theory it was a grave mistake to open the vast stretch of country beyond the Mississippi River, a fatal mistake to make the Louisiana purchase, the Florida purchase, the Gadsden and Alaska purchases. Under the same theory it was fatal to the people of Kansas that Oklahoma was opened up; it is a fatal mistake for us to proceed with the extension of irrigation and the reclamation of arid regions of the West and Southwest.

The facts are that in every case the opening up of new resources not only built up the new country, but added to the prosperity of the older sections.

It is semiludicrous to hear such Members as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] pleading the cause of the American farmer. The chief opposition to this measure does not come from the consistent friends of the farmer, but from the apostles of a high prohibitive tariff, who in their zeal for the manufacturer have always fought the farmers. [Applause on the Democratic side.] If you analyze the motive behind the limited but desperate resistance to this measure you will find that it comes from those who fear to let the levee of high protection be broken even by a crawfish hole, and their fear is well grounded. This reciprocity treaty is the first real break in the levee of high protection. It will be followed by other breaks in rapid succession, and will lead to the revision of our fiscal policies and the placing of our industries on a sound economic basis by giving us, through a widening policy of reciprocity, a wider access to the natural resources of this hemisphere, and by giving our industries the discipline of competition and the conquest of the markets of the world.

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend at this juncture to discuss at length the unsound position in which our industries have been placed by the persistence of the policy of high protection. I will only point out what must be clear to anyone with a knowledge of human nature, that an industry getting the large profits within a high protective wall will not be interested in the business of world's markets beyond, where the profits under competition are comparatively small. Instead of going out for the larger markets, the men controlling the industry will spend most of their time stifling competition at home, so as to gain full benefit of these tariff walls. After filling the home market the industry stops developing. For more than 10 years the industries of America have been hampered in their development. With our great natural resources supplying the raw materials and the power, and with the wonderful skill and adaptability of our people, our industries ought to have gone out these last 10, 12, or 15 years to the conquest of the markets of the world. The profits on a single article would have been smaller but the volume of business would have been much greater. The industries would have grown beyond anything in their experience, while the whole American people would have gotten the benefit of lower cost of living. They would have required vastly more laborers and the increased demand for labor would have raised the price of wages far beyond the present level. The astounding fallacy is advanced that this policy of continued high protection has been adopted for the protection of American labor, when in all the legislation on the books of the land you will not find one clause imposing a tariff on the importation of labor. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Labor is the one thing in this country that has never received the real consideration of the priest of high protection. [Applause on the Democratic side.] On the contrary, the evidence is full and complete that vast interests getting the benefit of the high tariff wall, and relieved of competition themselves, are the very agencies that have encouraged, if they have not subsidized, the influx of vast hordes of labor from Europe all on the free list. They have encouraged the sending over of the cheapest labor of Europe. They have gathered up the paupers in the highways and byways, and, dumping them on our shores, they did not guide them to the fields in need of cultivation, but directed their footsteps to the mine and the factory, and there the pauper labor of Europe has stood upon the neck and shoulder of American labor. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I have been accused of being afraid of other nations in behalf of my own country. I have studied America in comparison with other nations, and our civilization in comparison with theirs, and two great facts stand out. First, the weakness of our civilization, a weakness shown by every Republic since the world began, is the lack of preparation for military defense. Secondly, the strength of our civilization is economic, and lies in our commercial and industrial productiveness.

In what is being added to the increase of the world's wealth by industrial labor, America to-day is adding the equivalent of almost all of the rest of the world combined. We need never fear for our country in a fair competition in the markets of the world. The American who can produce four times as much as any man in the world need not fear the labor competition of the pauper. I will tell these gentlemen who plead for American labor that an American unarmed can not meet even a pauper armed. We need not fear for our country in the domain of its irresistible commercial and industrial strength, but our concern should be to safeguard the Nation in the line of its great weakness, lack of measures for defense. Our concern should be to see to it that our American man of peace who goes unarmed has a fair chance in the markets of the world, and is allowed to continue unmolested his peaceful productiveness which places him beyond the competition of all of the rest of the people of the earth. The true, sound, and wise policy for us to pursue at this juncture is to try to insure that this peaceful civilization of ours shall not be interfered with in its progress by the military power that others have prepared, though weaker in resources, and then, to lay the foundation for a permanent industrial greatness through the further educational development of our people, through the discipline of competition in the markets of the world, and through access to the great natural resources and the markets of the world. And this would dictate the adoption of this resolution. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DOREMUS].

Mr. DOREMUS. Mr. Chairman, I desire at this time to express to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] my appreciation of this opportunity to say a few words upon the pending question. As a new Member of this House, conscious of my inability to add anything new to this discussion, I am loath either to occupy your time or ask for your indulgence. My only excuse is that I represent a constituency that is perhaps interested more directly in this measure than any other community in the United States.

The district I have the honor to represent is practically unanimous for the passage of the pending measure. The city of Detroit, with a population of 465,000 people, is perhaps more directly and vitally interested in the ratification of this agreement than any other community in the United States. Our manufacturers, wholesalers, retailers, and laboring classes generally, with complete unanimity, are asking for freer commercial intercourse with Canada. The people of Detroit are an intelligent people; they have given careful and earnest consideration to this question. They do not ask for Canadian reciprocity solely because they believe it will benefit them, but because it will prove an advantage to the entire country. They recognize it as a national and not a local question. They are intelligent enough to realize the community of interest that exists between the city and the farm. If they believed the ratification of the proposed agreement would seriously affect the great agricultural classes they would not favor it. In short, they understand that the prosperity of agriculture is essential to the happiness and contentment of all our people.

The city of Detroit is but 2,600 feet away from our Canadian neighbors. It is estimated by the immigration authorities that about 3,500 people from Windsor, Walkerville, and Sandwich cross the Detroit River daily and earn their livelihood in Detroit. It is also estimated that about 1,400 Detroit people cross the river each day and earn their livelihood upon the Canadian side. The freest thing that crosses and recrosses that great artery of commerce is labor, and with free trade in labor we feel that

we have a right to insist upon free trade in the products of labor. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I wish to advert to the statements made by enemies of reciprocity on the Canadian side that this measure is merely the forerunner of annexation. If there is any sentiment in this country in favor of annexation with Canada it ought to be found in Detroit; but it can not be discovered there, because it does not exist. This talk of annexation is inspired merely for the purpose of frightening the people of Canada and defeating the ratification of the proposed reciprocal agreement.

Much has been said upon this floor of the disaster that will overtake the farmers if this measure becomes a law. Much has been said of the evil effects of opening our markets to Canadian wheat, grown, as the opponents of this measure tell us, upon cheap land by cheap labor. To my mind these fears are unfounded. I have always believed, and believe now, that when a country produces more of a given commodity than it can consume the surplus must find a market abroad and the price abroad will regulate the price at home. If this be true, it matters not, so far as the effect upon our market is concerned, whether Canadian wheat is grown upon cheap land or dear land. Both the United States and Canada produce a surplus of wheat which must be sold abroad. The Canadian surplus meets the American surplus in the markets of Liverpool and London. Does anybody in these markets ever inquire whether this or that particular wheat was grown upon cheap land or dear land; by cheap labor or dear labor? [Applause on the Democratic side.] In many of the counties of Michigan you may find farms valued at $50 per acre and farms valued at $100 per acre. The wheat grown upon each of these farms is hauled to the same market and sold at the same price.

In considering the price of wheat we are considering a world-wide proposition. If my position is correct, the importation to-morrow of every bushel of Canadian wheat into the United States would not break the American market. There would be the same number of bushels of wheat and the same number of mouths to feed. The abnormal demand created in Canada by the withdrawal of her wheat would maintain the price here. The farmer does not fix the price of his wheat. He does not figure the interest on his investment, the cost of seed and labor, and say to the consumer, "You may have it for so much." The price of wheat is fixed by the law of supply and demand, and speculation is the only thing that can interfere with the operation of that law. A tariff upon wheat benefits no one except the gambler who would "corner" his country's supply of wheat. [Applause.]

The distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HAMILTON], for whom I have the highest respect, and whose popularity at home is attested by his long-continued service here, contended that the tariff upon wheat raised the price. With much eloquence he declared that he was opposed to farming "on shares" with Canada and selling the surplus abroad. I think perhaps the gentleman's argument is influenced somewhat by environment and force of habit. I have lived all my life among Michigan Republicans. Knowing them as I do, and having witnessed the regularity with which they roll up their 100,000 majority at every election, I am convinced that they are opposed to doing anything on shares. He declared in the course of his eloquent speech that as the Canadian farmers paid nothing to support our schools and build our highways and bridges, they should be forced to contribute something to maintain the Government when they availed themselves of our markets. If the gentleman is correct when he says the tariff upon wheat raises the price, it may be pertinent to inquire who does the contributing, the Canadian producer of wheat or the American consumer of bread? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

If the opponents of this measure are right and the tariff does actually raise the price of wheat, it ought not to be imposed. A high price for wheat means a high price for flour, a high price for flour means a high price for bread, and, Mr. Chairman, a tax on bread is a crime against humanity. The loaf is small enough now. Had I the power I would make it larger instead of smaller.

While the ratification of this agreement will not and can not lower the price of wheat, it will, in my judgment, have a tendency to reduce the cost of living, especially in the towns and cities adjacent to the Canadian border. I certainly hope so. At certain seasons of the year, and when market conditions are favorable, we ought to be able to get more butter, more eggs, more potatoes, more poultry, more vegetables. In the consideration of this question we ought to look conditions squarely in the face. It was but a few years ago when the farmers constituted one-half our population. To-day they constitute but one-third. Population has been centralizing in the large industrial centers, and this country to-day is short on food and long on manufactures. What we need is more food and a broader market. I am in favor of this measure because I believe it will have a tendency to give us both. [Applause.]

The distinguished gentleman from Maine [Mr. HINDS], in the course of one of the most scholarly speeches on this question to which it has been my good fortune to listen, declared that the farm was a home as distinguished from a factory. I think that is true. The American farm is the finest home upon which the sun shines—and the American farmer is the most independent man within the confines of the two oceans. In all his experience he has never felt the pangs of hunger, and never will. With his broad, fertile acres he is never called upon to worry over where the next meal is coming from for his wife and his children. I do not believe the time will ever come in this country when, in order to make one-third of our population prosperous and contented, it will be necessary to visit privation and want upon the remaining two-thirds. If so, there is something fundamentally wrong with our industrial and social system.

Free trade has made the United States a great manufacturing and agricultural Nation. More commerce passes through the Detroit River in eight months than enters and clears the ports of New York, Boston, Liverpool, and Glasgow in an entire year. If you seek the great contributing cause of this country's marvelous growth, you will find it in that provision of the Federal Constitution which guarantees free trade between the States. What reasons exist for freedom of commerce between the States which can not be urged with equal force for freedom of commerce between the United States and Canada? To my mind there is no more excuse for a commercial barrier between these two countries than there is for a commercial barrier between Ohio and Michigan or between the upper and lower peninsulas of Michigan. [Applause.]

This measure would benefit the American farmer by enlarging the market for many of his products. Canada is not, and never will be, a great fruit-producing country. For the year ending March 31, 1910, we sold to Canada 59,000 barrels of apples against a tariff of 40 cents per barrel. We sold her peaches to the amount of 4,797,000 pounds against a tariff of $1 per 100 pounds. We sold her quinces, apricots, and pears to the amount of 4,941,000 pounds against a tariff of 50 cents per 100 pounds. We sold her cherries to the amount of 318,680 pounds against a tariff of 2 cents per pound. We sold her clover and timothy seed to the amount of $748,742 against a tariff of 10 per cent ad valorem. With the tariff against these and other products removed we would be able to sell Canada much more.

Some gentlemen on the other side are worrying over the future of the bean growers of this country if this measure should become a law. The total Canadian bean crop for 1909 was 1,324,600 bushels. Why, Mr. Chairman, the State of Michigan alone raises annually five times this quantity of beans. The production of beans in Canada is so small, compared with our own production, that the farmer has little to fear on that score.

The distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY], whose judgment I would be willing to accept on almost any question except the tariff, is much worried over the fate that will befall the hay producers of this country in the event this reciprocity agreement is ratified. He fears the Canadians will be able to flood our markets with cheap hay. Let us consider the hay question for a moment. In 1909 the Canadian farmers produced 11,877,100 tons of hay and sold it at an average price of $11.14 per ton. In 1909 the total American yield was 64,938,000 tons, the product selling at an average price of $10.62 per ton. In 1908 the total Canadian yield was 11,450,000 tons, selling at an average price of $9.96 per ton. In the United States the total yield for that year was 70,798,000 tons, selling at an average price of $8.98 per ton. My authority for these statements are the Canada Yearbook for 1909 and the Statistical Abstract of the United States for 1909. It would not appear from these figures that the American hay producer would be in any immediate danger from ruin by Canadian competition. In this connection I wish to direct attention to the fact that progressive American farmers to-day are not raising hay for the market, but are feeding it to their stock, and thus putting it back upon the land. They have learned by experience that they can make more money by this process than by selling their hay.

Reciprocity with Canada is no experiment. Under the reciprocity treaty of 1854 both manufactures and agriculture prospered as they never did before. In 1854, the year the treaty was ratified, our exports to Canada were $15,533,101. In 1862 they had increased to $25,173,157. In 1854 Canada sold to us

to the amount of $8,649,002. In 1862 she sold us to the amount of $15,063,730—a balance of trade in our favor for that year of over $10,000,000. In 1853, the year before the treaty, our imports from the Provinces were $7,550,718, and our exports thereto were $13,140,642—a balance in our favor of less than $6,000,000. The change was so great in 1855, the year after the treaty, that our exports increase to $27,806,020, or more than double those of 1853. As our imports in 1855 from the Provinces were $15,136,734, the balance of trade in our favor was $12,600,000, or more than we ever sold to Canada before in any single year, except one.

Mr. Chairman, if this measure will increase the Nation's supply of food, it ought to be passed without delay. [Applause.] The millions who reside in our large cities are entitled to some relief from existing conditions. They are at the mercy of the great trusts that stifle competition and fix the price of nearly every item of human necessity. They buy their cotton goods at prices fixed by the Cotton Goods Trust; woolen goods at prices fixed by the Woolen Goods Trust; hosiery at prices fixed by the Hosiery Trust; products of iron and steel at prices fixed by the Iron and Steel Trust; rubber goods at prices fixed by the Rubber Trust; meats at prices fixed by the Meat Trust. They work for wages fixed by the law of supply and demand and buy the plainest necessities of life in a restricted market controlled to a large extent by these great combinations. Rapidly advancing prices have so decreased the purchasing power of a dollar during recent years that the struggle for existence has become a particularly hard one.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the days of high protection in this country are almost numbered. Henry Clay, the ablest apostle of protection in American history, entered the Senate of the United States in 1806, and for 30 years contended that the Government should protect by tariff legislation our young and growing industries. He never contemplated, however, that a high protective tariff would be imposed forever. He believed that the time would come when our manufacturing industries would be upon an independent footing and be able to defend themselves successfully against foreign competition. In 1832 he introduced a tariff bill which provided for a gradual reduction of duties until 1842, by which time he estimated that the tariff would be upon a revenue basis, or an average ad valorem duty of about 20 per cent. Imagine his surprise, could he return to earth, upon learning that the so-called stand-pat element of the Republican Party, masquerading as the friends of American labor and assuming to be advocates of the principle for which he contended nearly a hundred years ago, had succeeded in fastening upon this country a tariff largely in excess of that for which he contended when our industries were young.

Protection as represented by the Payne-Aldrich bill is an instrument of oppression and a badge of dishonesty. It fetters legitimate business, curtails the world's markets for our products, burdens the consuming millions, and robs labor of its honest reward. It was not designed to protect American labor. It was designed to give to the American manufacturing and producing trusts an advantage to which they are not entitled, and by which they are to-day plundering the American people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Let us pass the pending measure and relieve, if we can, the oppressive conditions that burden our great industrial classes. Why continue to legislate against trade, the only thing that ever made a nation industrially or financially great? The time has gone by when the American people can live by trading among themselves. The much-vaunted home-market theory of 30 years ago will not do to-day. The great need of the present is a larger market for our surplus products. It is said that our cotton mills can turn out in six or seven months enough goods to supply the American people for a year. The surplus must find a market abroad or the mills will close. The prosperity of this country is dependent upon the prosperity of other countries. Strike down, if you please, one-third or one-quarter of the manufacturing industries of England and Continental Europe and the fires will die out in our own furnaces and the American farmers' surplus will go a begging in the markets of the world.

Let us abandon the policy of exclusion and retaliation and usher in the spirit of peace, commerce, and friendly trade relations with our neighbors. [Applause.]

Mr. McCALL. I yield 25 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. NEEDHAM].

Mr. NEEDHAM. Mr. Chairman, I propose in the time allotted me to confine myself strictly to the concrete proposition which is now before this body. This is a bill to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada. Under the terms of the Payne Tariff Act the maximum tariff of the United States would have become effective against Canada on April 1, 1910, unless prior to that time the President of the United States had proclaimed that the Canadian tariff did not discriminate against the United States. It should be remembered that the last tariff bill as it passed the House provided for a maximum and minimum tariff, and that all countries should be entitled to our minimum tariff, and the maximum tariff was to be applied only to countries that practiced tariff discrimination against the United States. The Senate, however, amended the theory of the maximum and minimum provision so that the maximum tariff should be applied to all countries unless the President of the United States should be satisfied, and so proclaimed, that no undue discrimination existed in the tariff of any country against the United States. The difference between the House bill and the Senate bill in this regard was radical, and, in my humble judgment, the position of the House upon the question was more consistent with our theory of the tariff than the position of the Senate. However, the adoption of the conference report on the last tariff bill carried with it the adoption of the Senate provision in regard to the maximum and minimum tariff.

The negotiations between the Dominion of Canada and the United States, with a view of giving the former the benefit of the minimum tariff rates of our law, offered an opportunity for the President of the United States to indicate to the representatives of Canada the willingness of the administration to take up the question of an agreement between the two countries for reciprocal trade relations between them. I am convinced that the President, in making this suggestion to the representatives of Canada, acted in conformity with the overwhelming public sentiment of the people of the United States. I am convinced that, disregarding all selfish interests and looking at the question from the broad standpoint of national policy, the President of the United States in taking the initiative in negotiating and in consummating a trade agreement with our neighbor, Canada, which provides mutual trade advantages, rendered a service which will stand out as a conspicuous accomplishment of his administration. [Applause.]

In prophesying the effect upon the commerce between the two countries which the ratification of the pending agreement will have we have the record of the years between 1854 and 1866, when the Elgin-Marcy reciprocity treaty was in force. Notwithstanding that during the greater portion of that period the growth of our commerce with all countries, owing to the Civil War, was necessarily seriously interrupted, yet the record of the increase of trade between Canada and the United States under this reciprocity treaty is indisputable. The opponents of the present legislation have intimated that the abrogation of the Elgin-Marcy treaty in 1866 was due to a depressing effect upon certain American interests by reason of Canadian competition. I think, however, that a fair consideration of the question will lead the unbiased mind to the conclusion that the chief factor which led to the abrogation of that treaty in the year 1866 was because of the attitude of Great Britain toward the United States during the Civil War. It can hardly be disputed that the intense antipathy of the people of the United States toward Great Britain and Canada because of the attitude of the British Empire toward the United States during the Civil War contributed largely to the abolition of this treaty, and thus marked a historical step backward in the trade relations between the two countries.

The agreement with Canada now before us is more comprehensive than the Elgin-Marcy treaty and includes commodities of various classes.

Briefly speaking, the provisions of the agreement now pending may be summarized as follows:

First. Reciprocal free lists on leading primary food products, such as wheat and other grain; dairy products; fresh fruits and vegetables; eggs and poultry; fish, cattle and sheep, and live animals; and tin plate. Also certain commodities now free in one country are to be made free by the other, for instance: Cotton-seed oil will go free into Canada, and rough lumber will come free into the United States. Barbed-wire fencing is to be admitted free into the United States.

Second. Mutual reduced identical rates on secondary food products, such as fresh meats, canned meats, bacon and hams, lard and lard compounds, canned vegetables, cereals, and other foodstuffs partly manufactured.

Third. Mutual reduced rates on a list of manufactured commodities, including motor vehicles, cutlery, clocks and watches, sanitary fixtures, satchels and leather goods, plate glass, brass band instruments, printing ink, and miscellaneous articles. Under this head, also, Canadian duties on agricultural implements are reduced to the present United States rates.

Fourth. On certain commodities special rates by each country are made, as, for example, Canada reduces her duty on coal and cement, while the United States reduces its duties on iron ore, dressed lumber, aluminum products, and so forth.

In order to get a comprehensive idea of the effect of the agreement in a broad sense, it is necessary to refer somewhat briefly to statistics and figures.

The following statistics and figures are taken by me from a speech delivered by John Ball Osborne, Chief of the Bureau of Trade Relations, Department of State, before the Economic Club of Portland, Me., on March 15 last, and they show that the present foreign trade of the Dominion of Canada amounts to $655,000,000, of which the imports are valued at $375,800,000 and the exports at $279,200,000; exactly 50 per cent, or one-half of the total trade of Canada, to wit, $327,700,000, is with the United States, while 36 per cent, or $234,800,000, is with the United Kingdom, the balance of the trade being with other countries.

Of the total importations into Canada just given above, and amounting to $375,800,000, the United States furnishes $223,500,000, or 59.4 per cent, of the total imports into that country; the United Kingdom imports 25.3 per cent, amounting to $95,800,000; the balance of the imports are from other countries.

Of the total Canadian exports Great Britain and the United Kingdom receive approximately one-half, or $139,500,000; the United States comes next, with 37.3 per cent, amounting to $104,200,000; while the balance goes to various countries.

A study of our foreign markets shows that the Dominion of Canada stands third as a foreign market for the exports of the United States, being in this respect surpassed only by the United Kingdom and Germany. However, as a source of our imports Canada stands sixth, being surpassed by five countries, namely, the United Kingdom, Germany, France, Cuba, and Brazil.

These statistics show the great importance of our trade with the Dominion of Canada. The showing is remarkable when we consider both the highly protective and the preferential features of the Canadian customs tariff. Since 1897 Canada has had highly protective rates, and at the same time has had preferential tariffs to the mother country and conventional tariffs with other countries, which have undoubtedly hampered the freedom of commerce between Canada and the United States.

The preferential rates which Canada offered to the mother country in 1897 were, first, a flat rebate of 12.5 per cent. This preferential rate was increased in 1898 to 25 per cent and then again in 1900 to 33.33 per cent in favor of the mother country, and has averaged about that rate since. Notwithstanding these preferences, the commerce of the United States with Canada has constantly grown, and, with the removal of the barriers provided for in the pending agreement, I am satisfied that the growth of commerce between the two countries will be by leaps and bounds. [Applause.] If the commerce of the United States with Canada has actually increased as statistics show, and we have, in fact, a greater share in the markets of Canada than the mother country, who can predict the share in that commerce which the United States would obtain should the agreement under consideration be enacted into law? [Applause.]

I said a moment ago that the United States now furnishes 59.4 per cent of the total imports into Canada and the United Kingdom 25.3 per cent. In 1884 England furnished approximately 40 per cent of the Canadian imports, while the United States at that time furnished between 46 and 47 per cent. In other words, the percentage share of England in the imports of Canada decreased, notwithstanding the preferential tariffs granted, from approximately 40 per cent of the total imports in 1884 to approximately 25 per cent in 1910, while during the same period, notwithstanding the highly protective tariff of Canada, the percentage share of the United States in the imports of Canada increased from approximately 46 or 47 per cent in 1884 to nearly 60 per cent in 1910.

These extraordinary, striking figures, under the conditions, demonstrate the enormous advantage and value of our commerce with Canada, and they clearly indicate that the mutual advantages to the two countries will be of incalculable benefit to each when freer trade relations, such as is contemplated by the agreement under consideration, are made a reality.

The large and important commerce which the United States now enjoys with the Dominion of Canada, notwithstanding the tariff barriers between the two countries and the preferential convention tariffs granted by Canada to other nations, justifies the belief that with the removal of these barriers to the extent provided in the agreement which we are now considering the commerce will be enormously augmented to the mutual advantage of both countries.

The policy of reciprocity has been a subject that has come before the American people frequently. I can not recall of a proposal for reciprocity with any country within recent years but what has met with violent opposition. A study of our various reciprocity agreements which have been presented for consideration fails to disclose with any degree of accuracy that they have been based upon any definite policy; that is, it can not be accurately stated that the reciprocity agreements heretofore negotiated by Republican Presidents have been confined to noncompeting products. Certainly all of the reciprocity treaties negotiated by the McKinley administration and known as the "Kasson treaties" provided for reciprocity in competing articles. I have a very vivid memory of these treaties, because they were pending for ratification at the time I entered Congress, 12 years ago. A large number of these treaties ruthlessly sacrificed many important California industries, and I had occasion to study their terms with a considerable degree of care, and pride myself that to some extent I had something to do with their defeat. To declare, therefore, as it has been done on this floor during the consideration of this agreement, that McKinley stood only for reciprocity in noncompeting articles is certainly not historically true, if we are to consider, as we must, that he approved of the acts of his own administration. It seems to me that the conclusion which every fair-minded man must reach is that the only safe way in considering reciprocity agreements is to consider each agreement by itself. In other words, each reciprocity agreement must stand alone.

The language of McKinley, in his last Buffalo address, in no sense bears out the assertion that he was opposed to reciprocity in competing products. I quote the gist of that speech:

> A system which provides a mutual exchange of commodities—a mutual exchange—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?

Mr. Chairman, whatever may have been the position of the Republican Party in the past, and whatever may have been the real sentiments of McKinley and the other great leaders of the party upon the question of reciprocity, it seems to me that at this time there is no occasion for division of sentiment upon this question because the Republican Party, in its last national convention, which is the last authoritative declaration of the party upon the subject, and should therefore be the guide of the party, made a definition of the policy of protection, when, in substance, it declared that the tariff should be limited for the purposes of protection to the difference between the cost of production in this country and the cost of production abroad, with a reasonable profit to the American producer.

I am willing, Mr. Chairman, that my vote for or against the pending measure shall be determined by the principle of the last Republican national platform. [Applause.] If anyone can convince me that the difference in the cost of production of any of the articles mentioned in the pending agreement is substantially less in Canada than the cost of the production of the same articles in this country, then I should feel that under the definition of protection in the last national platform, as a Republican, I was bound to vote against the measure. But my study of the agreement and the evidence submitted convinces my mind that there is no substantial difference. I agree with President Taft, who said in his speech at Springfield, Ill., on February 11 last.

> The conditions of production and of manufacture in the United States and Canada are substantially the same. Wages may differ in one part of Canada from another part, just as wages differ in different States in this country, but taken by and large, the character of the laborers, their intelligence and their skill, and the price paid them per unit of work, are not substantially less in Canada than they are in this country. * * * With that in view, still adhering loyally and sincerely to the principles of protection where it is needed to maintain our important industries, I did not hesitate to give the widest latitude to the Secretary of State and the commissioners who represented this country in offering to Canada a reduction of duties on goods and products coming into this country from Canada in consideration of the establishment of the same duty, or freedom from duty, on similar goods going into Canada.

After having made several visits to Canada myself I am convinced that the advantage is with the producer in the United States in competition with his competitor in Canada, generally speaking. The long, severe winters of Canada, the distance of the Canadian producer from the consuming centers of population, place a handicap upon the Canadian that greatly inures to the benefit of his American competitor. Of course there may be exceptions to this rule, but I am satisfied that, speaking broadly, the cost per unit of production of the competing articles provided for in the agreement under consideration are at least no greater, if not less—and, in my opinion, less—than in Canada, and in this view the report of the Tariff Board, set forth in Senate Document No. 849, Sixty-first Congress, third session, is a substantial confirmation.

Mr. DALZELL. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. NEEDHAM. Certainly.

Mr. DALZELL. I wish to ask the gentleman whether or not this measure conforms, so far as paper is concerned, with the last Republican platform?

Mr. NEEDHAM. I think it does.

Mr. DALZELL. You think there is no difference between the cost of making paper in Canada and in this country?

Mr. NEEDHAM. I think there is no substantial difference.

Mr. DALZELL. Oh, no substantial difference!

Mr. NEEDHAM. The report of the board, however, is before the Congress, and Members can determine it for themselves, but my study of the agreement and of this evidence convinces me that there is no substantial difference.

I find quite a few of the Members of this House who are now violently opposed to the pending agreement on the ground that it is an abandonment of the policy of protection were very substantial promoters and sponsors in passing through this House the legislation necessary to provide for reciprocity with Cuba. How the gentlemen referred to can reconcile their action is quite a mystery to me. Who will pretend that the labor conditions in Cuba are in any sense equal to our own, or that they in any degree approach the labor conditions in Canada? I opposed with what little ability I possessed the legislation providing for reciprocity with Cuba, because I felt it was an abandonment of the principle of protection, and because I felt an apprehension that the competition of the industries of that island would be injurious to the industries of the State of which I have had the honor to, in part, represent upon this floor for over 12 years. But our experience thus far under the policy of reciprocity with the Cuban Republic has not as yet had the effect such as I feared, and I have a strong conviction that the disastrous results which I apprehended may never materialize, and I am constrained to prophesy that the dire disasters which are apprehended by those on this side of the Chamber as a result of the enactment of the legislation now under consideration will also fail to materialize.

Now that we Members of the Republican Party have adopted a definition limiting the application of the policy of protection so that in fixing tariff duties they shall equalize the cost of production in this country and abroad with a fair profit to the American producer, and as there is no other country in the world where the conditions of production are as near an equality with our own as the Dominion of Canada, I sincerely trust that we may enact this measure into law and thus test the productive capacity and the competing ability of our people along lines of production and competition on substantial equality of terms.

Firmly believing that the putting into effect of the agreement under consideration will harm no substantial industry, but, on the contrary, will bring mutual benefit to both Canada and our own country, I shall support this great measure of a Republican President and a Republican administration. [Applause.] If, however, this measure should be put into force and effect and shall prove by its actual operation that the prophesies of those who now oppose it have been well founded and that we who now support it are mistaken, I will be the first to join in a movement for its abrogation.

Mr. Chairman, when this bill was before the House at the last session there was much discussion as to the effect the entering upon the policy of reciprocity with Canada would have under "the most-favored nation clause" of our treaties with other countries. It was vehemently asserted at that time, and may be again reiterated, that those nations which have treaties with the United States containing what is known as "the most-favored nation clause" would have the right under such clause to demand admission for their products into the ports of the United States upon payment of the same duties granted to Canada. I have given some study and attention to this matter, and I find that the decisions are uniform in the Supreme Court to the effect that under such conditions the clause does not apply. The Customs Court handed down a decision within the last 10 days unanimously affirming this policy. This question is treated quite exhaustively in volume 5 of Moore's Digest of International Law, pages 257–288, and I will not take the time to read any of these decisions, but anyone interested can examine these references if he desires.

The effect of these decisions and holdings is to make it the policy of the United States to refuse to grant the rates of duty provided for under reciprocity to any other nation than the one with whom the treaty is made. "The most-favored-nation clause" does not apply, because the rule is "Identity of treatment under identity of circumstances and conditions," and the conditions and considerations which would prompt our Government to grant tariff concessions to one nation under reciprocity are not the same, and in the nature of things can not be the same, as would induce the granting of similar rates to other countries with whom we have "the most-favored-nation clause" treaty.

Thus far I have not discussed, except in the most general way, the schedules of the proposed agreement. I have not attempted to analyze the effect which the treaty may have upon any single industry. My belief is that under the policy of protection, as defined in our last national platform, the cost of production in Canada being substantially the same as in this country, a tariff duty upon any of the articles enumerated in the agreement above that provided is not demanded in the interest of protection, and therefore my hope and belief is that the agreement itself will not, when it becomes operative, be disastrous to any American industry.

If incidentally the enactment of this legislation shall prove that the definition of protection limiting it, as was done under the terms of the last national platform, is insufficient for the play of industrial forces and the development and maintenance of our industrial conditions on a plane of healthfulness and prosperity, then that in itself will be an experience worth the experiment which this agreement contemplates. The people of this country will never continue any policy which will hamper our means of production and development or in the slightest degree imperil our standard of living. The American Nation is irrevocably committed to the policy of protection. [Applause.] We on this side of the Chamber may differ, and honestly differ, as to the amount of duty that should be granted to an industry to enable that industry to maintain the American standard and to meet the competition of the same industry of another country of lower standard. There are no differences here as to the necessity of maintaining the principles of protection. While I do not desire to assume to be opinionated, I venture to assert that those adherents of very high tariff rates are not the best supporters and advocates of the protective policy. In other words, rates in excess of what is known to place the domestic producer on a par with his foreign competitor may furnish an incentive, especially under present trade and industrial conditions, to monopolistic tendencies which would unduly burden the domestic purchaser and consumer. The true protective policy at no point requires its advocates to demand or defend excessive or unnecessary duties. [Applause.] I am persuaded that the following from a recent speech of President Taft should be most carefully considered by all protectionists, when he said, in speaking of the agreement now under consideration:

> There are those conservative protectionists who hang back from an approval of this agreement on the ground that it is a departure from the principle of protection and is the opening wedge to let in free trade. My own view is that no step could be taken more in the interest of a reasonable policy of protection than the approval of this treaty. The very existence of the policy depends on our abolition of the tariff where it is not really needed under the principle of the last Republican platform. If we persist in retaining it in these times of high prices and gradually exhausting food supply and base our retention on protection principles, we shall rouse an opposition that will know no moderation and will not cease radical economic changes until it has removed from the statute book the last trace of a protective tariff.

[Applause.]

But it is contended with great earnestness by those who oppose this legislation, that it will prove disastrous to the farming interests of our country. An attack upon the farmers of this country, or even a failure to properly guard their interests, would prove disastrous, and rightfully so, to those responsible for such a movement. I represent a district and in part a State where the leading industry is that of agriculture. The various branches of agriculture in my State, coming as they do in direct competition with the lowest paid labor in the world, where the conditions and where the standard of living is among the lowest, I fully appreciate that the farming industries of my State could not exist for a season with such competition except for the imposition of an adequate tariff. I would be the last individual upon this floor to cast a vote, and my State would

never tolerate a vote by any of its Representatives that would imperil or seriously affect the farmers of any portion of our country. [Applause.] I freely concede to every Representative upon this floor who may feel constrained to oppose this measure the utmost sincerity and honesty of purpose, and I only claim for myself the same honesty and sincerity which I freely concede to others. But after the best attention which I have been able to give to this subject in all its bearings I am unable to find that its enactment into law will imperil or appreciably affect the farming interests of the country, or of any particular section.

I appreciate the tremendous force which is included in any rallying cry made in behalf of the farmers of the country, but not being convinced that it is based upon truth and, furthermore, having a suspicion that there is possibly behind it something of selfish interests not allied with agriculture, I may be pardoned if I look with some degree of suspicion upon the forces and the motives of those who have inaugurated this protest. [Applause.]

There has been during the last few years a great prominence given to the subject of conservation. Tremendous interest has been created in the subject, and there is a widespread public sentiment that, with the enormous growth of our population and the consequent drawing upon our natural resources, the augmentation of these resources, and thereby to some extent prevent their exhaustion and impoverishment, is the part of wise statesmanship. Reciprocity with Canada must of necessity be chiefly confined to food and forest products, and the addition of these two great natural resources, bringing them within the reach of our fast-growing population, is a measure of conservation of greater importance than any that have yet been suggested.

Mr. Chairman, I have purposely refrained from discussing this legislation from the standpoint of any community or from the standpoint of any particular industry. This is an agreement between the Dominion of Canada and the United States of America which requires concurrent legislative action by both countries in order that it may be made effective. Any change by amendment, however strongly I might favor certain changes, would of necessity throw the whole proceedings into negotiations again between the two countries, with the consequent delay and possible failure of any agreement at all. We are therefore compelled to either accept or reject the agreement. That is the practical question before this body. We have got to either vote it up or vote it down. Anyone pretending to be in favor of the agreement, but who is desirous of amending it, is in reality opposed to the agreement. Such an attitude will not deceive anyone acquainted with the real situation. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, as a protectionist and a Republican, I find no difficulty in bringing myself to the support of this great economic measure of the administration of President Taft. Long after the petty bickerings and jealous criticism of his administration shall have been forgotten the action of our President in bringing this measure before the Representatives of the American people will stand out as among the great accomplishments of an administration singularly conspicuous for the constructive measures which have become enacted into law. [Applause.] My judgment tells me that from the standpoint of the national welfare we should enact this legislation. I believe with President Taft when he said:

> Now is the accepted time. Now Canada is in the mood. She is at the parting of the ways. Shall she be an isolated country, as much separated from us as if she were across the ocean; or shall her people and our people profit by the proximity that our geography furnishes?

[Loud applause.]

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BOWMAN].

Mr. BOWMAN. Mr. Chairman, this measure has been very ably debated from every side excepting possibly one, and that is from the standpoint of a Member from the State of Pennsylvania and of a miner or producer of fuel. I rise only from a sense of duty to express to this body, the greatest representative body in the world, some sense of the obligation which the State of Pennsylvania and the district I represent owes to the Province of Canada. I represent the heart of the anthracite coal regions of the State of Pennsylvania. I live in the Wyoming Valley, the land celebrated by the poetry of Campbell, celebrated through the life and work of the Moravian missionaries among the Indians, celebrated as the birthplace of the greatest race of aborigines the world ever knew, and celebrated, I believe it will be, as the birthplace of the greatest race that this country will ever produce. We have there today as the basis of our population the English, the Irish, the Welsh, the German, and the Scotch. There has been introduced within the last decade new elements of the best laboring blood of Europe. We have the Piedimontes and others of the best from Italy, the Lithuanian, the Pole, and the Slovak, and I tell you as one who has had opportunities to observe, that they will make as good citizens as any that this country has heretofore produced.

The State of Pennsylvania sent into the Province of Canada in the year 1910 a large part of over $33,000,000 worth of fuel bought by that country. Over $14,000,000 of that amount was anthracite, upon which we did not pay a cent of duty. They also used over $17,000,000 worth of bituminous coal, and upward of $2,000,000 worth of coke, upon which the inhabitants of that country paid over $3,000,000 in duty for the sake of burning it. That country, gentlemen, can never become an industrial nation. Why? Because they have no adequate supply of fuel. What can we get from them? That country is fitted by nature to produce food to help feed our industrial population. Boundless natural resources fit this country, with their help, to support an industrial race beyond computation.

Less than $98,000,000 covers the total imports of Canada into this country. You will note they paid us for fuel alone over one-third that amount and over $182,000,000 more for other merchandise. Should we not have some feeling of gratitude toward them?

Continue to build the tariff wall that now exists between us higher and wider and before you are through with it you will only have openings through it from which cannon will point from each side to the other.

This is not a question of a tariff; it is a higher and broader question; it is a question of the universal advancement of the human race. I listened with a great deal of interest to what was said by the gentleman from New York City [Mr. GEORGE]. The population in my city is very much like it; they need sympathy and help. But I will say to the gentleman from North Carolina, who called attention to the low wages paid in the State of Pennsylvania, that in the district that I come from we pay as good wages for labor performed as are paid in any place in the world.

We have serious accidents that excite the deepest feelings in man's nature. I once walked up to a shaft where a child was sitting and said to her, "What are you sitting here for, my child?" "I am waiting for my father." Her father had been buried in that mine through an accident that happened more than a week previous.

A fund was raised to relieve the necessities of those who were dependent upon the men who lost their lives in that disaster. I will say for the bankers of New York, however they may be traduced, we found their hearts open to the plea of distress. They, with the other good people of this country, established a fund which has been distributed in that mining district from that day to this, nearly 15 years.

In that connection I want to say that a lady from one of the principal cities of this Nation came to our city to ascertain what the conditions were, and whether it was necessary for her to do anything to ameliorate them. After visiting the whole community, she said to me, "There is more distress in one alley in my city than in your whole district." She visited homes that for months had not had a male protector to help them.

Gentlemen, I repeat, this is not a tariff question.

We are protectionists in my district. We believe in the protective tariff to the limit of competition, with a fair percentage to protect the manufacturer from surplus stocks. We claim that this is a protective measure, presented by one of the greatest Presidents this country ever produced—not the greatest politician, but a man with a broad judicial mind, deeply interested in the welfare of the people—and I submit that a fair majority, in my district ninety-nine one-hundredths of the Republicans and most of the Democrats, are with him.

Gentlemen, I shall vote for this measure [applause] because I do not believe it transgresses a single Republican principle, the principle of protection to American industries, and I do not believe it transgresses a single principle that protects the farmer in the best market for his product, the home market. Look over the reports of prices, the prices for to-day, of farm products in the United States, and there will be found as much difference in the various parts of this country as there is between those of this country and Canada. In the words of our Chaplain this morning, "Let our spiritual ears be unstopped and spiritual eyes be opened," that we may see in this measure one that is far above local conditions, one that tends to the advancement of the race, bringing together these two peoples who are one in lineage, one in their purpose—the elevation of the human race. [Applause.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD].

Mr. GOOD. "Reciprocity is only an international form of protection." This definition from the Standard Dictionary correctly describes reciprocity. It was this conception of reciprocity that caused the Republican Party to write in its platform:

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

This bill, introduced by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], contains none of the elements of reciprocity. It provides not for protection but for free trade in the United States and protection in Canada. [Applause on the Republican side.]

A DEMOCRATIC MEASURE.

The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] has said that this bill presents a political and not a partisan question. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] contends that it is both political and partisan, and that it is a Democratic measure, presented to this House in response to a resolution passed by a Democratic caucus, and that it is in full harmony with the declarations of the Democratic platforms.

I am inclined to agree with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN], and I, for one, am perfectly willing that the Democratic Party shall stand sponsor for this bill and shall be held responsible for its evil effects should it become a law.

The advocates of this bill content themselves with an academic discussion of reciprocity. They fail to point out wherein it is reciprocal and decline to analyze its provisions or the real effect which its enactment will have on the producer and consumer alike.

PROPOSED TRADE NOT RECIPROCAL.

By the provisions of this bill all the products of the Canadian farm are brought into competition with the product of the farms of the United States. It surrenders to the farmers of Canada the markets of the United States for all their produce. For the surrender of these markets it is proposed to reduce the duty on the farm implements manufactured and imported from Canada. This is practically the only reciprocity provided for in this bill.

Let us place in parallel columns, first, a list of the produce of the farm, and, second, a list of the farm and other machinery on which it is proposed to reduce the tariff, with the amount of such proposed reduction, and see if it is a fair and equal trade and if it is reciprocal. On the other side we have a list of practically everything grown on the farm, from which all tariff is removed and which is brought into direct competition with the cheaper farms and the cheaper farm labor of Canada. On the other side we have a list of manufactured articles upon which the duty is reduced and by which it is alleged the farmers of this country will profit all that they have lost through the placing of farm products on the free list:

What the American farmer gives and what the Canadian farmer gets.	*What the Canadian farmer gives and what the American farmer gets.*	
FREE LIST.	REDUCED DUTIES OF FARM IMPLEMENTS.	Per cent ad valorem.
Cattle, horses, swine, sheep, mules, poultry, wheat, rye, oats, buckwheat, barley, dried peas, cowpeas, beans, corn, hay, straw, potatoes, sweet potatoes, yams, turnips, onions, cabbages, and all other vegetables; apples, peaches, pears, grapes, and berries; butter, cheese, milk, cream, eggs, honey, cottonseed, linseed, and other oil seeds, including clover and timothy seed, and other articles.	Farm wagons	2½
	Plows	5
	Harrows	5
	Harvesters	2½
	Reapers	2½
	Seed drills	5
	Mowers	2½
	Horse rakes	5
	Cultivators	5
	Thrashing machine parts, baggers, weighers, etc	5
	Parts of thrashing machines, for repair	2½
	Portable and traction engines, no change.	
	Horsepowers for farm use, no change.	
	Hay loaders, potato diggers, fodder cutters, grain crushers, fanning mills, and hay tedders	5
	Motor vehicles, except for railways	5

Who can discover any real reciprocity in this trade? The injury it would work to the agricultural interests of this country is apparent. The benefits which we would receive are so small that they can not be discovered. No one has pointed them out.

CANADA'S DEMAND.

For more than a century the Dominion of Canada has knocked at our door for the free admission of her agricultural products, and at all times she has maintained the right to protect her manufacturers, as well as the manufacturers of Great Britain. She has desired free trade in agricultural products. At the same time she has demanded that her manufacturers be protected from importations by the American manufacturer.

Let us not, therefore, delude ourselves into believing that the reduction of from 2½ to 5 per cent in ad valorems on farm machinery will be of any benefit to the farmers of the United States. The Canadian farmer desires to enter into free competition to feed the 100,000,000 people of the United States and Canada, but the Canadian manufacturer is unwilling to enter into free and open competition with the American manufacturer in supplying the market of the two countries with manufactured articles. As long as Canada maintains her present position there can be no such thing as reciprocity between Canada and the United States. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The simple fact is that it costs more to produce the products of the farm in the United States than it does in Canada. As shown by the report of the Tariff Board, farm labor and farm land is higher in the United States than it is in Canada. Under these conditions it can not truthfully be said that the cost of production is the same in the two countries.

LOWER PRICES TO FARMER NOT FOLLOWED BY LOWER PRICES TO CONSUMER.

It necessarily follows, therefore, that the price at which the farmer will be compelled to sell his produce will be affected by the enactment of this law. The extent to which the value of our farm products will be affected no one can say. But it does not follow that because the farmer will be obliged to accept lower prices for his produce that the ultimate consumer will be able to purchase his food supply any cheaper.

These positions are not inconsistent. By our complex method of production and distribution big interests profit by the loss to the original producer, and the price to the consumer is seldom affected. The best example of this is to be found in the removal of the duty on hides. I recall the argument of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] when he discussed the provisions of his bill. He contended that the duty on hides did not benefit the farmer, but, as he expressed it, only benefited the "big four," and that the removal of the duty on hides would not lessen the price of hides to the producer.

By the Payne tariff law hides were taken from the dutiable list and placed on the free list. On August 7, 1909, the Shoe and Leather Reporter gave the wholesale price of hides, No. 1 packers' native steers, at 17 cents per pound. On February 4, 1911, the same grade of hides was quoted by the same authority at 14 cents per pound. Everyone who is familiar with the subject knows that the farmer received 4 cents per pound less for his hides on February 4, 1911, than he received on August 7, 1909; but where is the buyer of shoes or of any other article manufactured from leather who could purchase such article cheaper on February 4, 1911, than he could on August 7, 1909?

HIGH COST OF LIVING—IS TARIFF RESPONSIBLE?

In the memorable campaign that ended on the 7th day of last November the principal issue was the high cost of living. The Democratic Party contended that the Payne tariff law was responsible for high prices. That election is far enough in the past and the next election is far enough in the future so that we ought to be able to consider the question of the high cost of living dispassionately and purely as a business proposition, separate and apart from factional strife and political clamor.

The argument presented by our Democratic friends in support of this measure is a most ingenious and conflicting one. It all depends upon the person making the argument. Many of the arguments are based on the theory that this bill will not reduce prices, while others bottom their arguments on the express proposition that cheap food products will flow from the agreement authorized by this bill. By this bill they would lower the cost of living.

HOW DEMOCRACY WON.

I desire, therefore, to consider the question of the effect that recent tariff legislation has had on prices. First let us inquire if the issue of the high cost of living was fairly and honestly presented in that election. What are the facts? A few days before election, in practically every congressional district of the North our Democratic friends distributed circulars entitled "High cost of living," in which was placed in parallel columns a two weeks' store bill for October, 1896, and October, 1910. Such a circular was used in the district I have the honor to represent in this House. But, mind you, this circular was distributed only in the cities and towns. Our Democratic friends were very careful to see that this circular should not fall into the hands of the farmer, for it was only the price of farm products that this circular assailed.

DEMOCRACY WOULD LOWER PRICES ONLY ON FARM PRODUCE.

If the statements contained in this circular were good argument to the wage earners on the subject of the high cost of

living before the election, they ought to be good argument to the farmers after election. I shall, therefore, for the benefit of Democratic and Republican farmers alike, print this circular in the RECORD. It assails only the product of the farmer, and points to the year of 1896 as a year presenting ideal conditions and ideal prices. The circular is as follows:

VOTERS AND HOUSEHOLDERS, READ THE WITHIN CAREFULLY—HOW TO SAVE YOUR MONEY—TAKE INTO BOOTH WITH YOU WHEN YOU VOTE—VOTE FOR YOUR FAMILIES.

High cost of living facts—Read carefully—Ponder well—Vote right—Prices, 1896 and 1910.

The Republican Party has been in complete control of every department of the Government since 1896—President, Senate, and Congress. They have given you a government of trusts—Beef Trust, Sugar Trust, Flour Trust, Clothing Trust, and the "daddy" of them all, the Tariff Trust. See the result below:

St. Louis prices.

TWO WEEKS' STORE BILL.

OCTOBER, 1896.		OCTOBER, 1910.	
2 pounds salt pork	$0.10	2 pounds salt pork	$0.40
5 pounds pork chops	.50	5 pounds pork chops	1.25
5 pounds pork ribs	.30	5 pounds pork ribs	.75
4 pounds smoked shoulder	.30	4 pounds smoked shoulder	.54
2 pounds sausage	.15	2 pounds sausage	.35
5 pounds lard	.35	5 pounds lard	.85
5 pounds corned beef	.25	5 pounds corned beef	.62½
4 pounds butter	.40	4 pounds butter	1.20
2 dozen eggs	.20	2 dozen eggs	.50
1 pound cheese	.13	1 pound cheese	.25
1 barrel flour	3.50	1 barrel flour	5.65
4 pounds chicken	.40	4 pounds chicken	.72
21 pounds sugar	1.00	21 pounds sugar	1.16
2 pounds steak	.20	2 pounds steak	.35
5 pounds roast beef	.50	5 pounds roast beef	1.00
	8.28		15.59½

Look at these two store bills. Vote to protect your pocketbook. Your table bill has doubled; have your wages doubled? You pay 100 per cent more for your clothing, blankets, and household goods; has your salary kept pace with the increased cost of living? Your rent is higher and your fuel is higher; how much higher is your weekly wage check? Don't you think you had better help put the trusts that have doubled the cost of living out of business? Congressman GOOD's vote helped to make the bill $15.59½ instead of $8.28.

FARMERS NOT ENTHUSIASTIC OVER DEMOCRATIC PRICES OF 1896.

I hope the farmers will study this circular. When they come to read it, let them take the first item, "Two pounds of salt pork, 10 cents," and ask themselves how much they would be obliged to sell their hogs for, allowing for offal, packers', jobbers', and retailers' profits, in order that salt pork could be bought at 5 cents a pound retail. Let me appeal to them to apply the same test to every item in this circular and then ask themselves the question, without regard to political affiliation, if they are in favor of this Democratic demand that the price of farm products that prevailed in 1896 shall be restored and shall permanently prevail. [Applause on the Republican side.]

DID PAYNE TARIFF INCREASE PRICES?

But is the Payne tariff law responsible for the cost of these articles? How can it be honestly charged that it increased the cost? The Payne tariff bill did not increase the duty on a single article named in this circular. One of the articles named in the circular was placed on the free list. On 8 of the 15 articles the duty was reduced 25 per cent and on the 6 remaining articles the duty was unchanged. So we have presented here the very amusing claim of our Democratic friends that by placing 1 of the 15 articles on the free list, by reducing the duty on 8 25 per cent, and by allowing the duty on 6 to remain unchanged we have thereby increased the cost of these articles to the consumer. For lack of a better name, I can only call this kind of reasoning Democratic logic.

It is a familiar saying of our Democratic friends that "the tariff is a tax, and the consumer has to pay it," and as corollary to this proposition it is also claimed that the removal of the tariff on an article by that much does it reduce the price to the ultimate consumer.

Let us apply this rule to some of the notable reductions in the Payne tariff law and ascertain if there has been a corresponding reduction in the price to the ultimate consumer.

Of the articles enumerated in this circular, the duty on pork, lard, and beef was reduced 25 per cent, and yet the retail price of these articles for 1910 advanced, if the information set forth in this circular is correct.

The tariff on cabbage was reduced 33 per cent, and yet where is the householder who is able to buy cabbage more cheaply because of the reduction in the tariff? The tariff on bituminous coal was reduced 33⅓ per cent and on agricultural implements 25 per cent. There was a reduction of 55 per cent on harness and of 60 per cent on boots and shoes, yet the purchasers of these articles at retail saw no reduction in the price after the tariff was lowered.

The tariff on barbed wire was reduced 37 per cent; on nails, spikes, and tacks from 20 to 50 per cent; and on starch 33 per cent; but where is the person who purchased any of these articles at retail who experienced any of the benefits of lower prices, which our Democratic friends proclaim would flow from a reduction in tariff duties.

But our friends on the other side of the aisle will say that these reductions were too slight, and that in order to benefit the ultimate consumer by lower prices the reduction should have been greater. The answer to this argument is that we took the tariff all off of several things which, or the products of which, are in general use, and in those cases there has been no reduction in the price to the ultimate consumer.

We placed hides, posts, and petroleum and its products on the free list. What was the result? The farmer is compelled to take 4 cents per pound less for his hides, but who receives the benefit of the reduction? Certainly not the ultimate consumer. The ultimate consumer is not interested in the price of hides. He is interested in the retail price of boots and shoes or of harness or of some other manufactured product of leather. Notwithstanding the fact that we took all the tariff off of hides, to the detriment of the farmer, and took 60 per cent of the tariff off of shoes and 55 per cent off of harness, the ultimate consumer of boots and shoes and of harness is obliged to pay more for both of these articles to-day than he could buy them for before this reduction. Fence posts were placed on the free list, but the purchaser of fence posts at retail realizes no reduction in the price.

Petroleum and its products were placed on the free list, but the users of kerosene and gasoline oils are looking, and will continue to look, in vain for a corresponding reduction in the retail price of these articles because of this reduction in the tariff.

TRUSTS AND NOT CONSUMERS BENEFITED.

Should the agreement which this bill authorizes be entered into, the unorganized and unprotected farmers of the North will have strong competition and will be forced to sell their raw materials at reduced prices, but the ultimate consumer—the user of shoes, not hides or leather; the purchaser of oatmeal by the package, not oats by the bushel; the buyer of flour by the sack or bread by the loaf, and not wheat by the bushel; the user of starch and not the purchaser of corn in the shock or in the crib—will find that the Canadian farmer has a better market and a better price for his product. Yes; he will then learn that the American farmer is compelled to sell his product in a more restricted market and at a reduced price, but that he, the ultimate consumer, will be compelled to pay the same price for what he eats and for what he wears that he paid before the enactment of this law.

The result is that the farmer who raises and sells the raw product of the farm must take a lower price. The manufacturer and the jobber, who are organized and control the situation, secure a larger profit; the ultimate consumer pays the same or a higher price.

This is a condition to be deplored and to be corrected, but the tariff, except where it is excessive and on noncompetitive articles, is not responsible for it. Large manufacturers, importers, and distributers practically control the output of the necessities of life and dictate the price. Take coffee, for instance, which has been on the free list for years. Rio No. 7 on August 1, 1909, sold for 7¼ cents per pound at wholesale. On February 4, 1911, the wholesale price of the same grade of coffee was 12$\frac{7}{10}$ cents per pound. The cause of the advance in price in coffee can not be attributed to the tariff; nor can the increase of the price of the articles named in this misleading and unreliable circular.

HIGH PRICES WORLD-WIDE—WORLD-WIDE CAUSES.

If gentlemen on the other side of the aisle have any real desire to get to bottom of the question of the high prices, and the relation of the tariff to them, they will not proceed far with their investigation until they discover that the tariff, except in cases of excessive duties and duties on noncompetitive articles, has little, and in almost every case absolutely nothing, to do with the retail prices to the ultimate consumer. They will also find that supply and demand, overproduction and shortage in crops, cold storage and monopoly—these and other agencies control the entire question of the rise and fall of prices. They will find that these same causes obtain in free-trade England as well as in the United States.

The difficulty in considering the question of the tariff and its relation to prices is that we have considered it from a very narrow and restricted viewpoint. We have not considered the question of the prices of food from the standpoint of the markets of the world. We have not compared our market of food products with the market of like products in other countries. The only comparison that has been made compares the price of articles at a time when the country is prosperous with prices of like articles at a time when the country was locked in the

paralysis of hard times, when everybody had labor or the product of labor to sell, and when but few had the money with which to buy. In 1896 prices were low, and there was no market for many of the products of the farm or the factory, even at bankrupt prices, and I hope and pray that those times and those prices shall never again come to this country. [Applause.] It means hardship and suffering.

WHAT AN AGE OF CHEAPNESS MEANS.

Is it an age of cheapness that is desired? I very much doubt it.

Where shall we begin in this crusade for cheaper things? Some one says cheaper rent—cheaper homes. The home is the foundation of our institutions, the bulwark of our Republic, and nothing is more to be coveted than homes at fair and reasonable prices. But what does this mean? Cheap rent and cheap homes mean cheaper labor in the stone quarry, cheaper labor in the limekiln and the cement factory. It means lower wages for the stonemason, the bricklayer, the carpenter, the lather, the plasterer, the plumber, the painter, and the laborer. Rent is high, but the labor that built the house is high, and all the material that went into it is high, and that material in turn was largely the product of labor.

We can not have high prices for labor and low prices for the product of labor. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Cheap homes mean cheap labor, and so it is with everything that we eat and everything that we wear—it is largely the product of labor. Cheap food and clothing mean cheap labor on the farm, in the factory, and in the shop. Laborers of this country, do you want it?

I do not want to be understood as approving all of the increases in the cost of the necessities of life, nor do I contend that labor has always had its just share of that which it, jointly with capital, has produced. It too frequently happens that the avarice and selfishness of men robs labor of its just share in the progress of its time. All too often men in their avarice exact too high prices for the necessities of life. It was always so; it always will be so. These inequalities and injustices are seen in every period of the world's history. They have existed, not by virtue of any law but in spite of statutory enactment. Much as these conditions are to be deplored, no political party and no government has yet discovered an easy or a complete remedy.

Our Democratic friends say that this is a proposition of give and take. I admit it. It takes protection from the farmer and gives it to the trusts. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I have compiled from Bulletin 77 and from the bimonthly bulletin of the Bureau of Labor a comparative table, showing the increase in prices of 11 principal products, and also the increase in wages in 11 principal occupations for the years 1899 to 1907. I shall append this table to my remarks, for it shows that the increase in the price of labor has kept pace in the cost of food products.

The increase in the prices of food is not confined to the United States, but is a world-wide movement. A comparison of the retail prices of the necessities of life in this country with prices of similar articles abroad will reveal the fact that the increase in prices abroad has been as rapid and almost, if not fully, as great as in this country.

In an editorial in the Independent the editor says:

> The fact that prices have risen the world over—in England, in Russia, in China, and South America, although not as much as here—proves a world-wide cause.

Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor, and one of the best posted men on the conditions of labor and the prices of the necessities of life in the world, says:

> Mentally contemplating the many cities I have visited, and having in mind the conversations I had with workingmen who had lived both in Europe and America, I believe that I may assert that whether the cost of living in Europe or America is greater to the workingman depends entirely upon the standard of living he adopts while in America. If he voluntarily lives the life of self-denial in this country that he compulsorily lived in his native land, his outlay in money will remain about the same. Even then he will hardly be able to escape gaining something from the superior supply of the good things of life in America.
>
> Living is cheap to the wage earner of Europe only because he does without what in America soon becomes a necessity to him—food in good quantity and quality, presentable clothes among his aspiring fellow workmen and their families, and a comfortably furnished home in quarters responding to his awakened desire for equality with his American neighbors, and in general a larger and freer life.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> How often do these people eat meat? is a question the American in Europe finds himself asking when looking about among wage workers. Meat is usually from 25 to 100 per cent higher in price than in the United States.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> The immigrant coming to America finds that if he can buy in quantity (in cases where he need not) his flour, fuel, potatoes, oil, sugar, coffee, salt—the essentials for his plain table—all cost less than they ordinarily do in the land he left. The cheapness and abundance of many varieties of fruits and of our melons and tomatoes is a surprise to him. Closely after the most pressing necessities comes a line of things cheaper than in Europe—cotton clothing, including overalls, jumpers, shoes.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> The main conclusion as to housing is the same as that relating to food: If the immigrant to this country is willing to continue living here at the same level he is obliged to accept in his native land, he can find it for the same money.

WHAT DEMOCRACY PROPOSES.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN], a member of the Ways and Means Committee which reported this bill, says: "This is a step, and only a step, in the right direction." The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] has introduced another bill, which has been favorably reported to this House by the Ways and Means Committee, in pursuance to the action of the Democratic caucus. This bill is the next step which our Democratic friends propose to take to reduce the price of the products of the farm. Under the guise of putting farm machinery on the free list, when they know or ought to know that the American farmer would profit nothing by the enactment of such a law, for but few foreign-made implements are suitable for or would ever be used on the American farm, it places the American stock raiser in direct competition not only with the farmers of Canada, but with the farmers and stock raisers of the entire world. This farmers' free-list bill places beef, veal, mutton, pork, and all kinds of meat on the free list. If this free-list bill proposed by our Democratic friends shall become a law, the stock raisers of Iowa and the Middle West—and every farmer in that section is a stock raiser—will be forced to compete with the cheap land, cheap labor, and cheap live stock raised in Mexico, in Argentine Republic, and the other South American countries. [Applause on the Republican side.]

WHY PROTECTION FOR SOUTHERN PRODUCTS ONLY?

This Democratic program is the most unreasonable and unfair proposition ever submitted to the Congress of the United States. If these two Democratic measures shall become laws, everything that is grown on the farms in the North will be on the free list, while everything that is grown on southern farms will be protected by tariff duties. Is this fair?

The Republican policy of protection provides for the "imposition of such duties as will equal the cost of production at home and abroad, together with a reasonable profit to American industries." It measures the protection that the farmers of the South shall enjoy with the same rule that it measures the protection granted to the farmers of the North.

And this is as it should be. If we are to have free trade in the farm products of the North with all the world, then let us have free trade with all the world in the farm products of the South. If we are to have free wheat, free flour, free corn, free hay, free oats, and free barley, why not have free oranges, free lemons, free bananas, and free citrus fruits? If free beef, free veal, and free meats of all kinds are so much to be desired, why not free sugar, free rice, and free tobacco?

Why should we grow free popcorn in the North and protected peanuts in the South? [Applause and laughter.] In a word, why free trade for the products of the farms of the North and high protection for the products of the farms of the South? Real reciprocity with Canada is a good thing for both countries, but reciprocity between the different sections of our own country is better.

PROTECTION JUSTIFIES WISDOM OF THE FATHERS.

The United States and Canada! What untold possibilities are embraced in these! Separated only by an imaginary line, the people of the United States and Canada, having a common ancestry, engaged in common pursuits, living under natural conditions in all respects similar, speaking a common language, having a common religion, have not enjoyed, either individually or nationally, the same degree of prosperity. Why?

The early settlements in these two countries were made about the same time. The area of the United States is less than that of Canada, yet under the policy of protection to American industries our country's growth has been unparalleled, and to-day we number 92,000,000 people. Under a policy of granting to the mother country preferential rates of duties, which stimulated manufacturers in Great Britain and gave but little or no encouragement to them at home. Canada's growth and development has been so stunted and retarded that to-day her total population numbers less than 7,500,000 people.

The annual yield of our farms aggregates over sixteen times more than does the farms of Canada. The value of our farm animals is eight times more than the value of the farm animals in Canada. The value of the manufactured products in the Dominion of Canada in 1905 was only $1,308,000,000, while in the same year, under the policy of protection, the products of our factories aggregated the stupendous sum of $14,802,000,000.

PROTECTION ASKS FOR NO APOLOGIST.

Mr. Chairman. I have no desire to defend the policy of protection. That policy needs no champion, no apologist, no defender. In the beginning the fathers laid deep and wide the foundations of protection. The first law signed by George Washington as President of the United States was a statute providing for protection to American industries, and from that day to this protection has been our beacon light, lighting the way to an industrial and commercial supremacy unapproached in all the history of the world. The record of our achievements under this policy is the industrial history of the Republic, portraying a progress unrivaled and unchecked, except when the policy of protection was abandoned. Under this policy ours has become a nation of individual prosperity, a land of opportunity, a country of such marvelous industrial and commercial achievement that it is the hope and inspiration of the world. Others may tamper with these foundations, but I, for one, shall vote to keep the faith. [Applause on the Republican side.]

APPENDIX.

Comparative table showing the increase in the price of food products and the price of labor from 1899 to 1907 (increase shown in percentages).

[Compiled from Bulletin 77 and the Bimonthly Bulletin, Bureau of Labor.]

PER CENT OF ANNUAL INCREASE IN THE RETAIL PRICE OF FOOD.

Years.	Wheat flour.	Chickens.	Eggs.	Fish.	Beef roasts.	Mutton.	Veal.	Pork.	Butter.	Potatoes.	Beans.
1899	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1900	.....	.....	.....	6	2	2	1	5	3	.....	10
1901	.....	1	4	1	6	6	4	15	5	21	14
1902	.....	11	17	4	14	11	11	26	14	21	17
1903	7	16	23	7	9	9	10	24	13	19	18
1904	26	18	29	7	8	11	11	21	11	26	17
1905	26	21	30	9	8	14	13	24	15	14	16
1906	14	26	32	16	11	21	18	35	21	14	15
1907	24	29	36	20	14	26	20	40	30	25	19

PER CENT OF ANNUAL INCREASE IN WAGES.

Years.	Bricklayer.	Boiler maker.	Carpenter.	Compositor.	Laborer.	Machinist.	Painter.	Plasterer.	Plumber.	Stone mason.	Hod carrier.
1899	4	1	3	3	.....	1	4	6	3	2	8
1900	6	6	10	3	.....	3	10	9	4	4	7
1901	12	7	15	7	8	6	14	14	7	10	9
1902	18	7	23	10	12	10	19	23	10	19	14
1903	24	9	30	13	14	12	24	31	17	26	22
1904	27	13	29	15	14	12	27	33	24	29	23
1905	32	15	33	16	14	13	29	39	28	29	24
1906	38	18	41	20	22	16	36	48	31	35	34
1907	40	23	51	24	29	20	42	53	48	39	35

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, as a Republican and an admirer of our great and good President I frankly confess that I enter upon the discussion of the measure before us with somewhat of embarrassment. But if as a Republican and a believer in reciprocity I have some embarrassment in opposing this bill, which has been labeled a reciprocity measure, how much greater must be the embarrassment of the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle, who but recently commissioned by the American people, as they understand it, to revise the tariff along Democratic lines—whatever that may be—find themselves confronted at the very threshold of their opportunity and responsibility with the necessity of accepting from a Republican President this measure which they present as the first fruits of their promises to the American people in the last campaign. If we recollect what they promised aright, it was that they were to remove the duty from certain trust-made goods, that they were going to reduce certain so-called "iniquitous schedules" of the Payne tariff bill, but lo and behold, this triumphant and vociferous majority, immediately upon being convened in special session, accept from a Republican President a measure prepared under his direction and present it without the opportunity of amending it by so much as a word, a line, or a syllable. It occurs to me that this must be a trying situation for the gentlemen on the other side.

I have no criticism to make of anyone connected with the executive departments of the Government with regard to the negotiation of the agreement, the fruit of which is presented in the measure before us. The President in his message to Congress presenting the agreement gave to us the reasons which actuated him, and referred to the conditions and circumstances which in his opinion warranted an effort on his part to make a trade agreement with Canada which he hoped, of course, would be advantageous to the people of both countries. The President having secured the best agreement he could under the circumstances—and how far that agreement before us differs from the hopes and expectations with which the negotiations were undertaken we can not say—it became his duty to transmit the finished product to Congress for its consideration.

RESPONSIBILITY RESTS WITH CONGRESS.

He did his duty, he accepted his responsibility. The measure is before us, the responsibility is now ours. We have now our duty to perform, and it occurs to me that what we shall do with regard to this measure depends very largely upon what we view to be our duty and responsibility under the circumstances. This being the case, I would like to propound this query to gentlemen on this side of the Chamber.

Had this measure come as an original product of the labors of the Ways and Means Committee of the House, had they initiated the legislation and presented it to us without opportunity to amend, how many votes would there have been on this side of the Chamber for the measure when the vote came upon its passage? In my opinion, very few. On the other hand, is there anyone who in the wildest flight of fancy can picture a condition under which the Democratic majority, elected on the promises that temporarily swept them into power, would upon their own motion and their own volition have presented to the House this measure in its present form? Had anything of that kind occurred, had this been the handiwork and product of a Democratic Ways and Means Committee of the House, and presented without the opportunity of amendment, how many votes would there have been for it on that side of the Chamber? And, gentlemen, our duty and responsibility is in nowise lessened or affected by the fact that this "pact," as it is called on the other side—and it is "packed" with disaster to American industries, from start to finish—that this pact did not originate in the House of Representatives, where under the Constitution it should and by the law it must originate, but originated elsewhere. Our duty remains the same as though it had originated in a constitutional way and been presented in the ordinary course of business. Whatever others may think about it, Mr. Chairman, I shall deem it my duty, touching this measure, to vote against it, as I would have voted against it had it originated in a committee of this body.

NOT TRUE RECIPROCITY.

This is called a reciprocity agreement; but who ever heard of a reciprocity agreement in competing articles? That is a curious and jaundiced view of reciprocity which says to the farmers along 3,000 miles of our border, "You must surrender your magnificent markets to your only formidable competitor, because, forsooth, the Canadian Government proposes to lower the duty on coal for the benefit of its own people in central Canada." What sort of reciprocity is that which assumes that the stockmen throughout the length and breadth of the land shall be pleased with the arrangement because, while their industry is to suffer from the competition of all of the surplus of Canadian live stock, at the same time and in the same pact the Canadian Government is endeavoring to give its people cheaper cottonseed oil and early tomatoes? There is no reciprocity in the measure from a Republican standpoint, but rather the surrender of the markets of our farmers and stockmen in the hope of helping not them but other classes of our citizens.

AS TO "SPECIAL INTERESTS."

Few arguments have been made for the measure, that I have heard; but in lieu of arguments there has been a lot of declamation, and some gentlemen have suggested that we should support the measure because certain "special interests" are said to be against it.

The only "special interest" I have heard from that is against the measure unanimously and everywhere is the special interest upon which rest the foundations of this Republic, the special interest which is the bone and the sinew, the hope and the defense of the Union—the farmers and the stockmen of the United States. [Applause on the Republican side.]

But while we are talking about "special interests," let us not forget that there are powerful special interests moving heaven and earth in its support. For instance, there is the special interest that speaks every day with a million tongues that is for the pact because of the hope that it will give them, the great newspapers, temporarily at least, cheaper print paper, though it may destroy American industries employing tens of

thousands of American workingmen. Great railroad systems on both sides of the international boundary are for it because it will increase their business. Great coal interests in Pennsylvania and West Virginia are for it because they indulge the fond hope that of the 8 cents reduction in the Canadian coal duty they will get a small crumb; I hope they, at least, will not be disappointed, for they are the only American citizens who can ever get any benefits under this bill without injury to their fellow citizens. The great milling interests are for it because they believe it will help their business.

WORSE THAN IT APPEARS.

The agreement is bad enough on its face in all conscience—the surrender of five millions of duty upon the remission by Canada of half that sum; the surrender of the splendid market of 92,000,000 people in the hope of obtaining the uncertain market of 7,500,000 people, 65 per cent of which we already have in spite of the preferential tariffs in favor of other countries. But these facts, writ in letters so plain that he who runs may read and the wayfaring man, though a fool, may not err therein, tell only half of the story. The fact is that for those products to which we give free entry into our ports we furnish an absolutely unlimited market, while as to those products for which Canada gives us free trade or a lower duty we either have the market now or conditions are such that it is utterly impossible for us to increase our trade there.

Does anyone doubt who understands the great grain and milling business of the country that with this agreement in force all the surplus of Canadian wheat will come through our ports, and that, great exporting nation that we are, we will purchase all those grains and give them the benefit of our splendid channels of export, and that the same thing will occur with regard to live stock? As for print paper we will furnish an unlimited market. And what do we get in return? A reduction of the duty on cottonseed oil, a slight reduction of the duty on coal, reductions that by no possibility can be of any advantage to American citizens or extend American trade.

HIGH COST OF LIVING.

But the gentlemen have said that we must not mind that, that this pact or agreement was entered into for the purpose and with the expectation of reducing the high cost of living, and that it will have a wonderful effect in that direction.

A month ago it might have been worth while to have spent some time arguing against that proposition, but it is scarcely necessary now, for the proponents of the measure have themselves been spending all the time they have spent in argument in trying to prove that they did not mean what they originally said and to assure us that by no possibility can the tearing down of the tariff wall as against Canadian products reduce the price of American farm produce. Ah, the trouble is the gentlemen started in originally to prove too much, and now they are endeavoring to prove too much in the other direction. The fact is that this agreement will not furnish the ultimate consumer any product of the farm, the mine, or the forest cheaper than he is now obtaining it, but will largely reduce the income of the American producer in those lines.

Everyone who knows anything about the farming business knows that a difference of 10, 15, or 20 cents a bushel in the price of a farmer's wheat means the difference between a fair profit and absolute loss. We all know that the difference of a dollar or $2 a head in cattle or of 50 cents or a dollar a head for sheep means to the stockman the difference between success and disaster. And yet who is there who believes that such reductions would ever reach the table of the ultimate consumer or benefit those who consume the products?

Wheat must pass through the hands of the miller, the jobber, the retailer, and to the baker, and the difference in price, which to the Dakota farmer spells ruin, will never be discovered in the price of the loaf of bread upon the table of the consumer. Cattle and sheep must go to the packing house and pay heavy freight charges on the way, pass on to the jobbers, to the butchers, and finally come to the table of the consumer; and a reduction in price, which to the stock growers in my country means disaster, will never be noted in the price which the consumer pays for the product in the butcher shops of the country.

ENCOURAGING CANADIAN DEVELOPMENT.

There is an objection to this agreement which appeals very strongly to the people of the intermountain States who are desirous of seeing their country settled and developed. For a number of years past there has been a strong tide of immigration from the United States into the Canadian northwest; mostly of substantial farmers and business men of some means, the very classes we need the most for the settlement and development of our region. These people have been passing through our territory by the thousands, lured to Canada by extensive advertising, setting forth the liberality of Canadian land laws compared with ours and therefore the better opportunity of securing a home and a farm cheaply. This agreement, providing, as it does, that the immigrant to the Canadian northwest shall enjoy additional advantages by having free access to our markets for his produce and his live stock, will tend to further encourage and increase the settlement of Canada by American farmers, thus retarding and delaying the settlement and development of our Intermountain States.

I take off my hat to the gentlemen who, on behalf of the Dominion of Canada, negotiated this treaty. [Applause on the Republican side.] No longer may the Yankee pride himself on being the great trader of the world. I commend to him our Canadian cousin. Those gentlemen knew the trade and industries of their country, and they drew an agreement every line of which gave them the advantage of the wonderful markets of the most wonderful country on earth in exchange for seeming advantages in the markets of a land where, in spite of all preferential tariffs against us, we now practically control all the markets worth while.

INTERESTING DETAILS.

Here is an illustration of one of the minor matters not overlooked in this pact. Up on our northern boundary, west of Lake Superior, is a great railway line, and the heroic builder of that great overland system is an exceedingly earnest supporter of this measure. That railroad is, I believe, the largest single importer of coal from Canada into the United States. Under the Dingley bill the duty on lump or run-of-mine bituminous coal was 62 cents and on slack or fine coal 15 cents per ton.

It so happened that by certain Treasury decisions the importer of coal came to receive the slack rate upon an estimate of all the fine coal in every shipment, with the result that the importer was only paying the higher rate upon about two-thirds of our importations.

This, of course, was a fraud on the Treasury, for commercially slack is the fine dust, cuttings, and broken coal produced in the process of mining and screening. It is sold at a low price. Oftentimes there is no market for it, but at any rate it is always cheap compared with commercial grades of coal selling at from one-fifth to one-third of the price; therefore this being a cheap product is entitled to a comparatively low rate. Under the Treasury ruling referred to, however, the importer received the slack rate on as great an amount of every shipment of the higher priced coal as he could badger the customs officials into accepting as being fine enough to pass through a half-inch screen. In order to put an end to this practice a provision was placed in the Payne bill in which the rate on coal was reduced to 45 cents per ton and the slack rate remained at 15 cents, to the effect that the slack rate should only apply to slack produced at the mine and shipped as such; and behold, the percentage of slack in our importations decreased from about one-third to about one-sixth or less of the total importations, though the same proportion of actual slack was imported as before. In this agreement we find a provision which, while it does not change the slack rate, does restore the language of the Dingley bill.

The railroad to which I refer imports, I think, about three-quarters of a million tons of coal a year, and if under this change of phraseology we shall go back to the old practice under the same language, I estimate that the difference in duty paid will amount to a very neat sum of money per annum, possibly somewhere between $60,000 and $75,000 on the importations of that one railway.

This is only one of the details which indicate that while no one here seems to have known anything about the details of this agreement during the time that it was under consideration, yet some interested people must have known much about it during the days of its negotiation.

REVIVAL OF DOCTRINE OF MACHIAVELLI.

Mr. Chairman, if I had time I should like to go into the agreement in some considerable detail, but my time is brief, and I want to close by referring to the fact that the consideration of this measure has developed a very remarkable philosophy, a philosophy pronounced and promulgated some centuries ago in Florence, but against which the good sense and the fairness of the world rebelled, a philosophy at this late date resurrected and reincarnated, apparently to serve the purposes of a temporary majority on the other side of the aisle. This philosophy has been stated in varying terms by several gentlemen on the other side, among them the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KONOP]. But the gentleman who most clearly stated it to the House was the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] in his speech to the House when this measure was for-

merly under consideration. Before I refer to what he said, I want to refresh your memory with the fact that it has been admitted by speakers who are defending the measure on both sides of the Chamber that it is unfair, unjust, inequitable, and full of inequalities, but nevertheless ought to be passed. This is the contribution of the gentleman from Pennsylvania:

Again, while many features of the agreement reached by the parties will work injury, at least temporary, and possibly injustice to some particular sections of each country, if the common good of the entire people of either country is subserved by the agreement as a whole, it is the part of statesmanship for the Government of the country so affected to disregard the local or sectional disadvantages and injuries and consider only the total net result of the contract.

THE COMMON GOOD.

When did it happen, gentlemen, that the common good was ought else but the sum of individual and local well-being? When did it occur that common good could be founded upon inequality, upon injustice, upon the destruction of industry? When was it considered good governmental policy to sacrifice a part of the people for the benefit of others? Not since the days of Machiavelli, whose name has become synonymous with that discredited philosophy which would sacrifice a large portion of the people in the hope of benefiting others. According to this philosophy, American citizens, American industries, American communities are to be considered as pawns upon the chessboard, to be sacrificed without mercy and without consideration if by their sacrifice some temporary gain shall be had in a desperate political game. From this doctrine of Machiavelli, from this doctrine of selfishness and injustice I appeal to the Republican doctrine of true reciprocity and protection for all citizens and all industries. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, under Republican reciprocity the people of both countries, of both peoples to the agreement, are benefited, and no one is injured. Under Republican reciprocity and protection the benefits extend to every citizen and every industry. We seek the common good, not through injustice and discrimination, but through benefits conferred upon all alike, by surrounding this great Nation with its high standard of living, with its high-wage scale, with its splendid opportunities, on all sides by the tariff wall of protection, without which you can not keep out the inundating tides of the products of pauper labor and peon conditions and maintain American standards and promote American ideals. From the new doctrine of the temporary majority on that side—that it is proper and right to sacrifice American communities here and there, in the vain hope that other American communities may prosper thereby—I appeal to the beneficent policy that for the last 50 years, under the leadership of the Republican Party, has built up, established, and maintained here the most universally prosperous conditions ever known among men. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. PROUTY].

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. Chairman, I belong to that verdant class known as the new Members. I recognize the courtesies and precedents of this floor, which dictate that new Members should be seen and not heard, and I came here with a chastened resolve to respect that custom; but the course of this debate has simply made it impossible for me to keep still, and this is my only explanation or apology for fracturing a custom or breaking my own chaste and strong resolves.

I come from a section of the country where agriculture is its principal source of wealth. While we are not all farmers in Iowa, we all realize that it is impossible to injure the agricultural interests without affecting every department of business.

This fact makes this situation embarrassing to me. I am a firm believer in Canadian reciprocity, and for years have been a humble advocate of it on the prairies of Iowa. I advocated it, however, because I believed that it would be of benefit to the agricultural interests of my State; that it would have a tendency at least to break the power of some large organizations that had monopolized the American market, and were exacting unreasonable prices from the farmer. I never advocated it for the purpose or with the hope that it would reduce the price of agricultural products.

I am now puzzled with the dilemma of supporting or opposing a measure that represents the principles I have advocated, but so applied as to produce exactly opposite results from what I had intended should be accomplished by it.

Instead of putting upon the free list the articles of monopolistic manufacture in this country, this bill safely protects and guards them, while the agricultural products alone are made to feel the withering effect of free competition with the cheap, fertile fields of Canada. The advocates of this bill now have the affrontery to tell us that because we have been advocating reciprocity we are now getting just what we asked for. They seem to overlook the fact that we asked for bread and they have given us a stone, or, at least, a lemon.

They pass the bottle with the good old label on it, but the real thing has been removed and the bottle has been refilled with a bitter concoction, and when some are disposed to make faces and grimaces they simply point with an assuring smile to the good old label.

Now, even in Iowa, prohibition Iowa, I am not quite certain that all of her people would be satisfied with a mere label, and I am suspicious that the constituents of the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina and the gentleman from Kentucky would not be satisfied with mere labels, however assuring or inspiring. We are not satisfied with a bottle labeled "reciprocity," we want some of the real thing in it.

My objection to the Payne tariff bill was not so much that the duties were too high, but that they were adjusted in such a manner as to be unfair; unfair, if you please, to the great agricultural Middle West, of which my State is a part.

I never could see any justification in putting hides upon the free list while retaining the products manufactured from them upon the protected list.

The farmers of my section of the country, however, were consoled by the assurance that if they allowed the tariff to be taken from hides that they would be recompensed for their loss by an equal or greater reduction in the price of boots, shoes, and other leather products which they bought.

The agricultural West has certainly waked up and found that they were handed a lemon in that matter. While hides have steadily gone down, boots, shoes, and all other leather products have speedily gone up. While being compelled to sell their own products for less, they are compelled to pay more for what they buy. They have been hit both coming and going.

Now, gentlemen, that is unfair. I find lurking in this proposed reciprocity agreement the same element of unfairness. In fact, it is accentuated. The Payne bill only puts hides on the free list. This measure, now fathered by the majority, puts not only hides, but hoofs, horns, and tail, and all between on the free list, and still leaves boots and shoes on the protected list. Can anyone tell me why wheat should be on the free list and flour on the protected list? Are not the millers of this country, with their large capital, extended experience, splendid mills, and latest improved machinery as able to compete with the millers of Canada in the manufacture of flour as are the farmers of the United States able to compete with the farmers of Canada? If not, why not?

The tenets of my party prescribe that we shall have a tariff sufficiently high to equal the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad. Every man, I believe, who has spoken upon this subject in this Congress or the last, has admitted that the cost of production of wheat is less in Canada than in the United States. Why is not wheat, under the tenets of our party, entitled to that much protection? Practically every man who has spoken upon the subject, either at this session of Congress or the last, has admitted that articles could be manufactured in this country, on the whole, as cheaply as they could in Canada. If this is true, the tenets of our party, honestly applied, would remove protection from manufactured articles rather than from agricultural products.

The advocates of this measure make this strong argument in its defense on the ground that it will bring cheaper food to the laboring man. If that is the real object, why should there be protection upon flour? The laboring men of this country eat flour, not wheat. [Applause.]

It is plain that there is a combination between the large milling interests of this country to maintain prices on flour. If that is true, what advantage can the consumer of flour receive by an agreement that allows wheat to be bought by the miller cheaper but protects him from competition? The miller can still hold his price just as high as he did before.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman permit a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. PROUTY. Certainly.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman vote with us for free flour?

Mr. PROUTY. With Canada?

Mr. HARDY. Yes; and with the balance of the world.

Mr. PROUTY. No, sir.

Again, if the stock raisers of this country are compelled to raise cattle and sell them in competition with those raised in Canada, why should not the American packer be compelled to sell meat products in competition with the Canadian packer? Is it possible that the American packer can not compete with the Canadian packer, if he gets cattle at the same price?

What are the conditions which make it necessary to protect the packer and leave the stock raiser open to the effects of competition?

It is not an idle guess that the great packers of this country are in a conspiracy to maintain prices and throttle competition in this country. They are under indictment for that very act, and the only defense that they have so far offered is that they have been at it so long that it is now barred by the statute of limitation, and that the Government knew it so well that it is now entrapped. [Laughter.] Is the Government under obligations, while prosecuting them for conspiracy, to maintain prices to shield them from foreign competition so that they may be able to hold up prices? Our recently elected United States Senator from Iowa is going to stop at Chicago on his way from Des Moines to Washington long enough to put some of those fellows in the penitentiary. [Laughter.] What good will that do the consumer if the monopoly is still protected?

I would like for some one to show us how it will make cheaper beef to the consumer if the packers have a monopoly. If they have a monopoly, as soon as cattle come into their possession, whether from Canada or the United States, they are subject to the same conditions, and they can, they have, and they will fix the price to the consumer with very little regard to the original cost of cattle.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I would like to yield to the gentleman from Texas, but I can not spare the time.

If the United States is going to secure cheaper meat products to the laboring men of this country, they must devise a system that will maintain competition not only at the point of production, but clear up to the point of consumption. If they want to help the laboring man, they must keep in mind that laboring men eat beef, not cattle; they eat pork, not hogs; they eat mutton, not sheep. [Laughter and applause on Republican side.] Why, then, put upon the free list the things they do not use and leave protected the things they do?

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

Mr. PROUTY. Yes; I will yield.

Mr. HARDY. I want to answer the gentleman.

Mr. PROUTY. No; not answer. That should be in the gentleman's own time, not mine.

Mr. HARDY. I want to say that we do not think it necessary to give a duty on meat; that we favor free meat, too.

Mr. PROUTY. Why, then, do you not put it in the measure that you propose to railroad through with the gentle assistance of the steam roller?

Mr. HARDY. Because we know that some of you on that side want to kill the treaty by adding something that will not go through. That is, it will that way be held in the Senate. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. PROUTY. Again, if by this reciprocity treaty it was intended to furnish cheaper lumber to the farmer as an offset for those losses that he sustains, it, in a large measure, fails in its purpose. While it puts rough lumber on the free list, it leaves all kinds of manufactured lumber still on the protected list. Everyone familiar with the consumption of lumber in this country knows that by far the greater per cent of it is used in manufactured form; that is, it is planed on one side or both; on one edge or both edges; grooved, flanged, or otherwise prepared. This necessarily must be done by the mills. The rough lumber will therefore be bought by the mills in Canada, and before distribution in the United States, as is claimed, the lumber of Canada will be subject to the same conditions as the American product is now. While it will enable the mills to secure cheaper rough lumber, I fail to see how it will assist very materially in enabling the ultimate consumer to receive cheaper dressed or otherwise manufactured lumber. Take the duty off all kinds of lumber, and then you will enable the farmer to get cheaper lumber, because it will enable the Canadian mills to ship their product direct to the farmyard in the United States, and thus avoid the combination of the American lumbermen.

It is claimed that the manufacture and sale of agricultural implements in this country is monopolized; that one concern controls the trade. Can anyone tell me why the Government is under obligations to protect their product from competition while leaving exposed to competition the man who uses them? Can anyone give me a rational reason why the man who makes the plow should be protected more than the man behind the plow?

The Government has recently indicted and is pressing for trial the members of the Bathtub Trust.

This is a trust that controls plumbers' supplies in the United States. What justification can there be for the Government to prosecute these people for combination to maintain prices and at the same time afford them protection from competition so that they may maintain prices? I venture the assertion that the removal of the duty on plumbing material would do more in a nighttime to destroy that trust than all the grand juries and district attorneys could do in 10 years.

The reason I am not satisfied with section 3 in the bill proposed by the majority is because it is indefinite. It does not declare for any policy. It simply authorizes and requests the President to continue negotiations, without marking out any course along which these negotiations should proceed. I believe it is not only within the province but it is the duty of Congress, as the representatives of the people, to declare for a national policy.

If it is the judgment of this Congress that the President of the United States should continue negotiations for the purpose of putting upon the free list pumpkins, turnips, and popcorn—which seem by accident to have been omitted from the free list—let us do so; but if, on the other hand, we believe these negotiations should be continued with the view to putting on the free list some articles which would, in a measure, compensate the agricultural interests of this country, let us have the courage to do so.

In the substitute I shall offer for section 3 I have described with detail the articles that I believe should be put upon the free list, if it is intended to secure compensating benefits to the agricultural interests of this country. If the amendment I offer shall carry, I believe it will compensate the farmers of my section of the country sufficiently to warrant me in supporting the measure; but if it is not so amended, I shall be constrained to vote against it.

I can easily understand and comprehend the situation on that side of the House [pointing to the Democratic side]. Its majority and leadership come from a section of the country whose staple products will not be affected materially by this measure. They can not raise cotton, cane, rice, or peanuts in Canada. But I apprehend that if there was a large and fertile tract of land skirting the Southern States where these commodities would grow better and could be raised cheaper than in their own territory, and it was proposed to tear down the tariff wall, we would be permitted to witness girations and contortions on that side of the House [pointing to the Democratic side] that we will not be permitted to see to-day.

In the high and patriotic ideals of Democracy there still seems to be room for the homely rule "that it makes a difference whose ox is gored." But I wish to remind the gentlemen from the South of the eternal truth that "what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander." If we of the North are to furnish free popcorn for the boys of the South, you gentlemen of the South should furnish free peanuts to our girls of the North.

There are some men on this side of the House [pointing to the Republican side] who are opposed to this measure for exactly the opposite reason that I am. They fear that it will establish a precedent that will lead to the including of manufactured articles as well as agricultural articles in the free list with Canada. I am frank to say to you that if I were sure that it would lead to that result I would favor it.

I might be able to say to my agricultural friends in Iowa that while they had lost in the price of the product they had for sale they were perhaps reaping a substantially equal benefit from the reduced price of the things they had to buy.

The agricultural districts of the United States are simply asking for justice, not favors. They simply insist that that which they sell and that which they buy must be either on the free list or on the protected list. Now, that is fair.

The agricultural interests of this country have been held to the cause of protection from the time of the institution of the system by the argument that it was to the advantage of the farmer to build up a home market; that is, to bring the factory alongside the farm. With full belief in that theory, and with full faith in their Government that when they had once built up that market they would be allowed to preserve it for themselves, the agricultural interests of this country have for more than half a century borne the burden of protecting American manufactures, and I can not help but feel that it is grossly unfair to this industry to take away this market, that their own sacrifice has built up, and open it up to the foreigners, who never contributed a dollar for its upbuilding, and just at a time when the conditions of national production and trade makes this market of special advantage and interest to the American farmer. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The gentlemen who are now offering this bill seem to admit its unfairness to the American farmer, for they announce that they have another bill putting upon the free list most or all the items of which I have made complaint. Now, these gentlemen know that while that measure may possibly pass the House it can not pass in its present form the Senate, and if perchance

it should pass both Houses of Congress it can not pass the veto of the President. And this Congress will adjourn with farm products on the free list and everything the farmers buy still on the protected list. The gentlemen in charge of these measures know that. But they only smile, and think it a good joke on the Republicans. It may be a good joke on the Republicans, but it is a hard one on the farmer.

While there are many things in that bill for which I should be glad to vote, there are some things in it that will prevent its receiving my approval. I might be willing, as a reciprocal arrangement, to have the American farmer put in competition with the Canadian farmer, but I am not yet willing to allow the American farmer to come into competition with the world.

This bill, which they have designated as the "farmers' free-list" bill, puts upon the free list beef, veal, mutton, lamb, pork, and all kinds of meat. This would throw the American farmer into direct competition, not merely with Canada, but with Mexico, Argentine Republic, and the other countries to the south of us, where everybody knows cattle can be raised for less than one-half what they can in this country. If you will take the tariff off the beef and mutton from the Argentine Republic, it will drive the product of Iowa, Illinois, and Nebraska from the markets of all the eastern cities. Right now mutton in refrigeration is being shipped from Argentina into the New York markets, and after paying a duty of a dollar and a half per hundred is still able to compete with the American product. How long would it take to drive out the American mutton if the tariff was removed?

The reason I favor putting these matters in the reciprocity agreement is that we could not include it in the general tariff law and make it applicable to Canada alone. This would be a violation of what is known as the "favored nations" clause in our treaties with the principal nations of the world. It could be put into a reciprocal agreement with Canada without opening up the markets of the South. American farmers could probably stand the competition from the north, but they are not able to stand the competition of the south, and for that reason I am not able to give my support.

The reason I do not like this treaty is that it is unfair to the agricultural industry of this country. It puts upon the free list practically everything that the farmer produces and puts scarcely nothing on the free list that he consumes. Now, this is unfair. Very many able men have, however, said upon this floor that this reciprocity agreement would not materially injure the farmers; that it would not reduce the price of their commodities. That may be true, but I am afraid of it. To say the least, it is experimental, and it seems to me that it is time some of these experiments should be tried on some other department of industry.

This whole situation reminds me of a condition that existed in a certain family in the neighborhood of my early childhood. There was a wealthy and aristocratic family that had an unfortunate, demented girl. Her name was Sally. Everybody called her "Silly Sally." The family used her as a kind of an experimental station. When they had a mess of greens, and were not quite certain whether they were mustard or poison weed, they first tried them on Sally. If they had a mess of parsnips and were not quite certain whether they were tame or wild, they first tried them on Sally. If they had edibles from the timber and were a little bit in doubt as to whether they were toadstools or mushrooms, they tried them on Sally, and if they did not kill her, then the rest of the family partook. Poor Sally, even in her demented condition, finally comprehended the purposes for which she was being used, and one day in her desperation kicked over a pan of real mushrooms.

Now, I want to serve a notice—a mild and possibly verdant notice—upon the Members of both sides of this House, that the American farmer is getting rather tired of playing the rôle of "Silly Sally," and is now demanding that these experiments, or some of them at least, be tried on other members of the family. [Long laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, the bill under consideration provides for the approval of the so-called Canadian reciprocity treaty. If this bill becomes a law and the Canadian Parliament enacts corresponding legislation, the agricultural products of Canada will be admitted into the United States free of duty, our farmers will be placed in direct competition with the farmers of Canada, and agriculture, the most important industry in the United States, will be robbed of any direct benefit from our protective-tariff policy.

This measure comes to us with the indorsement of a Republican President. I entertain the highest regard for our present Chief Executive, the Hon. William Howard Taft. I have confidence in his judgment, respect for his opinion, admiration for his ability, faith in his sincerity of purpose, and recognize that in negotiating this trade agreement and in urging its approval he has been actuated by the purest of motives, with no other object in view than to render to his country and countrymen the highest service possible. I regret exceedingly that in this matter I can not follow his leadership.

Free trade in farm products with Canada will result in irreparable loss to the farmers of the United States. Agriculture is the foundation of our wealth, the bedrock on which rests our industrial fabric, the pillar that upholds our free institutions, and the mainstay of our national strength and greatness.

Depression in agriculture means paralysis in trade transportation, mining, and manufacturing. Prosperity to the 10,000,000 persons employed on our 6,000,000 farms means prosperity to all—prosperity to the 5,000,000 persons employed in trade, commerce, and transportation; prosperity to the 7,000,000 persons employed in mechanical pursuits and manufacturing establishments; prosperity to the 1,000,000 employed in our mines; prosperity to the 5,000,000 persons employed in personal and unclassified service; and prosperity to the one and a quarter million of persons employed in professional pursuits.

Any legislation, any national policy that lays the hand of adversity upon the farmers of our country, will start in motion a great tidal wave of disaster, that will go on and on, increasing in force, until it envelops every industry and business in the land.

Canadian reciprocity as exemplified by the proposed legislation has not been in recent times an issue before the American people. It was not an issue in the campaign of 1908. It was not an issue in the campaign of 1910. No national convention of any political party has made a declaration thereon. Senators and Representatives in this Congress, as a rule, were not elected on this issue. We have not discussed this question before our constituents. It is a new question. The facts have not been presented to the people. The farmers and others who feel that this measure would affect them injuriously have had no opportunity to be heard. No intelligent, trustworthy public sentiment has been formed on the subject. In great questions like this, affecting vitally the national interests of the people, Congress should follow public opinion. It is our duty to crystallize public sentiment into law. As Representatives in Congress there is no safer guide for us than the will of the people. In this matter no man can say he is following public sentiment, for no real public sentiment has been formed. Without an intelligent public sentiment to guide us, without opportunity to fairly discuss this question before the American people, the advocates of this measure propose to enact legislation that will be more far-reaching in its influence upon the business interests of this country than any other law that has been passed since the close of the great Civil War.

There is no emergency calling for immediate action. Our country is facing no crisis. No great national peril confronts us. We are at peace with the people of Canada and with all the rest of the world. Times are good. Our workmen are employed at good wages. Internal commerce is flourishing. Our railways are busy. Our industries are active. The country is prosperous. Under these conditions it is unwise to hastily enter upon a long voyage of doubt and uncertainty, knowing not whether we shall land in a harbor of peace and safety or go down in a wreck that will be the result of our own folly and madness.

FARMERS' WORK IN BUILDING NEW STATE.

I have no apology to offer for standing here in defense of my farmer constituents. I was born and reared on a farm. I know something of the difficulties with which the farmer contends. I know from personal experience the hardships he must endure, and the struggle he must make to maintain himself and family.

Twenty-two years ago to-day I stood on the border, near the line between Kansas and Oklahoma. I was waiting for the gun to be fired at 12 o'clock noon, April 22, 1889, giving the signal for the start in the first great race for homes in the new promised land of Oklahoma. With that great rush I went into the new Territory and have resided there continuously ever since. In this 22 years I have been intimately associated with the farmers of that country. I know the sacrifices our homesteaders have made in the founding and building of the new State of Oklahoma. I know that it has been through the industry, the toil, the sacrifices, the persistence, the pluck, energy, and intelligence of our farmers that Oklahoma has attained such eminence in wealth and population and has made such a splendid record in the building of homes, churches, and schools, and in the founding of social and political institutions.

CONSTITUENTS IN CITIES.

All my constituents are not farmers. Oklahoma City, within my congressional district, contains 70,000 or 80,000 population. I have many smaller cities. I owe to my constituents residing in the towns and cities the same consideration that I do those residing upon the farms. I can not, however, comprehend how I can help those residing in cities by injuring those who reside in the country. Oklahoma is essentially an agricultural State. The merchants, bankers, clerks, professional classes, as well as all those engaged in mechanical pursuits, manufacturing and transportation, must realize that they are dependent for their own prosperity on the prosperity of our farmers. I am informed that in Oklahoma City there are nearly 5,000 men who are members of trade unions and labor organizations. But not a single one of these men has written me asking me to support this trade agreement with Canada.

GYPSUM ON FREE LIST.

Before I discuss this bill as to its general effect upon our country, I desire to register my objection to the provision that places crude gypsum upon the free list. I regard this provision a discrimination against Oklahoma, and especially against the industrial interests of the second congressional district. There are gypsum deposits in 16 States of the Union and also in Arizona and New Mexico. But in no State are the deposits so abundant and of such excellent quality as in the State of Oklahoma. The greater portion of this lies in my congressional district. The use of gypsum has largely increased in recent years. In 1897 there were but 188,000 tons of gypsum produced in the United States, while in 1909, only 12 years later, 2,252,785 tons were produced. The value of the product in 1909 was $5,906,738. The use of gypsum is being rapidly extended, and in view of the abundance of the deposit in the United States it is apparent that the further extension of its use will prove a blessing to mankind. Under the Dingley tariff law, approved in 1897, a tariff of 50 cents per ton was placed on crude gypsum. This was the first duty that was ever levied upon gypsum. Under this law there were large importations of gypsum from Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, and Cape Breton, Canada. This gypsum was not manufactured in Canada, but brought down by cheap water transportation to gypsum mills in New York and other ports along the northeastern Atlantic coast line. These manufacturers and the owners of gypsum beds in Canada demanded that gypsum be placed on the free list. Under the bill as reported from the Ways and Means Committee of the House, and as it finally passed the House, the duty on gypsum was reduced from 50 cents to 40 cents per ton. But this was further reduced by the Senate bill to 20 cents per ton; but as the bill finally became a law the duty on crude gypsum was fixed at 30 cents per ton.

The reduction of the duty on gypsum resulted in about 20 per cent increase in the imports of crude gypsum in the year 1909 compared with the year 1908. With crude gypsum on the free list the importations of crude gypsum from Canada will largely increase. This will mean that just so much less of our own gypsum will be mined, manufactured, and consumed in the United States. In 1910 the United States collected over $100,000 in duty upon crude gypsum. The placing of gypsum on the free list will rob the Treasury of that much revenue. Canada will be several hundred thousand dollars richer in disposing of an increased amount of her crude gypsum. But the people who consume gypsum products in building and other purposes will get gypsum products no cheaper, as the gypsum mills of New York and other eastern cities will have in that section a monopoly of the trade.

My State, and especially my congressional district, has an inexhaustible supply of gypsum. In my district there are now some eight or nine gypsum mills in which large capital has been invested. These mills give employment to a large number of persons. It requires no argument to show that the increase in the importation of Canadian gypsum into the United States will decrease the demand for the products of the gypsum mills of Oklahoma, retard the expansion of the industry, and reduce the amount paid out for wages. In brief, free gypsum from Canada will to some extent at least injure the gypsum industry of my congressional district, and this is one of the reasons why I can not vote for the so-called reciprocity treaty with Canada.

GENERAL PROPOSITIONS.

Before we pass this bill we may well pause and consider what results must follow if this reciprocal trade agreement shall be put in operation.

First. How will it affect the farmers of the Untied States?

Second. How will it affect the farmers of Canada?

Third. How will it affect the masses of the nonfarming population of the United States?

Fourth. Who will reap the chief benefits from Canadian reciprocity?

Fifth. The general effect and influence this new policy will have upon us as a Nation.

RECIPROCITY WILL INJURE OUR FARMERS.

Free trade with Canada in agricultural products will inevitably injure the American farmer. There is no escape from the result.

If the proposed reciprocal trade agreement shall be put in force, its effect upon the farmer of the United States may be summarized as follows:

1. Reduction in the extent of his market.
2. Reduction in the price of his products.
3. Reduction in the value of his land.
4. Reduction in his annual profits.
5. Reduction in his ability to support his family.
6. Reduction in his value as a citizen.

These results are so certain, sure, and inevitable that they seem to be outside the realm of discussion. We can not, of course, determine to what extent these reductions will be made. But reductions all along the line will come.

REDUCTION IN MARKET.

First. There will be a reduction in the market of the farmers of the United States. This proposition needs no argument. There are over 90,000,000 of people in the United States. Two-thirds of these people are nonfarming population. These people are customers of the farmers. Through their ability to consume, the market of our farmers is created. With this law in effect the farmers of this country must divide their customers with the farmers of Canada. This means a reduction in the number of customers which our farmers now have. It means a division in the market. If you divide this market, you make it smaller. Our farmers can not give away part of what they have and still retain all they have.

REDUCTION IN PRICE OF PRODUCTS.

Second. There will be a reduction in the price of our farm products. This will come, first, as the result of increased competition, and, second, under the inexorable decree of the law of supply and demand. Free trade in Canadian farm products will place our farmers in direct competition with Canadian farmers. Free competition always means lower prices. Competition, even on equality of conditions, may mean loss. Even if our farmers have equally as good conditions, there is still danger in competition. There would still be the absolute certainty that this competition must, from the nature of things, reduce the prices of the products of our farmers. The very object and purpose of the tariff on farm products is to relieve our farmers from foreign competition. The assertion, so often repeated, that the tariff upon farm products does not in any way affect the price of these products is untrue. There are two markets for everything we produce—the home market and the foreign or world's market. The protective tariff protects the farmer in the home market. It gives him that market practically free from competition abroad. Our home market is the best market in the world, because the customers in that market have the ability to buy and to pay good prices. With the home market largely free from competition, our farmers are then better equipped to go into the world's market and compete with all other nations in disposing of their surplus products.

The protective tariff affects the farmer in precisely the same way that it affects the manufacturer. It is said that the price of wheat in Liverpool fixes the price of wheat paid to our farmers. I do not concede this proposition. Our manufacturers sell their surplus products abroad. In 1909 our manufacturers, in finished products, sold in the world's markets goods valued at $440,229,407. They had to compete with the manufacturers of all other nations in the markets of the world. They met these foreign competitors in prices, in quality of goods, and in ability as salesmen. But no one pretends that these foreign markets where our manufacturers sell their surplus products control the prices our manufacturers receive at home.

If Canadian farm products come into our market free of duty, importations will be largely increased. In other words, the supply of farm products in our markets will be largely increased. There will, however, be no corresponding increase in the demand for these products. Then the law of supply and demand comes in and decrees that the price must go down. We may repeal the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill, but neither the Congress of the United States nor the Imperial Parliament of Canada or Great Britain can repeal the law of supply and demand in its effect upon prices.

REDUCTION IN VALUE OF FARM LANDS.

Third. There will be a reduction in the price of farm lands in the United States. The price of farm products is the greatest factor in measuring the value of the land. This is demonstrated by what has taken place in the last 15 years in this country. There has been a large increase in the price of all farm products and a corresponding increase in the price of farm lands.

Eleven years ago the total value of our annual agricultural products was but $4,417,000,000. In 1909 these products in value reached the enormous sum of $9,000,000,000. In the meantime there had been a large increase in the value of farm lands, this per cent of increase being practically in the same ratio as the increase in the value of agricultural products.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HOUSTON). Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield to the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes; I will yield for a question.

Mr. CULLOP. I want to ask the gentleman one question. The gentleman says it would affect the price of the farmer's products in this country. How would it affect the price of the farmer's products in this country if this reciprocity measure were adopted?

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, the effect would be to make prices lower; it will put them down.

Mr. CULLOP. Are prices in Canada lower than they are here?

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I understand that prices in Canada, as a rule, are lower on farm products than they are in the United States.

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I can not stop for a number of questions.

Mr. CULLOP. I want to be right, and I suppose the gentleman does——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield further?

Mr. MORGAN. For one more question.

Mr. CULLOP. Wheat was quoted yesterday at Winnipeg, Canada, at 93 cents a bushel and only 86 cents in St. Louis. Now, would the higher price of wheat in Canada lower the American farmer's price?

Mr. MORGAN. I do not know what the quotations were yesterday at St. Louis; but, generally, wheat in the United States averages in price about 12 cents per bushel higher than the average price in Canada.

REDUCTION IN PROFITS.

Fourth. There will be a reduction in the profits of the farmers. This follows naturally the other three propositions. A reduction in the farmer's market, a reduction in the price of his products, and a reduction in the value of his land must mean a reduction in his profits.

To what extent the proposed Canadian reciprocity will reduce the general profits of the farmers of the United States no one, of course, can definitely determine. But whether a reduction of these profits be great or small, it will in the aggregate be of utmost importance to the farmers of this country. Last year the total value of our farm products amounted to $9,000,000,000. If the loss should be 1 per cent on the total value of products produced, it would mean a loss of $90,000,000 to the farmers of this country. If the losses amounted to 5 per cent, based upon the total value of farm products, the losses would amount to $450,000,000 per annum. But whatever the loss may be, the Congress of the United States should under no circumstance enact any legislation that means the loss of a single dollar to the farmers of the United States.

REDUCTION IN ABILITY TO SUPPORT HIS FAMILY.

Fifth. Canadian reciprocity will reduce the ability of the farmer of the United States to provide for his family. The welfare of the family of the farmer may well challenge our most earnest consideration. On an average the boys and girls of the farmers of the United States do not have equal opportunity with the boys and girls in the family of the nonfarming population of this country. The family of the farmer is greatly restricted in social, educational, and religious advantages. They are often remote from the school, from the church, and from the social center. These conditions make farm life nonattractive and to a large extent are responsible for the desertion of our farms.

REDUCTION IN VALUE OF THE FARMER AS A CITIZEN.

Sixth. We reduce the value of the farmer as a citizen of the United States. When you have divided and circumscribed the market of the farmers, reduced the prices of his products, reduced the value of his land, curtailed his profits, reduced his ability to provide his family with the necessary comforts and advantages of life, it must then follow that you have thereby made the farmer a less valuable citizen. Not less valuable because the farmer will cease to be patriotic, but because by legislation you have shorn him of the means whereby he might serve his country.

EFFECT ON THE CANADIAN FARMERS.

Having determined what this reciprocity agreement will do to the farmer of the United States, let us briefly consider what effect this trade agreement, if put into force, will have upon the Canadian farmers. Naturally, the very reverse will come to the Canadian farmers. Free trade with Canada in agricultural products will have the following effect upon the Canadian farmer:

1. It will increase and extend his market.
2. It will increase the price of his products.
3. It will increase the value of his land.
4. It will increase his annual profits.
5. It will increase his ability to provide for his family.
6. It will increase his value as a citizen of his country.

Before this bill passes the title of the bill should be amended so as to make it read: "A bill to encourage Canadian agriculture, extend the market of the Canadian farmer, increase the prices of his products, augment the value of his land, magnify his annual profits, and make him a more valuable citizen of the British Empire."

For one I shall cast my vote for the farmers of the United States rather than for the farmers of Canada. I stand for a policy that will extend the market of our farmers, increase the price of their products, augment the value of their land, increase their profits, and make them more independent, prosperous, contented, and happy.

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Chairman——

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

Mr. MORGAN. I decline to yield.

Mr. CULLOP. I want to ask you just one other question.

Mr. MORGAN. I decline to yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma declines to yield.

Mr. MORGAN. I would be glad to do so if I had more time.

EFFECT ON THE NONFARMING POPULATION.

The proposed reciprocal trade agreement will not greatly benefit the great masses of the nonfarming population. The hope of a reduction in the cost of living will not be realized. The high cost of living is not mainly due to the prices the farmer receives for his products. The farm prices of products are not now too high. On the average, the consumer pays double the price the farmer receives. The middlemen are responsible for any exorbitant prices that are paid for food products. The cost of distribution is excessive.

The real difficulty lies in the fact that food products after leaving the farmer's hands too frequently go into the hands of monopoly. The farmers are unorganized. There is free competition between the 6,000,000 of our farmers. Why not Congress strike at the real disease with which our Nation is suffering? Why not enact laws that will control all the private monopolies of our country?

If we have not the power now, let the Constitution be amended so as to give the National Government the power to control our great industrial corporations that have it in their power to control the prices of the necessaries of life. This would be a step in the right direction, and a step that would be effective. Canadian reciprocity, as now proposed, will reduce the prices our farmers receive for their products, but will not reduce the price the consumer pays, because the great corporations fix the prices paid by the consumer. Canadian reciprocity in farm products simply means untold injury to our farmers, with no benefit to the masses of the nonfarming population of this country.

WHERE THE BENEFITS GO.

All will concede that the proposed agreement if ratified would greatly augment the trade and commerce between the two countries. The material advantage from this increased trade in this country must go largely to those engaged in trade and commerce. Transportation companies, manufacturers, and merchants are the persons that will be benefited by this additional trade and commerce. Our great railway lines will be benefited, because it means an increased volume of business. The great cities will be benefited, because there our railways center, and it is from these centers that trade and commerce proceed.

This reciprocity agreement if put into effect means greater dividends for owners of stock in our railways, more business for our merchants in our great cities on the north, and greater profits for that portion of our population engaged in trade and commerce. It means to our great cities lying within reasonable

proximity to the Canadian border more business, increased trade, additional commerce, larger population, enhanced values in real estate, more wealth, and better opportunities in life. These benefits will go to the men of means rather than the poor; to the directors of corporations; to merchants with capital; to men employed at large salaries; and to professional classes. The men employed in manufacturing and mechanical pursuits and by transportation companies will receive no special benefit from the proposed reciprocal trade agreement.

WILL DESTROY OUR INDUSTRIAL INDEPENDENCE.

The United States is to-day the most independent nation on earth. We have the ability to feed and clothe and house and equip our own people. We produce an abundance of all the necessaries of life. From an industrial standpoint we are independent of the world. We lead all other nations in the four great industrial pursuits—internal commerce, mining, manufacturing, and agriculture. We are well balanced in our industrial strength. We were first a nation of farmers. Agriculture was the chief pursuit of our people. That day has passed. Manufacturing has overtaken and surpassed agriculture. Our annual manufactured products are valued at $14,000,000,000; our annual agricultural products are valued at only $9,000,000,000. It is not our manufacturing interests but agriculture that needs encouragement to-day. But instead of encouraging agriculture by this bill you are enacting a law that will depress agriculture.

If we pass this bill and the reciprocal trade agreement shall go into effect, from that time on the United States has lost one of the chief props that makes her to-day the greatest nation on earth. We have lost our industrial independence. We cease to feed our own people. We look to Canada for bread. In peace and in war we look to a foreign nation to supply us with the "staff of life." Think of the folly of a great country like the United States, blessed with a soil and a climate that should always make agriculture her chief industry, giving up in the contest and entering upon the policy of buying her bread from a people that owe allegiance to a foreign flag. If such a policy is to be pursued, if such a result must come, it must come without my vote, without my support, and without my approval.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MURRAY].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I had hoped that I might be able simply to say "Amen" to the splendid sentiments that were so eloquently expressed by the Democratic Member from Massachusetts on the Ways and Means Committee of this House of Representatives [Mr. PETERS], and that has been my purpose during the long time since this debate has been going on. But although I am unable to get in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of to-day a transcript of the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois, the former Speaker of this House [Mr. CANNON] during the course of the debate yesterday said:

And now I want to say one word more to you men of Massachusetts. I love Massachusetts. She has done more than any other State in shaping the sentiment and promoting the civilization of the Commonwealths of the country; more than any other State in the great Republic. Did you vote for Foss?

That was the query of the former Speaker.

He was elected. Is that the permanent sentiment of Massachusetts? When the penalty comes, as it will between now and 1912, and consumption and production are narrowed, are you still going to support Foss? Is he your leader?

This agreement might well be labeled—

Continued Mr. CANNON, in his inimitable manner—

"By the grace or the punishment of God and the aid of the Secretary of State and Foss of Massachusetts." Choose ye.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to say, in reply to those questions, that we, the people of Massachusetts, have chosen, not after the short season of an autumnal campaign, but we have chosen after a contest for Canadian reciprocity that has covered at least 10 of the last years in the political history of the Commonwealth which I have the honor in part to represent; and it is only because I know something of that political history and because I have been permitted to have some small share of leadership in the campaigns that have been conducted that I crave the indulgence of the House for the limited time at my disposal to address myself to these queries.

Did we vote for Foss—Foss, who in 1902 and 1904, as a Republican candidate for Congress in the Back Bay district of Boston, tried to come to this Congress on the issue of reciprocity with Canada? He was practically driven out of the Republican Party because of the insistence with which he supported resolutions in Republican conventions favoring this doctrine of Canadian reciprocity. I say he was practically driven out, because, while the gentleman himself has always insisted that he was driven out by our brilliant senior Senator, HENRY CABOT LODGE, I have lately discussed the matter with the Senator, and he says that there never was any driving, but that he always had the most kindly sentiments for Canadian reciprocity.

I suppose that reciprocity became a live issue in the politics of Massachusetts in 1892. I have found that in the national platforms of the Republican and Democratic Parties of that year, 1892, reciprocity was first mentioned; that in the Democratic platform of 1892 the language used was:

Trade interchange on the basis of reciprocal advantages to the countries participating is a time-honored doctrine of the Democratic faith, but we denounce the sham reciprocity, which juggles with the people's desire for enlarged foreign markets and freer exchanges, by pretending to establish closer trade relations for a country whose articles of export are almost exclusively agricultural products, with other countries that are also agricultural, while erecting a customhouse barrier of prohibitive tariff taxes against the richest countries of the world, that stand ready to take our entire surplus of products and to exchange therefor commodities which are necessaries and comforts of life among our own people.

I conceive that was good Democratic doctrine in 1892, and I believe, sir, that it is equally good Democratic doctrine now in 1911. I want to contrast, in the record of this House, as I have contrasted in my own mind, the declaration of the Republican Party in that same year on the "triumph of reciprocity." Why, you would believe, from reading the Republican platform of 1892, that reciprocity then had ultimately triumphed, and that under no possible condition of circumstances could it be a matter which in 1911 would engage the attention of the American Congress for the length of time that we have given to it during the past week or 10 days.

We point to the success of the Republican policy of reciprocity—

Says the Republican platform—

under which our export trade has vastly increased and new and enlarged markets have been opened for the products of our farms and workshops. We remind the people of the bitter opposition of the Democratic Party to this practical business measure, and claim that, executed by a Republican administration, our present laws will eventually give us control of the trade of the world.

Mr. Chairman, the limited study that I have been able to give to the history of this question makes me believe that possibly there was a time in the history of our country when reciprocity was a live thing in our commercial system, but that, sir, was before it was "executed" by a Republican administration.

It was nearly 10 years after these party platform declarations, Mr. Chairman, that the matter of Canadian reciprocity came entirely to the front in the political and economic discussions of our State, but by that time it was clear to all that the matter would have to come to a final settlement.

Mr. Foss, Mr. Henry M. Whitney, the men who composed the Reciprocity League and the Free Trade League, and many others kept insisting that the making of an agreement like that contained in the pending bill would be of tremendous advantage to the Commonwealth and to the country, and their views were given wide publicity by the great newspapers of Boston and the State.

Senator LODGE was the chief spokesman of the many who were opposed to the views of these men, at least to the form in which those views were presented, if not, indeed, to the substance of them. I want to have printed in the record of this debate certain speeches that I have read again with interest in the wonderful Library of Congress that we have here, during the short time since this session has been sitting. I believe these speeches will do more to clarify the minds of the country and of this Congress than any words or original thoughts that I might attempt to contribute to the discussion at this time.

Let me read, therefore, so much of Senator LODGE's speech before the Home Market Club on April 2, 1903, as relates to reciprocity with Canada, that you may determine for yourself the extent of interest that he had at that time in the measure and the kind of interest that he was taking.

It is very evident that the Democratic Party in the failure of all their other issues propose to fight the next national campaign upon the tariff and its allied questions. Under the soft and deceptive name of tariff reform or tariff revision they propose to renew their old attack upon the protective policy. Signs of their purpose abound on all sides, not the least significant being the pleasing recrudescence of Mr. Cleveland. So high, indeed, is their enthusiasm rising that evidence lately taken in the city of Boston indicates that zealous tariff reformers in certain parts of this city, not content with a single vote, have severally voted, three, four, and as often as seven times for the promotion of the cause they have so much at heart. Therefore, Mr. President, it will not be out of place for me to say a few words in regard to a phase of the tariff question which has been the subject of some recent discussion.

I refer to Canadian reciprocity. From the utterances of the free-trade newspapers one would suppose that Canadian reciprocity was some solid, tangible object, which, if obtained, would shower wealth upon the United States, and that we are prevented from grasping it in our hands solely by the malign opposition of the Republican Party. Another idea emanating from the same source and which I saw repeated in a speech the other day in our legislature, appears to be that Canada is longing to open her markets to American manufacturers, and that the Republican Party will not permit her to do it. All this is, of course,

an utter misconception. Reciprocity with Canada, as with any other country, is a commercial agreement reached through negotiations in which each country makes concessions in return for similar concessions on the part of the other. Canada is not seeking to open her markets to our products. On the contrary, she has, thus far, steadily refused to do so, and reciprocity with Canada has not only not been prevented by the Republican Party, but the Republican Party is the only party which has made and is making any effort to bring it about. Let me briefly trace the history of Canadian reciprocity, for that will give us the facts, which are, on the whole, more comfortable to live with than large phrases and vague vaporings.

In 1854 the Elgin treaty of reciprocity went into effect for 10 years and was terminated by notice in 1866. In the treaty of Washington in 1871, under the administration of Gen. Grant, a Republican, there were reciprocal provisions with the Dominion relating to export duties, goods in transit, the navigation of the St. Lawrence, and the fisheries, limited to 12 years. In 1883 the United States notified Great Britain of her intention to terminate the fishery clauses, and they were accordingly terminated on July 1, 1885. President Cleveland, Democrat, then made a fishery treaty which was so injurious to our fishing industries that it was rejected by the Senate, 30 Senators voting against ratification and 27 in favor. When it is considered that a treaty requires two-thirds majority in order to pass, the magnitude of the defeat may be easily understood.

Mr. Cleveland, however, made no effort to bring about a treaty of general reciprocity with the Dominion of Canada. President Harrison, a Republican, through Mr. Blaine, his Secretary of State, also a Republican, opened negotiations for a treaty of reciprocity with Canada, but the negotiations were broken off because Canada declined even to consider opening her markets to our manufacturers. You will observe the Republican Party tried to obtain reciprocity at that time, but was thwarted by Canada, and it is well for those who shout loudly for Canadian reciprocity to remember that the United States does not make a treaty by itself alone, but with another country, and that the other country has something to say. So the Harrison attempt failed through the refusal of Canada to admit our manufacturers at reduced rates. During the next four years of Mr. Cleveland, a Democrat and a free trader, no attempt was made, so far as I am aware, to establish reciprocity with Canada.

President McKinley, a Republican, came in in 1897. He immediately took measures for a negotiation with Canada to establish reciprocity and to settle certain other pending differences. The joint commission appointed for this purpose met in the summer of 1898 and again the following winter. The insistence of Canada upon certain claims in regard to the Alaskan boundary, which our commissioners regarded as untenable, and her refusal to separate the Alaskan question from the other matters under discussion, led to the adjournment of the joint commission without action. Again the negotiations had failed through the action of Canada. President McKinley then endeavored to make other arrangements for the Alaskan question, and England refused. The same effort was made a year ago by President Roosevelt, a Republican, and that likewise failed through England's refusal.

This year Mr. Hay, a Republican, succeeded in negotiating a treaty, under which the Alaskan question has been referred to a separate commission. This was an absolutely essential step toward making possible any negotiations for a convention of reciprocity. I had some part in securing the ratification of this Alaskan treaty by the Senate, and one of my principal motives was that it cleared the way for a renewal of the negotiations of 1898 and the establishment of reciprocity thereby, so far as reciprocity was possible. It seems to me that the negotiation of this treaty by Mr. Hay and its ratification by the Senate, thus removing the obstacle to reciprocity negotiations, was a more practical service to the cause of Canadian reciprocity than talking about it in the newspapers or passing resolutions.

The commission of 1898 will soon be called together, and among other questions they will consider that of reciprocal trade between Canada and the United States, and will endeavor to reach an agreement upon that and other points. Thus it will be seen from this statement of facts that the Republican Party and Republican Presidents alone have done all that has been done to bring about Canadian reciprocity, and that the failure of the negotiations since 1888 has in every instance been due to the attitude of Canada. These plain facts will have, I am aware, no effect upon those servants of truth who discuss Canadian reciprocity in the columns of the Boston Herald and the Springfield Republican. They will continue to portray the Republican Party as endeavoring to prevent Canadian reciprocity and myself in particular as its bitter opponent. Personally, I have always supported the Republican policy of reciprocity with Canada, and I have not only done this winter what I could to remove the obstacle to reciprocity negotiations by securing the ratification of the Alaskan treaty, but I introduced a bill for reciprocity in coal and should have pressed it as an amendment to the bill removing the duties on coal for one year, if I had not been convinced that to do so would have delayed the passage of that measure so much desired by the country at that moment of stress and exigency.

Experience has convinced me that reciprocity by convention with competing countries generally in competitive products is impracticable, and that the result we desire in that direction can be reached only by legislation.

But I have felt, and still feel, that with Cuba and Canada, which adjoin the United States, we still might make reciprocity agreements. We have made a reciprocity treaty with Cuba. Apart from all moral and political considerations, that treaty in its reciprocal provisions was the most advantageous to the United States of any reciprocal treaty I have ever seen, yet the extreme difficulty of securing reciprocity with Cuba, either by law or treaty, has been made manifest to the country, and it is well for the Democratic newspapers and orators who are trying here to make an issue out of Canadian reciprocity to be reminded of the fact that with a single exception every vote in the Senate against that Cuban treaty of reciprocity was cast by a Democrat. I hope that the commission which is to meet again to consider our differences with Canada will be able to make a reciprocity arrangement beneficial to both countries, but I do not propose to mislead anybody by painting bright visions of the prosperity which is to pour in upon us under such a treaty. I was told this winter by a leading member of the Canadian Parliament that Canada would never make a reduction on manufactured products, for she desired to continue her preference to England; that all Canada wanted was reciprocity in natural products; and, with the exception of coal, I do not see much advantage to New England in that proposition. I have seen it stated also in the newspapers that the coal interests of Canada have passed resolutions against reciprocity in coal. Nevertheless I hope we shall be able to make some mutually advantageous trade arrangements with Canada.

I do not think they are likely to be very extensive, and none will be made that does not give to the United States an adequate return for any concessions made by us. I have now stated the whole case of Canadian reciprocity. If it is ever brought about so as to be in any measure beneficial to our industries and our trade, it will be through the efforts of the Republican Party alone, for the party of protection is the only party that will ever make reciprocal arrangements, because the free-trade Democratic Party is by the very nature of their belief opposed to a policy like reciprocity, which can of necessity come only through the existence of a tariff.

Let me pass next to a particular phase of reciprocity with our neighbors on this continent, as embodied in the convention now pending in the Senate between the United States and Newfoundland. This is a treaty of reciprocity in tariff duties. Some people appear to think that reciprocity means that some other country will admit our products free of duty or at lowered rates if the Republican Party out of pure malevolence does not prevent it.

Other persons seem to suppose, if we may judge by what they say, that a reciprocity treaty consists in admitting the products of some other country to our markets at lowered rates of duty or entirely free. The first conception is ridiculous and the second is merely an effort to get free trade in spots. True reciprocity is neither of these things. Reciprocity in trade, as I have said, is an arrangement between two countries by which, in consideration of mutual concessions, mutual advantages in tariff rates are supposed to be given. There is, therefore, only one test to be applied to a convention of this kind, and that is whether in return for the concessions which we make we receive a proper equivalent. We must examine first the concessions made by us and weigh their effect upon the domestic industry or industries involved, and we must then see whether we receive in return adequate concessions from the other party to the convention.

In the Hay-Bond treaty the price which we pay to Newfoundland for the concessions which she is supposed to make to us is at the expense of a single industry. Under this convention we agree that substantially all the important products of the deep sea and shore fisheries, as well as salmon, trout, and salmon trout, shall be admitted to our markets free of duty, with the single exception of fresh codfish. This is a very sweeping and a very large gift, and in it are involved the fortunes of a great industry. The men who carry on that industry, without a dissenting voice, testify that this removal of duty means to them substantial ruin, and they are the people who can judge best and who must first be considered. I will not enter into the details of their case, for time forbids. I will merely state the principle involved and one fatal objection.

The removal of all protective duties from cured or salt fish will result in the transfer of our salting and curing establishments to Newfoundland, because Newfoundland is nearer the fishing grounds and the labor there is cheaper. But that is not all. Where the great packing and curing establishments are placed there will the fishermen go, and if the packing and curing establishments are transferred to Newfoundland the fishing fleet of New England will follow them and become English and Canadian. This is the united testimony of the men whose all is at stake on the fisheries, and it can not be disregarded or brushed aside. I have been accused of being sectional and local and of abandoning the interests of the country at large to Gloucester, because I have opposed this sacrifice. Do you imagine that it is Gloucester alone whose interests are at stake? I would fight long before I would sacrifice the interests of Gloucester, that historic, gallant town, even if she stood alone; but she does not stand alone, and those who think she does simply disclose their ignorance of our fisheries. When you strike Gloucester you strike the men of Essex, who build her fishing fleet; the men of Swampscott, who build her dories; the factories which make her nets; the paper mills of Springfield and Holyoke, which make labels for her products and the boxes in which her fish are packed; and the great railroad which she helps to feed with freight and passengers. That is Gloucester alone.

Now, come down here to Boston. Forty-eight of the firms who deal in fresh fish in this city and own your fishing fleets protest against this treaty. Ninety captains, who go out from the port of Boston and from Cape Cod to reap the dangerous harvest of the Grand Banks and the Georges, have protested to the Senate against this treaty. Provincetown protests against it. Pass out beyond our borders; the State of Maine, with 17,000 fishermen, protests against it through the representatives of the industry and through her Senators and Members of Congress. The fishermen of the Chesapeake in Maryland have been heard against it. The menhaden fisheries, whose establishments dot the coast from Rhode Island to North Carolina, have formally protested against this removal of the duties on fish. The Pacific coast, with its great and growing fisheries in Alaskan waters, joins with their brethren of the Atlantic and protest. These are some of the facts, and yet some persons say it is a local interest and we must not sacrifice everything to a single town.

I repeat, these fishing industries declare that the removal of the duties will be ruinous to them. Bear that in mind, for one great industry must not be sacrificed in the mere hope of helping others or on the vague promise of general advantages. Now, what do we get in return? First, the privilege to take bait without a license. The only people who use bait are the fishermen, and they are the only people entitled to speak on this point. They declare unanimously that the bait privilege is of no value. Last year two vessels from Maine and about thirty-five from Gloucester took out bait licenses at a cost of something over $4,000. The amount was trifling and the fishermen do not care whether they pay or not.

They do not need licenses now, and they do not care whether Newfoundland refuses them bait or not, for with modern refrigerating arrangements they can supply themselves perfectly well from Eastport or Gloucester. It is but yesterday that Provincetown shipped two cargoes of bait to the French fishermen at Miquelon. Therefore, so far as the fishermen are concerned, they get nothing whatever for the removal of duties which now protect their product. Let us pass next to what the United States at large will get by sacrificing her fishing industries. Seventy-one articles are enumerated in this treaty as on the free list. I asked the gentlemen who appeared in support of the treaty how many of these articles were already on the free list. They did not know. I did, for I had taken the trouble to look it up.

Sixty-three of the 71 articles enumerated in the treaty as on the free list are on the free list now. Of the remaining eight, seven are agricultural implements, and those can only be imported free by residents of Newfoundland when not for sale; that is, we can not export them free of duty to Newfoundland, and the apparent concession is nothing. There remains one article, "gas engines covered by patent," taken by the treaty from the dutiable list and placed on the free list.

Do you think we can build up a trade in "gas engines covered by patent" sufficient to compensate for the loss of the fisheries? I take leave to doubt it. We now come to the dutiable list mentioned in the treaty. There are 16 of these articles. On bacon, ham, tongue, smoked beef, and sausages there is a reduction of three-quarters of a cent a pound, of 20 cents a barrel on peas, and 10 cents a barrel on oatmeal.

The other 9 articles remain at the present rate. I asked the gentlemen who appeared in behalf of the treaty whether there was any reduction in flour. They said no; that 25 cents a barrel was the existing duty, and so far they were correct, but they were so ignorant of their own case that they apparently were not aware that there was a punitive duty on flour of 50 cents a barrel directed against any nation placing a duty on Newfoundland fish.

The punitive duty would come off if the treaty was ratified, but I do not believe in making concessions to any people in return for the removal of punitive, discriminating duties. I believe in giving advantages to our friends and discriminating against those who discriminate against us. Does the treaty provide that these rates shall remain? Not at all. It simply provides that if rates are raised they shall not be raised against us higher than against anybody else. Why did not Newfoundland admit to her free or reduced list boots and shoes, rubber boots or woolen blankets? That would have been of some benefit to the industries of New England and the United States. But those are left untouched and with a preference to England on both blankets and rubber boots. What does the Newfoundland market amount to? There are 210,000 people in Newfoundland, according to the last census.

In Massachusetts and Maine alone there are 100,000 directly dependent on the fisheries, without adding those who live by the allied industries, and they are consumers who give you an exclusive market. Of this Newfoundland population 55,000 are engaged in the fisheries, 1,547 are farmers, 2,682 mechanics, 1,258 miners. How many farm implements or gas engines do you think we should sell to that population? And on the articles chiefly used by three-quarters of the population, who are engaged in the fisheries, we get no reduction. The total imports of Newfoundland in 1900 were $7,500,000 from all countries. When you remember that the exports of domestic products from the United States in 1902 was $1,300,000,000, the amount of the entire Newfoundland import does not seem very imposing, and our actual export to that island of $2,000,000 still less so.

But I will give you a better comparison. The manufactured shipping value of Gloucester's products alone was $6,000,000 in 1901. If we should get the entire value of all the Newfoundland imports it would not much more than cover the value of the fisheries of Gloucester alone, and the value of the product of the fishermen of the United States is $46,000,000. We want to think carefully before we endanger an industry whose annual product is $46,000,000 in seeking a market where we now sell only $2,000,000 and to which this treaty opens no additional door. The gentlemen who appeared before the committee were the representatives of a Newfoundland steamship company, an Englishman engaged in Newfoundland business in New York, Mr. Hall representing the Boston Chamber of Commerce, and Mr. Osborne Howes, who is connected with the business of insurance and is the principal editorial writer on the Boston Herald. The first three gentlemen argued for the treaty on the general ground that it would improve our trade relations with Newfoundland and tend to prevent the island from becoming a part of the Dominion of Canada. They did not show, and were unable to show, that there was any direct benefit to our trade in this treaty, and their testimony as to the fisheries was slight and of no value, because they had no personal knowledge of them and were not engaged in them.

They all testified, however, that in their opinion the removal of the duties proposed in the treaty would not lower the price of fish in the United States, so that the treaty, according to its advocates, would be of no benefit whatever to the American consumer. I should like to see general trade relations with Newfoundland improved, I should be glad to make a treaty with Newfoundland, but I want something in the treaty which shall be of advantage to us and satisfactory to our fishermen. Mr. Osborne Howes, the last advocate of the treaty before the committee, used one argument peculiar to himself and which I can not pass over in silence. He said that the fishing vessels of Gloucester were no longer manned by native-born Americans, but largely by men of foreign birth. He explained this fact by the statement that "it is a dangerous business, and that is the reason Americans do not care to enter into it." In my opinion he exaggerates the fact, and I am certain that his explanation is utterly wrong.

Native-born Americans have abandoned many employments because they can find others more remunerative, but they never abandoned anything through cowardice and fear of danger, either in war or peace. He also undertook to show from a single death roll that these men were not, as a rule, naturalized. This last proposition is incorrect. There is a large percentage of foreign-born men among our fishermen, but most of them are naturalized and a very large proportion remain in the United States and bring up their families there. Three hundred and thirty men from Gloucester enlisted in the War with Spain. Of these 287 resided in Gloucester. One hundred and sixty were American citizens, many of them native born. Of the 170 remaining more than half had taken out their first papers, leaving about 85 to be classed as foreigners. This, I think, is a fair statement of the proportion.

Mr. Howes's argument was that the fishermen having ceased to be in large proportion native born, were no longer entitled to protection. That to me is a new doctrine. The man who carries the naturalization papers of the United States has the same rights in every way to the protection of the Government as the man born on the soil. Mr. Howes, who has the temptations which beset all great rhetoricians, referred to these men as "the mercenaries of the sea," who are willing to face perils which the native born, according to Mr. Howes, are too cowardly to encounter. He has a well-known faculty of making telling phrases. It is to his vivid pen that we owe the sentences that "the flag is a piece of textile fabric" and "patriotism is a virtue of barbarians." But, Mr. President, when we talk about "the mercenaries of the seas," it seems to me that, although he declared that he used the word without disrespect, he is applying a harsh term to men who gain their living in a hardy and dangerous pursuit, too dangerous, as Mr. Howes says, for the native born.

The "mercenaries of the sea!" Why, then, any man who works for wages is a mercenary if he happens not to have been born on American soil. Men who come to New England and toil in our mills are, under his teaching, the "mercenaries of the factories." Mr. President, I confess that I revolt against such an idea, and I think it would be just as fair to say that the man who earns a large income by instructing us in the columns of the Herald how this Government ought to be run is a mercenary of the press. Just one word in conclusion before I leave this matter of the fisheries. There is something more to me in this question than balancing dollars and cents and imports and exports.

Mr. Howes sneered at the argument for the fishermen based on sentiment. I do not. I can not forget that before Endicott landed at Salem the New England fishermen were established on Cape Ann. I can not forget the record of the Gloucester men in the Revolution and the War of 1812. I know that whether native born or foreign born they sent more men in proportion to their population into the Navy of the United States in the Spanish War than any other city or town in the country. I know that of their recruits 76 per cent passed the physical examination, against 14 per cent in Boston and 7 per cent in New York.

I know from the lips of captains and admirals that they were men fit for any duty as soon as they came on board the ship. There are 6,000 of them on that fishing fleet, and when you want them in the day of great stress you can have them for the asking. Do not forget the peril of their calling. Over 2,000 men from this one town have given up their lives in this industry in the last 25 years—nearly a hundred a year. Go down to Gloucester in the autumn and you will hear the annual death roll called. You may read of it in the words of Kipling in "Captains Courageous." If you had been there a month ago, you would have seen the other yearly ceremony of Gloucester. They can not lay wreaths upon the ground where their dead sleep, but the children go out by the edge of the sounding sea and cast flowers upon the waves, for there in that pathless, unmarked waste their dead are buried.

Gloucester represents only part of the great American fisheries, but I say again—and you may call me local, if you will—that if Gloucester with her history stood all alone I would not in the face of that history desert her, and I would plead her cause as best I might at the bar of the Senate of the United States. I shall not be called upon to do so, but if I were I should not plead in vain. Massachusetts would be with me, and the United States from California to Maine. They would be with me, because the patriotism in war and the silent courage in peace of these poor fishermen ranging daily through gray northern seas are known to the world, and patriotism and courage are beloved of the American people and never are out of fashion.

I commend this speech to the Republican Members of this House who are disposed to be timid about supporting the pending legislation, for, whatever charges we Democrats of Massachusetts have at any time been disposed to make against Mr. LODGE, we have always known that he is a most brilliant exponent of regular Republicanism; and when he assures us, as he does in the speech that I have read, that the Republican Party has always stood for reciprocity with Canada, but that Canada has always stood in the way of it, we have the right to expect at this time, when Canada stands not in the way, the vote of every Republican who would stand true to the teachings of his party.

Can it be that in this instance Mr. LODGE was wrong in his exposition of Republicanism on the matter of reciprocity? Surely the Republican speeches that we have listened to in this Chamber during the sessions of this Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union bear some testimony against his views.

Can it be that the Republican Party has only stood for reciprocity with Canada when Canada has stood in the way of it?

Those of us who hail from Massachusetts would not be greatly surprised to find that this is so, for we know the treatment that was accorded to Mr. Foss in Massachusetts when he tried to put the Republican Party there on record in favor of it. We have not forgotten that he was hooted down in a Republican State convention when he tried to exercise his right as a delegate to have a resolution adopted in favor of it, and we have not forgotten that he told those who hooted him down that some day the people of the Commonwealth would listen with interest to his words.

We have not forgotten the points that he made in speeches and in writings in favor of reciprocity, and I am glad to be able to read to you from another bound pamphlet that was given to the Boston Public Library, as the bookplate says, "by Eugene Noble Foss."

This pamphlet has an address on the "Trade relations between the United States and Canada," which was made in Boston, Mass., in 1904, while Mr. Foss was yet active in the ranks of the Republican Party. Let me read this speech to you, rather than tell you what it says, so that you may know exactly what the views of Mr. Foss at that time were:

MR. PRESIDENT AND MEMBERS OF THE CANADIAN CLUB:

I confess that I am beginning to feel at home here. This is the third time I have been made the recipient of your courtesy, and I believe that our meeting has helped us to understand each other better.

Now, Mr. President, I am not assuming that your members and guests are on one side of the reciprocity fence and I on the other; or even that our distinguished guest from over the line is so far from our point of view that he can hold nothing in common with the friends of commercial reciprocity in the United States.

You will recall that at a former meeting of this club your guests were a leading Canadian journalist and a prominent manufacturer from Ontario; and you will remember that after we all had had our say, we discovered that the ideas, or fundamental principles, for which each of us stood were broad and liberal enough to enfold us all. I trust we will reach the same conclusions to-night.

CANADIAN SENTIMENT NOT MISUNDERSTOOD.

It is a mistake to suppose that we who have led in the movement for closer trade relations with Canada do not understand what present conditions are. In fact, the logic of the situation, the unmistakable index of the facts bearing upon it, has compelled us to accept very much of the Canadian view. Notwithstanding our wealth, our power, our resources, our influence, we have regarded the small group of neighbors at the north as competitors to be feared and excluded, not as friends and customers to be given the hand of commercial welcome. We have massed our seventy-five millions of people against their five millions and entrenched ourselves behind a wall over which the frightful shapes of our supposed commercial enemies could not climb. They have

planted a 25-foot wall against our trusts and we have builded a 50-foot wall against their farmers and fishermen."

I am neither unpatriotic nor unrepublican in thus admitting the mistaken course which the United States has pursued with respect to Canada. I quote these facts merely to show to some of our Canadian friends who apparently think otherwise, that many of us who have been foremost in the reciprocity movement have not been blind to the unequal conditions which exist. In all the agitation which has been going on so incessantly the past few years, our main request has been that our own people appreciate these conditions. I have no sympathy with the political jingoism which would make these conditions an excuse for doing nothing to correct them.

We have not the right to ask anything of Canada that is not for her interest. We shall only make ourselves ridiculous if we do. The burden is upon us to prove that freer trade between the two countries will benefit both; for times have changed, and it is not now Canada that is seeking reciprocity.

I believe in the principle of protection, which is fundamental in this country. By the same token, I can have no criticism to offer of the growing desire of the Canadian people to protect themselves from destructive foreign competition. I can, however, properly point out that protection carried to the point of exclusion is not protection, it is imposition; and I can suggest that our Canadian friends will do well to learn this truth from our experience and not from their own.

EXCLUSION IS NOT PROTECTION.

I would like to ram this fact home with another; and we can also supply the object lesson in this case. We have built up our own country in spite of domestic competition fiercer than Canadian industries ever can be called upon to suffer. If we can do this here, what can we not do for Canada under fair and reasonable trade conditions? So far the Dominion has shown her wisdom in refusing to cut herself off from the facilities with which we can help her to develop her immense resources. Does she now contemplate fastening upon herself the heaviest possible form of indirect taxation merely because we have refused her tariff favors which other countries are disposed to grant? Or, on the other hand, shall the blindness and arrogance of our own stand-pat contingent be permitted to force such a policy upon a friendly customer?

Granted that the markets of Great Britain are of more present importance to Canada than those of the United States, shall we forever continue to ignore the value of our Canadian trade, whether it be coming or going? These are questions which the people of both countries will do well to ponder.

Fortunately for a partial solution of the vexed question of trade relations, our own necessities bid fair to force our Government to look the Canadian question squarely in the face. In several commodities our demand already has outrun our supply, and we are buying heavily, regardless of tariff taxes. In others the exchanges between the two countries are so general, for geographical and other reasons, that a lively trade in competing products has developed both ways. In practically all these products the tariff serves no useful purpose, but adds a burden of expense which is without profit to either party to the transaction. In still other cases where the demand is great, the United States tariff is yet so high that no purchases are attempted.

HERE IS A BASIS FOR RECIPROCITY.

These three classes furnish the basis upon which a consistent scheme of tariff revision must rest. You will notice that I use the current phrase, "tariff revision," but by it I mean "reciprocity." And I wish to say right here that I do not believe in any kind of tariff revision or tariff legislation which does not recognize reciprocity as a fundamental principle. I wish to declare, and this is as good an opportunity as any, that reciprocity is just as much and just as great a principle, a system, a primary economic policy, if you will, as free trade or protection, as they are commonly understood.

I believe that it will not long hence become recognized as a practical working system infinitely superior to either stand-pat protection or free trade. It will recognize your friends, customers, and allies in a commonsense and common-justice fashion, instead of attacking them as does stand-pattism, or favoring your enemies at your own expense, as does doctrinaire free trade. Any good business man or good neighbor will go a great way and sacrifice much to favor and benefit these by whom he lives or profits largely. Hence, I go in for some system of tariff revision in the future which shall aim to benefit, as well as ourselves, countries which make their prosperity ours. This is simply good business as well as good morals, Gen. Draper and William Whitman to the contrary notwithstanding.

I have said that the basis of tariff revision, or reciprocity, as far as Canada is concerned, must rest upon three classes of articles; that is to say, articles which each country must buy of the other, duty or no duty, or in which they make a mutually profitable interchange under natural conditions.

As an illustration, I have prepared a table showing the principal articles in which the two countries have an interchangeable trade. These figures show our exports to Canada and dutiable imports therefrom of practically identical articles in 1903:

United States exchanges with Canada, 1903.

	Exports.	Imports (dutiable).
Horses	$2,121,000	$295,000
Sheep	174,000	986,000
Breadstuffs [1]	5,532,000	843,000
Coal (bituminous)	9,668,000	4,811,000
Eggs	78,000	18,000
Fish	743,000	2,859,000
Fruits [2]	1,008,000	133,000
Hay	108,000	2,236,000
Hides	521,000	1,186,000
Iron ore	264,000	320,000
Dairy products	192,000	24,000
Vegetables	651,000	493,000
Wood, unmanufactured	4,766,000	13,830,000
Wood pulp	38,000	1,867,000
Gypsum	.....	319,000
	25,864,000	30,220,000

[1] Exclusive of corn. [2] Varieties common to both countries.

ABOLISH SOME TARIFFS, REGARDLESS OF CANADA.

Now, here is a natural and necessary trade of $55,000,000, and which might be two, three, or four times that amount, hampered and harassed by tariff restrictions, which are of no possible benefit, but, on the contrary, work absolute injury to every interest concerned.

Now, I believe for one—and I intend hereafter to insist upon the belief to the limit of my power—in making a start toward reciprocity by either abolishing or radically reducing the duties on all the articles in this list. If Canada prefers to keep on her more moderate duties, where she levies them, to her own privation, let her do it, but that is a poor reason why we should.

The Home Market Club has finally been forced to concede us coal and iron ore, and William Whitman gives us lumber. Everybody but Col. Clarke wants free hides; and here you have at once accounted for three-quarters in amount of the products under discussion.

In regard to hay, meats, vegetables, fruit, and eggs, I doubt if a government could stand against the demand for a removal of the duties on them, if the people should make this a distinct issue—as they will before long.

In regard to one more prominent item, breadstuffs, it is now fully recognized among those whose opinion is worth anything, that we must either make wheat free, and promptly, too, or prepare to suffer disaster in our milling industries.

As to barley, the outrageous duty upon that and upon the malt made from it is the heaviest burden which our great brewing industries are called upon to bear.

Where can there be any argument or controversy on this great question as I have here presented it?

SOME QUESTIONS FOR THE POLITICIANS.

It is the evident purpose of some of our legislators at Washington to refuse to reduce the tariff on Canadian goods because, as they will say, Canada will make no concessions. This will be the pretext on which they will maintain the status quo.

The only real thought in their minds is to discover the cleverest excuse for standing pat. We understand very well the purpose of these statesmen, and I want to ask some of them who are beginning to profess a tardy love for reciprocity, what they intend to do to show their good faith. They profess to believe in reciprocity in competitive articles. Will they introduce bills lowering our schedules to somewhere near Canada's, or will they prefer to relieve the necessities of the country by direct legislation and place on the free list coal, iron, lumber, wheat, hides, wood pulp, etc.?

This is the practical question we business men purpose to put right up to these politicians until we know exactly where they stand and what they are going to do. We purpose to find out whether those professions made just before election meant anything or not. It is not enough for them to say that they are in favor of reciprocity which will be "mutually advantageous" to both countries. We are willing to concede that the United States should take the initiative. We not only owe it to Canada, in view of her attitude in the past, but we owe it to ourselves as the larger of the two countries, and from the further fact that Canada is our best customer in manufactured goods and our neighbor at that; and from the further overshadowing fact that Canada's commercial policy still remains liberal toward us and gives us such generous access to her markets.

HOW TO MAKE A START.

Now, let us make a start by putting some of these things which we are in desperate need of on the free list, whether Canada reciprocates or not. By so doing we will be not only helping ourselves, but we will be helping Canada to pay a portion of her debt, at least, in commodities instead of cash.

Every business man here knows that treatment of that sort on our part will not conduce to less purchases on the part of Canada. On the contrary, where we are now selling her one hundred and thirty millions we should soon be selling her two hundred millions per annum, if we would only show a disposition to take in payment what she has to offer and what we stand in need of.

Every business man knows that this is the soundest kind of business sense. No one of us ever lost anything yet in trying to help a good customer sell his product. As President Roosevelt said in his Minneapolis speech, "We must also remember that in dealing with other nations, benefits must be given where benefits are sought."

SHALL WE FOLLOW SPAIN AND PORTUGAL?

Both in the United States and in Canada we find those who are no doubt conscientious in their opposition to reciprocity between the two countries. In the United States they are known as the "standpatters," and are represented by the Home Market Club. They represent the ultrahigh-tariff element in the Republican Party. They honestly confuse protection with prohibition.

In Canada they are represented by the Canadian Manufacturers' Association. To my mind these two elements propose to do for the United States and Canada practically what Spain and Portugal once did in adopting a policy of selfishness and exclusiveness which, as Hon. John A. Kasson has shown, "other nations would not tolerate, and long-continued wars followed—wars of conquest, which led to the impoverishment of the nations which persisted in their career of international selfishness. Spain and Portugal," continues Mr. Kasson, "once in the forefront of national prosperity and greatness, are now at the rear of the column and apparently without the power of recuperation."

Now, Mr. President, the policy of the Home Market Club and the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, carried to its logical conclusion, would bring these two countries to the same end.

From an economic point of view there appears to be every reason why Canada and the United States should come together commercially. We must all admit that the tendency all over the world is toward amalgamation and consolidation, in the interest of economy and the elimination of ruinous competition. We all know that the United States and Canada are competitors in the markets of the world, and are to be so more and more each year as the development of Canada goes on.

COMMERCIAL UNION A NATURAL POLICY.

For instance, Liverpool makes the price for the export wheat, not only of the United States but of Canada. And so of the other exports, whether natural products or manufactures, of both countries. Now, the natural and logical policy for these two contiguous countries is commercial union; an amalgamation, if you please, which will protect the interests of both. If a complete commercial union were possible, it would be the best solution of the whole problem. That is, that trade should be as free and unrestricted between the United States and Canada as it is between the several States of our own country.

This is what I should like to see, for it would mean not only the greatest possible development of both countries in every direction, but it would furthermore insure for all time peace and good will.

IMPROPER SYSTEM OF TAXATION THE BASIC FAULT.

But I recognize that at the present time commercial union may not be practicable from the fact that Canada, like ourselves, has not yet been educated to the principle of direct taxation. When we shall have advanced in civilization to the point where we will not shrink from levying our taxes upon the sources from which they are justly due, and not through class legislation, we can then treat this great business proposition on a business basis. The systems of taxation of the two countries are to-day the only obstacle to the fulfillment of one of the greatest and most beneficent unions in the history of the world. I have faith to believe that before long the people of both countries will remove this artificial barrier to their greatest happiness and prosperity.

Mr. Chairman, the Foss of those days was the Republican of Massachusetts who was crying in the wilderness for the recognition of this doctrine. I do not know whether or not he was driven out of the Republican Party for daring to express these views; but I do know that he became convinced that within the ranks of the Republican Party in Massachusetts there was no opportunity for him to develop this doctrine, and in 1909 he joined hands with the Democrats of Massachusetts, became our candidate for lieutenant governor on the ticket with Hon. James H. Vahey for governor, and the Republican majority of many thousands of previous years was, in the short limits of a six weeks' campaign, cut down to six or eight thousand votes.

I know, too, that in the spring of 1910 he was impressed into service as a Democratic candidate for Congress in the district long represented here until his death by the late Hon. William C. Lovering, and we went into that district and we preached the doctrine of reciprocity with Canada and honest revision of the tariff. And the fourteenth Massachusetts district, that had been sending a Republican Congressman by nearly 15,000 majority, sent here Eugene Noble Foss, a Democrat, by nearly 10,000 majority. [Great applause on the Democratic side.]

I know, too, that in the fall of 1910, because of the forceful, businesslike way with which he had presented this and other similar issues to the people of our Commonwealth, he was chosen by the Democrats of the State to be our candidate for governor and was triumphantly elected under most unfavorable Democratic circumstances during the early part of the campaign.

You might say that these victories are entirely personal; you might say that these things mean only that our standard bearer has been a great success as an individual candidate. Let me refer you, then, to the Manual for the General Court of Massachusetts of this year, 1911, where may be found the official votes for Representatives in the Sixty-second Congress in each of our 14 districts. I took time to-day to total the vote for Democratic candidates for Congress as well as the vote for Republican candidates for Congress at the last election in our Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

We have in this Chamber 10 Republican Congressmen from Massachusetts and only four Democratic Members. You might well suppose, as I have learned in conversation with many of you that you really believe, that we are only able to get an occasional victory here and there in our State. But, sir, I find that the total Democratic vote for Congressmen in Massachusetts last fall was 204,639 as against a total Republican vote for Congressmen of 203,136. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And when I point out to you that in the ninth district, which I represent and which is the most strongly Democratic district in the State, I not only had to compete with the Republican candidate, but also with an Independent, who had served as a Democrat for eight years in this body, you will readily see that these totals do not altogether tell the story. The fact is that last fall we were at least 10,000 votes stronger on the matter of sending men to this Congress than our Republican brethren, although they have a large majority in the delegation here. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I make the point not because of any vainglorious spirit, but simply to show you how Massachusetts stands to-day on current political questions as a result of the campaign made these many years by Eugene N. Foss and Henry M. Whitney and the members of organizations like the New England Reciprocity and Free Trade Leagues. I make the point, too, that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] may know.

Yes, sir; we did vote for Mr. Foss, and we say that he typifies the permanent spirit of the old Commonwealth, about which the former Speaker seems to be solicitous. I subscribe most heartily to the splendid tribute that he paid to the old State that has done so much in the development of this country, and I say to him he need have no fear that the spirit of that Commonwealth differs to-day from what it has been in the great historic past.

The spirit of Massachusetts yesterday, on the 19th of April, 1911, when he asked his question, was the same spirit that characterized the Minute Men at Concord and Lexington on the 19th of April, 1775. [Applause.] The spirit of Massachusetts yesterday, on the 19th of April, was the same spirit that characterized the men of Massachusetts on the 19th of April, 1861, when they marched through the streets of a then hostile Baltimore and began a long line of brilliant achievements in the great Civil War. [Applause.] The spirit of Massachusetts yesterday, on the 19th of April, was the same, sir, as it was on the 19th of April, 1898, when we started out to fight our War with Spain. [Applause.]

And I believe it is because he so vitally typifies that splendid Massachusetts spirit that Eugene N. Foss was the Democratic Congressman elected from an overwhelmingly Republican district, and is to-day the wise chief executive of a great State in a great Union. [Great applause.]

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Chairman, I regret more than any Democrat in this House can regret the necessity which impels me to make a speech on this subject. I had intended to say nothing on the floor of the House in reference to the Canadian treaty. I had intended to content myself with casting my vote according to my conscience and my duty to my people and no more. But certain recent strictures from my own colleague from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] have made it imperative that we who differ with him should say something with reference to our position in order that our people may know why we are opposed to this measure.

I want to offer my sincere thanks to my good friend the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] for yielding to me the time to address this House. He is in favor of the treaty, but, like the magnanimous gentleman he is, has yielded enough time for me to state my position in order that my fellow Members and my constituents may know why I oppose it.

Mr. Chairman, I have never regarded modern reciprocity as a Democratic doctrine. If I had the time, I believe I could convince any fair-minded Democrat or Republican that it is not Democratic doctrine. I believe that in 1854 reciprocal free trade between the United States and Canada was a Democratic doctrine, but mark you, my friends, the wonderful difference between the reciprocal free-trade agreement between Canada and the United States in 1854 and this so-called reciprocity treaty, which is no more than a revision of the tariff laws between the United States and Canada. Reciprocal free trade of 1854 put practically everything that was produced in the United States and Canada on the free list.

That was genuine reciprocity, fair to both countries and to all the people concerned. In that agreement flour, breadstuffs, bread, meats, coal, and lard, and all of the people's necessities were placed on the free list, which is not so in the present measure, but on such necessities a high protective tariff is left.

That is the last we heard of reciprocity from the Democratic Party until about 40 years afterwards, in 1892. In the meantime, James G. Blaine appeared upon the scene with his modern doctrine of reciprocity, which was like the sample we are now discussing. I do not wonder that my young friend from Massachusetts [Mr. MURRAY] stands here and sings the praises of reciprocity. It is strictly a New England cult and of New England origin. It was born in that section of the country which has always clamored for cheap or free raw materials which she has to buy and for a high protective tariff on what she manufactures and has to sell. That is why New England to-day is advocating so strongly free trade in farm products and raw material. They are willing to put the other fellow's products on the free list, but whenever you take away some of their protection on what they produce then you will hear them squeal loud and protest much. New England has always had free cotton for her big cotton mills and high protection on her cotton manufactures. She secured free hides two years ago in the Payne bill and held to protection on shoes, and she now hopes to put all other farm products on the free list. Then her selfish plan will be consummated. James G. Blaine is the father of modern reciprocity. He first presented the scheme to Benjamin Harrison in 1890. He urged Mr. Harrison to send his message to Congress in 1890 advocating reciprocity. President Harrison did so, and who was it that introduced the reciprocity provision as part of the Republican tariff law of 1890? None other than Nelson W. Aldrich, highest protectionist, I suppose, that this country ever saw. He was responsible for section 3 of the McKinley Act of 1890, which has ever since been known as the reciprocity provision of that tariff law. When that section was voted on in the Senate my recollection is that every Democrat in that body voted against it, including the two great Senators from North Carolina, Vance and Ransom, while all the Republicans, led by Mr. Aldrich, voted for it.

Under this section 3 various reciprocity agreements or treaties were negotiated by the President. I might say, in passing, that Gen. Grant was for reciprocity, and so was President Arthur, and certain treaties were negotiated by that administration. When Mr. Cleveland came to be President he withdrew them, so much opposed to sham reciprocity was he. In 1892 the Democrats carried this country and elected a Democratic Congress. What happened? At that time, when they met here in Congress on the 4th of March, 1893, various reciprocity treaties were in operation, and when the Wilson-Gorman law was passed those treaties were, ipso facto, repealed by the Democrats. In 1892, 38 years after the real reciprocity treaty with Canada in 1854, the Democrats put in their platform a provision which said that trade interchange on the basis of reciprocal advantages to the countries participating is a time-honored Democratic doctrine; that is, reciprocal free trade between countries, which was the only reciprocity ever theretofore advocated by the Democratic Party, and hence the only kind referred to as being time honored; but here is what our party, in the same clause, said about modern reciprocity, the genus we are now considering:

We denounce the sham reciprocity which juggles with the people's desire for enlarged foreign markets and freer exchanges by pretending to establish closer trade relations for a country whose articles of export are almost exclusively agricultural products with other countries that are also agricultural, while erecting a customhouse barrier of prohibitive tariff taxes against the richest countries of the world that stand ready to take our entire surplus of products and to exchange therefor commodities which are necessaries and comforts of life among our own people.

Mr. Chairman, I interpret that Democratic declaration as a condemnation of the present treaty, and that is why I say this treaty appears to me to be a sham and a fraud. I quoted that portion of the Democratic platform in a recent published interview for the purpose of showing the party had condemned this kind of treaty, which I consider to be a sham and a fraud and essentially unjust.

When the Democratic Party repealed the reciprocity treaties in 1894 the Republican Party in their platform condemned the Democrats for it. Not only that, but they congratulated themselves on the success of the reciprocity treaties in the following language: "We [the Republican Party] point to the success of the Republican policy of reciprocity." In 1897 various bills were referred to the Ways and Means Committee after the Republicans had regained control of the House, and this book which I hold in my hand contains practically the history of reciprocity legislation in this country. A majority of the Committee on Ways and Means, which was Republican, brought in a report to the House of Representatives in which they stated that the repeal by the Democratic Party of the reciprocity treaties was "a public calamity, and that the policy that they represented shall be permanently adopted in our tariff legislation." Who signed that report? Nelson Dingley, jr., who was the father of the Dingley tariff law that every Democrat in the United States has denounced; Mr. SERENO E. PAYNE, the progenitor of the Payne-Aldrich bill, and who now favors this treaty; Mr. JOHN DALZELL; Albert J. Hopkins; Charles S. Grosvenor; Jonathan P. Dolliver; George W. Steele; Martin Johnson; Walter Evans; and our high-protectionist friend, James A. Tawney. That was the Republican view of modern reciprocity as expressed by the Republican Ways and Means Committee, and that is the view Mr. Taft now seems to take. Now, what did the Democrats on that committee say about reciprocity? Here is what they said in concluding their report:

We conclude that there is little evidence of any marked benefits flowing from reciprocity agreements. We conclude that uniform rates of duty, applying equally to the products of all nations, is the only safe policy to pursue, as it can give occasion to no complaint of unfair treatment such as must arise under a scheme of discriminating duties.

That minority report was signed by Benton McMillan, of Tennessee, a Democrat who served on the Ways and Means Committee probably longer than any other southern Democrat; Joseph Wheeler, another great Democrat from the South; and H. G. Turner, of Georgia.

It is not fair to other nations to give Canada this advantage while at the same time refusing to give it to other countries. We believe in equal justice to all nations, as well as equal rights to all men. This treaty violates that great principle. The object of free farm products, as found in this Canadian reciprocity, is to give somebody an advantage over somebody else, and this is just as undemocratic and unfair as protection, which is nothing more nor less than giving one class of people an advantage over another class.

I quote from the Democratic campaign handbook of 1902:

Moreover, such a policy disregards Washington's wise advice and substitutes for this noble rule of conduct the sordid bargains, the unequal and ever-changing discriminations of trade treaties. This great Republic ought to govern its foreign policy by principles of justice and sound economic laws and treat all nations alike. Then it would need no commercial treaties and few political ones.

I say, therefore, that I have never regarded this kind of reciprocity as a Democratic doctrine. I know this treaty is not a Democratic measure, and my Democratic friends on this side will agree that it is not. Is there a Democrat on the floor of the House who will stand up here and say this treaty is Democratic doctrine—a Democratic measure? I have no idea there is. But it is said that it is a slight step, a mere step, in the right direction. My colleague from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN]—and I am sorry he is not here—wrote a letter a week or two ago to a personal friend, Mr. McMichael, in our State on this question, and this friend published the letter in a newspaper and I have here a copy of the letter, and in that letter my friend [Mr. KITCHIN] says "that the Canadian reciprocity agreement is a short hobble-skirted step, but still a step." [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, ever since that particular kind of feminine dress was introduced into this country I have despised it. I do not like hobble-skirted dresses and I do not like hobble-skirted treaties. [Applause.] And yet my colleague from North Carolina—who made his strenuous effort here Saturday, lasting three hours—I thought, tried to convince the country that this is a simon-pure, genuine-blown-in-the-bottle Democratic measure; and yet he writes to a friend in North Carolina that it is only a "short hobble-skirted step." I noticed a woman walking down the Avenue yesterday who had on a hobble skirt. [Laughter and applause.]

I wanted to see just what distance this treaty carries us in the Democratic direction. Now, mark you, it is not a hobble-skirted step, but it is a "short hobble-skirted step"; and I picked out the tightest-skirted woman I could find [laughter and applause], and while I did not have a policeman's cyclometer to measure the length of each step she took, yet, according to my eyes—and I am a reasonably young man—she did not step more that 6 inches. [Laughter and applause.] I say again that it appeared to me she did not progress more than 6 inches each step; so, if that is the actual distance this treaty is to carry us toward the Democratic goal, it is a ridiculously short one to have so much ado made about it in the Halls of national legislation.

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

Mr. WEBB. If the gentleman will be brief.

Mr. SIMS. Without the treaty the woman can not even step 6 inches. [Applause.]

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Chairman, my friend says he would rather take 6 inches than no step at all. The doctrine of de minimis lex non curat—the law does not regard little things—applies here, and the people care nothing for a distance of 6 inches on the long road from a Republican tariff law to a Democratic measure. I am not admitting, however, that it is a 6-inch step in the right direction. I think it several miles in the wrong direction.

Mr. SIMS. The gentleman says he measured it. [Laughter.]

Mr. WEBB. Oh, I measured with my eye the distance the woman stepped; but what I am talking about is the infinitesimal distance, according to my colleague, that this treaty carries us toward the goal of Democratic doctrine, and I do not even admit that it is in the direction of Democratic doctrine at all, but I strongly deny it. I say it not only carries us no distance toward Democratic doctrine, but, on the contrary, it is toward Republicanism, for it is a species of reciprocity which Republicans have always advocated since the Civil War, and it was drawn by a Republican Secretary of State, urged upon us by a Republican President of the United States, and advocated by many distinguished Republicans of the House and Senate.

Mr. Chairman, I was first elected to this body in 1902. It was a proud honor the good people of the ninth North Carolina district conferred on me. I carried with me throughout the district in that campaign what most young men think is the regular Democratic Bible, namely, a Democratic campaign handbook. That is where I received my first "larnin," as the darky would say, in reciprocity. And here are some expressions in that handbook. In that year, mark you, the national Democratic congressional committee was composed of Gov. W. W. Kitchin, of North Carolina, Gov. Harmon, Clark Howell, and many other distinguished Democrats, among them my friend from Texas, Mr. RANDELL, who is now a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee. They sent out this handbook, which I hold in my hand, to the voters of the country, that contains these expressions about reciprocity, and, in my opinion, they size up exactly this treaty we are considering:

Reciprocity looks like free trade, but tastes like protection. It is really a new sugar coating prepared by the Republican tariff doctors for many patients who are refusing to take their protection pills straight.

In practice reciprocity is worse than protection.

Our farmers are not sending delegates to Washington to threaten Congress if it does not pass reciprocity legislation. There is nothing in it for farmers. To them it is a sham and a fraud.

And I say, with all the emphasis I am capable of now, that this treaty, as far as the farmer is concerned, is a sham and a fraud. [Applause.]

Reciprocity is based upon the same false theories as is protection, and, like protection, is a sham and a humbug, and to most people has been and will ever continue to be a delusion and a snare.

That expression describes this treaty precisely. All the arguments that have been made in behalf of this measure are to the effect that it will not hurt the farmer. I have not heard any Member argue that it will help the farmer, but before I get through I will point out how the big manufacturers and trusts of this country are going to be benefited and how it appears to me that the farmers' interests are being traded off for the benefit of the big trusts and manufacturers of the United States.

Another expression from the handbook:

Reciprocity is put forward to save protection and to stave off the demand for genuine tariff revision.

I say that when Mr. Taft sent this reciprocity bill to Congress, in January, on the eve of the assembling of the Democratic Congress, it was sent here, it seems to me, for the purpose of embarrassing the Democratic Congress; and I say here now, with no idea of being contradicted, that it has embarrassed us. It has embarrassed you, and you, and you, and a hundred, probably, of good Democrats of this Congress. Many Democrats are going to vote for it who do not want to do so. I do not like President-made laws, anyway. The people of the United States pay Congressmen about $4,000,000 a year to make laws. This is exclusively the function of Congress under the Constitution, and it is the duty of the President to execute those laws when so made; but this tariff-law treaty was made by the President and his Secretary of State and sent to Congress for our ratification, with a careful warning that the people's elected representatives must not change it, even to dotting an "i" or crossing a "t." This is usurping the duties of a great lawmaking body, and I object to it seriously.

Daniel Webster once said:

The contest of the ages has been to rescue liberty from the grasp of executive power.

The Chief Executive, Mr. Taft, not only directed the making of this treaty law, but is now actively using all his tremendous influence and power to have it ratified by Congress.

James G. Blaine said that reciprocity was the handmaid of protection, and I could quote on and on from leading Republican authority, Mr. Chairman, if the clock did not warn me that my time is fast running away. Here are the Republican platform declarations in 1896 in reference to reciprocity:

We believe that the repeal (by the Democrats) of the reciprocity arrangements negotiated by the last Republican administration was a national calamity. * * * Protection and reciprocity are twin measures of Republican policy, and go hand in hand. Democratic rule has recklessly struck down both, and both must be reestablished.

Hon. E. J. HILL, a distinguished Republican Member of this body and who is thoroughly versed in the history of his party, in a speech a few days ago, fervently advocating this treaty, said on the floor of the House that the treaty "is 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, and that it (the treaty) squares with the Republican doctrine of protection."

My Democratic colleagues, we were elected last fall in a tariff-revision-campaign fight, and I declare to you that it does not set well on me to have us assemble here in extra session and begin our cuttings and revisions, begin our tariff reductions by placing all Canadian farm products in free competition with our own farmers—the tillers of the soil—whose labors feed the world and whose chivalry and bravery have fought all the battles this country has won. [Applause.] The little tariff on farm products hurts no one, yet the first gun is aimed at him. There are glaring, monstrous inequalities in the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill that we might attack first and foremost; but, no; they are left for another day, and we are led by the President to an attack on the little tariff there is on the farmer's products and induced by him to place all he produces on the free list.

Mr. Chairman, there are four or five different classes of advocates of this reciprocity treaty, it seems to me, and the first of these advocated which I shall mention are those who believe in the annexation of Canada to the United States. Among that distinguished class I would place my Republican friend from Connecticut, Mr. EBENEZER J. HILL. And there are others, not only on the floor of this House, but all over this country who want this trade-treaty agreement with Canada, thinking that it will bring about annexation finally. For my part, Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to annexing Canada. Fisher Ames once said that "this country is big enough." And it is too big now. Continental United States is capable of sustaining a thousand million souls, and then our country would not be as thickly settled as Massachusetts is to-day. Continental United States could sustain every human being in the entire world, and then our population would be no more dense than Belgium's. We have enough territory at present; we do not need any more.

Mr. POU. Or the Philippines.

Mr. WEBB. No; I would like to swap them off or give them away. I fear they will be a source of unending trouble.

In addition to this there is a large proportion of Canadians of the Latin race, and it is an historical fact that no Latin race has ever accepted a republican form of government with any staying fidelity. They are natural monarchists; they will always look to a king and to the monarchy. There is no reason why we should annex Canada. We do not need her, and there is no reason, in my mind, for giving Canada an advantage, as we do in this treaty, over other friendly nations. Why should we not give to the people of England, our Anglo-Saxon brethren, the same privileges and benefits as we extend to this mixed population in Canada?

There is another class of men advocating this treaty who believe in what is known as the doctrine of free raw material, with a revenue tariff or a protective tariff on all manufactured articles. For my part I do not believe in this doctrine. I believe in the doctrine of that great statesman, Robert J. Walker, the father of our tariff faith, who worked out a policy which, if steadily pursued, would have put us as a party in power more often in the past and would carry us into power more surely in the future; who believed in putting a tariff on practically everything that is imported, whether raw material or manufactured articles, making the tariff low according to the necessity of the article and high in proportion to its luxury, so that if a tariff is a blessing everybody shares it, and if it is a burden everybody bears it.

My Democratic friends, when you abandon that doctrine and go to substituting for it the doctrine of putting a lot of products on the free list that men produce in this country, then there is no end to the possible free list, and the ultimate extreme to which you are driven is free trade. And I conceive that, under the Constitution that we have lived by and have loved for 120 years, and under which we live to-day, that so long as that Constitution exists in its present form we are compelled to levy a tariff tax in order to raise revenue to run the Government.

I look upon the tariff as a tax, and therefore I would make that tariff fall equally and justly and impartially upon the shoulders of all our people, not giving to some men the right to buy in the cheapest market and sell their products in the highest market and compelling some to sell their products in the cheapest market and buy in the dearest, because that is unfair and unjust. Whenever you create a long free list and retain a long protected list you thereby give to some an advantage over others. If you put all raw material on the free list, you give the manufacturer a double advantage, an advantage at both ends—the right to buy in the cheapest market and the privilege of selling in the highest market. I believe in the historic Democratic doctrine of a tariff for revenue, so levied as to make the burdens of the tax fall equally and justly upon all.

Mr. Chairman, there is still another class advocating the treaty, and that class consists of those extreme free traders who are willing to swallow the big protection hook that is hidden in this treaty in order to get the free-trade bait. My friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. GEORGE], I believe, said in his speech that he was a free trader. Now, free trade is a Utopian dream at present. The Constitution will have to be amended materially before we can adopt free trade. We are now legislating under conditions that actually exist and not under those that may be hoped for. Every Democrat and every Republican knows that as long as we have to raise $350,000,000 annually by import duties we are compelled to levy a tariff tax. Therefore in levying the tariff tax we should levy it on practically everything and give no one an advantage over anybody else, and not give to some the right to buy their goods from a free list and require that others must buy protected articles. That would be taxing some and letting others escape taxation altogether. That would be as unfair as taxing all farm lands and letting city property escape altogether.

There is still another class, and that class is composed of those who favor this treaty from purely selfish motives. Gentlemen, all life nowadays seems to be selfish. You can scarcely go about the streets of this city, you can scarcely move anywhere, without seeing selfishness stick up its ugly head.

And I tell you, my friends, I believe that selfishness and privilege and advantage are doing more to ram this treaty through Congress than any other single cause. Selfishness? Yes. Where is the man who will deny that the great metropolitan newspapers in the United States to-day who are advocating this treaty, many of them because they expect to get free wood pulp and print paper, are actuated by pure and unadulterated selfishness? I declare unto you, my friends, and unto them, that the great newspapers of this country are no more entitled to free wood pulp and print paper than is the poor toiler on the farm in my country and the poor laborer entitled to free woolen clothes or free sugar. And yet you will not think for a moment of putting these necessities of all the people, poor as well as rich, on the free list. If not, why not? They are as much entitled to cheap sugar and cheap clothes as the newspapers are entitled to cheap paper. Yes, we have many of the great city newspapers back of this treaty because there is a big saving in it to them by taking the tax off their print paper. There is no promise on their part to reduce the price of the paper to their readers or the cost of advertising space, but they see cheaper print paper and therefore bigger profits if the treaty passes. I do not blame them. This is such a selfish world that every man has to look out for self, just as many of the big newspapers are doing in supporting this treaty.

There is still another class of individuals who are supporting this treaty for selfish purposes. I am going to charge, and do charge, that the United States Steel Corporation, the biggest trust in the world, organized by J. Pierpont Morgan, the wizard of finance, who received $100,000,000 for organizing it, favors this treaty and is helping to pass it. I make the charge that that great corporation is advocating this treaty. I call upon my friends from Pennsylvania, the whole congressional delegation, many of whom I see before me, to deny that all the steel corporations in Pennsylvania are backing this treaty to-day and are advocating it. Why are they advocating it? I will show you a little later that it is because they are getting a big advantage in it. In the treaty Canada reduces her tariff barrier against United States iron and steel manufactures, which are exported to Canada, and as a quid pro quo Canada induces us to reduce our tariff barrier against her farm products in order that she may export them into the United States with greater ease and at bigger profits to her farmers.

The General Electric Co. wants this treaty ratified. This company is controlled and owned by J. P. Morgan and John D. Rockefeller, and is probably the closest trust in America, because many of its trust advantages are based upon patents. Why are they for it? They have to use a great deal of mica in the manufacture of electrical machinery and appliances. They get their mica duty free under this treaty, although mica has never before been placed on the free list since it was discovered in the United States. It was put on the dutiable list in the tariff law of 1890; it was put on the dutiable list in the Democratic tariff law of 1894; it was put on the dutiable list in all the other tariff bills since that time. Zeb Vance, the great commoner from North Carolina, one of the best-loved men that ever sat in the Senate of the United States from my country, assented to a duty on mica; Gov. Jarvis, that noble old Roman from North Carolina, Matt Ransom, who defended our State in war and peace, John T. Morgan, of Alabama, Senator Vilas, and other great Democrats voted for a duty on mica, and where their footsteps lead I gladly follow. This treaty puts mica absolutely on the free list and allows Morgan's trust to buy it from Canada without any tax, while retaining the same high Payne-Aldrich tariff rates on all of the trust's finished products, electrical machinery, which people everywhere are compelled to buy at the same extortionate prices.

Mr. PALMER. Where is mica mostly produced in this country?

Mr. WEBB. It is produced in North Carolina and in Mr. WEBB's district. [Applause.] If the trusts are fighting for their interests in the treaty, I shall not forget my people in the fight, for I have never gotten any bigger than the people of my district. [Applause.] It is contrary to human nature to get too big to represent your own folks, they who love and honor you, and whenever any man gets too big to do so, he ought to be put out of Congress. That is the doctrine that Zeb. Vance laid down away back more than 20 years ago when twitted about the tariff on mica, and I reiterate it here to-day, and when I get too big to represent the interests of my district I hope my people will beat me. I need not express the hope, for I know they will do it. [Applause.]

There is another group of interests back of this treaty, known as the Hill railroad interests. James J. Hill said in an interview that he did not see how a man with any sense could oppose it, or something to that effect. That was selfishness again speaking. Mr. Hill's railroads run into Canada and the United States, back and forth, and he wants to increase the trade between the two countries in order that dividends on his railroad stock may be enhanced and more money put into his pocket. Oh, yes; Mr. Hill, with all his power and influence, controlling about 30,000 miles of railroad, enough to girdle the earth, is advocating the treaty, and we can easily understand his interest.

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

Mr. WEBB. May I have 15 minutes more?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I should be glad to give that time to the gentleman, but I have not got it. I will yield him ten, and that is all I have to my credit.

The CHAIRMAN. How much time does the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will yield the gentleman 15 minutes, and we will have to run a little longer.

Mr. WEBB. I thank the gentleman very much. I realize that I am speaking under high pressure, because I have to put two hours' talk into 40 minutes.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is another class of citizens anxious to have the treaty passed, who, I believe, are deceived as to its effect on the cost of living, and that is the big-city dwellers. If every Member of this body were left to vote on this question without caucus action or other influence, I believe it would be the first time in the history of the United States that the big cities would be arrayed against the country districts. I believe the rural districts would vote against the treaty and the cities would vote for it, because the "interests" and many big dailies have put it into their heads that the cost of living is going to be reduced; and yet advocates of the treaty on this floor tell us that it will not affect the cost of living, for they know if they do so argue it is bound to be reduced at the cost of the farmer, and this they do not want the farmer to believe. If the framers of the treaty really wanted to reduce the cost of living, instead of taking the duty off wheat alone they would also have taken it off flour, too. The laboring man can not eat wheat, but he can eat flour. Wheat is put on the free list, while flour is taxed. And yet they leave the duty on flour instead of taking it off, and thus tax the people's bread. Then instead of taking the duty off cattle they would have taken it off meat also. You can not eat a steer, but you can eat beef. The man who drew the treaty, a former employee of the Steel Trust, left beef on the protected list at a cent and a quarter a pound, which will enable the Beef Trust to collect a royalty of more than a cent a pound on all beef the poor man carries home in his tired hands. Let me point out how the Beef Trust shows its fine hand in the making of this treaty. Cattle, the Beef Trust's raw material, are put on the free list, so that thousands can be driven across the Canadian border or shipped on the Hill railroads into the United States to be sold to the trust at the lowest competitive prices; but after the cattle are converted into meat, see what a tight grip the trust holds on the consumer. It generously consents to a reduction of one-fourth of a cent a pound tax on dressed meats coming into the United States, which is prohibitive and will keep out all Canadian competition in this great article of food, for last year Canada only sold the United States $84,000 worth of meats and lard; but this is not all. The friends of the trust induce Canada to reduce her tariff against American meats and lard three-fourths of a cent a pound on lard, and on meats 1¾ cents per pound, while last year the trust sold Canada 10,000,000 pounds of lard and large quantities of fresh meats, all aggregating—that is, lard and meats—$2,400,000 worth. Therefore the treaty keeps out of the United States trust competition in meats and lard and makes the Canadian market easier and freer for the trust.

If you want sincerely to reduce the cost of living, put things that men eat on the free list—meat and bread. This treaty will give the trust cheaper cattle and wheat, but continues the power of the trusts to rob the people, as heretofore, on flour and meat and bread.

I take the position that the treaty is unjust to the farmer. I said this when I first read it, and I am more firmly convinced now than ever that it is an injustice to him. In fact, the Ways and Means Committee have this morning brought from the press their report on the free-list bill which we will be called to vote upon pretty soon and which I wanted to make a part of this treaty as section 2, and in that report they admit that it is an injustice to the farming class of this country. I want to read you briefly an extract from that report:

In fact, action on the Canadian agreement involves the necessity of further and immediate action in removing a number of duties on imports from other countries, in order that justice may be done to the great army of our great agricultural producers, who in the Canadian agreement are to have all the alleged protection removed from their

products without a corresponding or reciprocal removal of the protective duties most burdensome on the commodities they must purchase as necessary to sustain their lives and industries.

Now, gentlemen, I declare unto you that this is an admission by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], Mr. KITCHIN, and the other Democrats of the Ways and Means Committee that this treaty, which is nothing but a new tariff law between us and Canada, is an injustice to the farmers of this country. I take the position that it is unjust, for the reason that all of the farmers' products are put absolutely on the free list, while the Canadian farmers now sell to the United States, even with the present tariff tax against them, more than our farmers export to Canada. However, of the manufactured products the reverse is true, and our exports into Canada are a thousand fold more than Canada sends into the United States, making the market for American manufactured articles easier, but making the competitive struggle of the American farmer with Canada fiercer.

The treaty places practically all agricultural products on the free list, thereby giving the large manufacturers and trusts of the country the right to buy farm products at the lowest price and compel the farmers to pay the manufacturers for finished products the highest price. The Republican Party for 40 years has maintained a system of tariff taxes which has enabled manufacturers to charge our people not only the world price for their manufactured articles, but the world price plus the tariff, while on the other hand the toiling farmer of the country, who has been producing more than our home market could consume and therefore shipping much abroad, has been compelled to receive only the world price for the product of his toil. Naturally they have not shared in the legislative-made prosperity, and many of the farmers and farmers' boys during the last two decades, feeling the inequality in the race for the accumulation of anything in life, have left the farms and gone to the cities and manufacturing centers where they might enjoy some of the artificial tariff profits.

This movement has drained the farms of splendid laborers until now the time has arrived when the farmers' products have not kept pace with the increasing population, and therefore our exports of farm products are smaller, and necessarily the price of our farm products has risen during the last few years and the farmer has been getting fairer prices. But now what do we behold? These great tariff-made barons and millionaire manufacturers are not willing that the farmer should receive an increased price for his products, and so in order to hold him down and compel him to accept the world price for his goods they propose to turn all the farm products of that great Dominion to the north of us into the United States to compete with every farmer that earns his living by the sweat of his face, and compel him to work harder and remain poorer than the tariff-protected industries of the country which have fattened at his expense.

Former Gov. Bachelder, of New Hampshire, now master of the National Grange, composed of 6,000,000 farmers, said that these 6,000,000 farmers were united in opposition to this treaty, and said he voiced this protest against free trade in farm products while protection was continued on manufactured articles, which the farmers were compelled to buy.

It has been truly said:

The farmer is the progenitor of the human race, and was the first to stand in the presence of the Creator to receive from him the decree of the Divine mind on the question of labor.

Mr. Chairman, all human progress and prosperity depend upon his industry and success, and our mighty commercial fabric, which dazzles the whole world, rests upon his broad back. All of the splendid ships sailing all the seas and docking at all the ports of earth are absolutely dependent on the corn fields, wheat fields, and cotton fields of the farmer. Without his industry and prosperity the railroad irons of our great national highways would soon turn to rust and the scream of the locomotive would soon become a strange noise in the land. Were it not for the humble tiller of the soil the owls and bats would infest the lofty spires of our magnificent cities, and they would soon fall to ruins as complete as those of Herculaneum or Pompeii.

The President of the North Carolina Farmers' Union thinks this treaty unfair and unjust to the farmer. He is one of the most intelligent and fair-minded men in that great State, and after careful study of the treaty here is what Dr. H. Q. Alexander, president of this great organization, says:

I approve of your course in opposing the reciprocity treaty with Canada as it was presented to the House by the President. That treaty is not fair or just. It seeks to lower the cost of living, but taxes the farmer with the reduction without in any way compensating him for his loss. And I am not sure that it would even lower the cost of food products to the consumer. All articles put on the free list are in the raw state. No manufactured products are admitted free. The farmers and laborers produce the raw materials. Capital converts it into the finished product. Capital is protected. The man must fight unaided for his living. The dollar is placed above the man.

Mr. Chairman, the farmer does not demand any special privileges, but he demands equal justice. This he is entitled to and with nothing less will he be satisfied.

Lands are undoubtedly cheaper in Canada, hence taxes are lower, and the Canadian farmers' cost of living is cheaper than to our farmers, for the Canadian pays a lower tariff tax on his necessities. The following table shows this:

Article.	Tariff paid by Canadian farmer.	Tariff paid by American farmer.
	Per cent.	*Per cent.*
Tinware	15	45
Hats	20	55
Sugar	35	80
Hose	25	87
Underclothing	22½	45
Axes	20	45
Scythes	15	45
Stoves	15	45
Chains (iron)	5	45
Knives and forks	20	60
Window glass	7½	60- 75
Jute bags	15	45
Cotton thread	17½	45
Glassware	15	60-100
Lamp chimneys	20	60
Lamps	20	45- 60
Rubber coats	15	35
Rubber boots and shoes	15	35
Blankets	Free.	40-150
Clocks	20	45

Thus the Canadian farmer can produce farm products cheaper than our farmers, for his burdens are lighter, expenses less, and this treaty throws our farmers absolutely into the unequal struggle for competition with his Canadian rival. The treaty places on the free list, which will reduce our revenue about $5,000,000, something like 54 articles produced on the farm, including wheat, corn, oats, rye, barley, butter, eggs, and so forth, while the Democratic Walker tariff law placed a tariff on all the farmer's products as well as on the manufacturer's; the Wilson-Gorman Democratic tariff law of 1894 did the same thing.

My friend from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] yesterday spoke in glowing terms of the fact that barbed wire was put on the free list in the treaty. Oh, my friends, what a ridiculous proposition! Does anyone think the farmer can be thus fooled? We have not imported a pound of barbed wire from Canada since it became a province of England; but we do export into Canada about a million dollars' worth a year. Now they take the tariff off barbed wire in order that it may come into the United States from Canada to compete with the Steel Trust in the farmers' interest. The only barbed-wire manufactory in Canada is a subsidiary corporation belonging to the United States Steel Trust. Now, when you have the United States Steel Trust in Canada competing with the United States Steel Trust in the United States will it not be a glorious competition and will not the price fall rapidly? This is a joke. To mention it is to laugh.

Yes; the Coal Trust gets in its work, too. The duty on coal going into Canada is 53 cents a ton. This treaty reduces the duty on coal going into Canada from 53 to 45 cents a ton, but keeps the same strangle hold on the people on all coal coming into the United States by retaining the Payne-Aldrich duty. The Coal Trust, of course, wants the treaty because it is giving easier access to Canadian markets, but keeps the same exclusive tariff on all coal coming into the United States; and the price of coal will not be reduced to our people. Canada shipped only $512,000 worth of coal last year to the United States, while the United States Coal Trust sold into Canada $11,000,000 worth. This treaty keeps out material competition with the trust, but makes the Canadian market easier and freer for the trust.

Let us take up the Agricultural Implement Trust. That trust has had the people of the United States by the throat, especially the farmers, for years. It gets the lion's share in this treaty. Plows, hoes, rakes, diggers, thrashing machines, drills, and all sorts of agricultural implements are going into Canada hereafter, when this treaty is passed, at a reduced Canadian rate. The ordinary Canadian rate against agricultural implements is from 25 to 17½ per cent. This treaty reduces the Canadian tariff against agricultural implements down to 15 per cent. Therefore, the Agricultural Implement Trust will sell more of these articles to Canada and reap bigger profits.

But, mark you, the treaty gives this trust the same Payne-Aldrich protective duty on all agricultural implements coming into the United States, so as to insure the old-time robbery of our farmers. Our entire purchases from Canada of agricultural implements during the year 1910 were only $74,000, if this book which I hold in my hand is correct, while the trust sold to Canada $2,230,000 worth of agricultural implements in that year, and this treaty simply makes the Canadian market larger and freer to that trust by lowering the Canadian tariff wall, but enables the Agricultural Implement Trust to rob the American farmer as it has in the past.

The Cement Trust was remembered, too, when this treaty was being framed, you might say, in secret, for the public and all Congress was kept in ignorance of it until it was ready to be sent to us, with orders that it must not be amended in the slightest particular, but that it must go through Congress with a hop, skip, and a jump or a dire extra session would be called. Well, the Cement Trust induces Canada to reduce her tariff on cement 1½ cents per hundred pounds, but the obliging treaty makers were careful not to lower the protective duty on cement coming into the United States, but kept the same Payne-Aldrich rate on it. So cement will sell no cheaper to our people, but the trust gets an easier market in Canada.

In the few remaining moments that I have I desire to make a personal explanation. Last Saturday my friend and colleague from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN], against whom I have no unkind feeling and with whom the most cordial relations exist, delivered somewhat of a lecture to those of us who could not see the situation as he does. He said that we were in mighty bad company, and even suggested that Mr. DALZELL had actually come over and influenced or fooled—I have not seen his speech, for it has not yet been published, and do not recall his exact words—the North Carolina Democrats in Congress, six of whom are against the treaty. Now, my friend Mr. KITCHIN did not mean that. He could not have meant it, and yet it has gone over my State that he said it. I do not have any idea that he meant that Mr. DALZELL could corrupt Mr. GUDGER, or Mr. PAGE, or Mr. POU, or Mr. DOUGHTON, or Dr. FAISON, or myself, or anybody else from North Carolina. However, so far as the company is concerned, in view of the gentleman's present companions in support of this treaty, I must conclude that even Mr. JOHN DALZELL is pretty fair company, because it has not been two months ago since we had up what is known as the tariff commission board bill, and when the vote was taken on the measure I find my good friend, the Hon. CHAMP CLARK, the Democratic Speaker, and Mr. OSCAR UNDERWOOD, the present Democratic floor leader, broke away from Mr. KITCHIN and voted with Mr. JOHN DALZELL. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. DALZELL did not corrupt or fool Mr. UNDERWOOD and Mr. CLARK; of course not. That kind of reasoning on the part of my colleague is not argument, but it is a species of an attempt to prejudice people's minds, and if I were as gifted in that sort of suggestion as my friend Mr. KITCHIN is, I would say that he is in rather bad political company, too, because around him stand the progenitor of the Payne-Aldrich bill, Mr. PAYNE, and our friend Nelson W. Aldrich is very anxious to have this treaty passed. The horrible Aldrich is for the treaty and so is Mr. KITCHIN. [Laughter.] The Steel Trust is for the treaty and so is Mr. KITCHIN. Andrew Carnegie, who boasts that he has made 43 millionaires in his lifetime and who is afraid that he will die rich, so much money has he made off the people, is for the treaty, too. The Beef Trust is for the treaty and so is Mr. KITCHIN. The Cement Trust wants it, too. Judge CRUMPACKER, who has always ardently favored cutting down southern representation in Congress on account of the Negro vote, is for the treaty, and Mr. KITCHIN is going to vote with him. The Agricultural Implement Trust is bending every energy to have the treaty passed and so is Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan, who wields more power and influence than any throned monarch and whose financial will Presidents of the United States dare not contrary, supports the treaty. In that bouquet of great financial wizards, powerful, heartless trusts, and high-protection Republicans my friend KITCHIN at present finds himself safely ensconced as the central flower. [Laughter and applause.]

He twits me because I am not willing that mica should go on the free list. Here again I refer to my former statement. Yes; mica is produced in North Carolina, in the mountains of my good State and district. Many poor people up there are paying the Steel Trust a high tariff tax on their picks, axes, and shovels with which they dig out this mineral, and are selling it for the best price that monopolistic buyers will pay them. Now comes along this treaty, this new tariff law, framed by friends of the great trusts, and places mica on the free list, although mica is the best revenue producer in all the list in comparison with the amount produced in the United States and imported. Why, in 1907 there was paid $435,000 duty on mica. Now a large portion of this revenue will be destroyed and remitted to the trust, and the taxes will be increased on the necessities of the poor in order to make up this loss of revenue. He stated that if you scratched a little deeper into my position on the treaty you would find mica. No; you do not have to scratch to find where I am on any question.

I told my fellow Democrats in the caucus that last fall when my people in the mountains wanted to know how I stood on the tariff and mica that I said to them that I would not promise that I would not vote for a reduction of the duty on mica, but being a Democrat and believing in a tariff for revenue, as the fathers of our party believed, and as there had always been a duty on mica, and since the Wilson-Gorman Democratic tariff law put a tariff on mica, that in view of this record of my party that I would not vote to put that article on the free list, and, my friends, I am not going to do it. [Applause.] Certainly not at the behest of a trust and a Republican administration. The caucus at once excused me from voting for the treaty.

Now, my friends, I do not care to be personal, but if I had the gift of innuendo and was willing to use it against political friend and foe as my colleague did in his long speech on Saturday, I might say that if you will scratch a little deeper under his advocacy of this treaty you might find peanuts.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I simply desire to call the attention of the gentleman from North Carolina to the fact that Mr. KITCHIN is out of the Chamber.

Mr. WEBB. I am very sorry he is not present. I did not know when I was to speak; if I had, I would have notified Mr. KITCHIN; but, after all, Mr. Chairman, I am saying no more about my colleague than he said about me. I understood from a colleague that he would be here to-day. This hour is the only time I could get to speak, and I must avail myself of it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I say I am sorry that my friend and colleague from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] is not here. There is no feeling between him and myself. We married in the same town, we attended the same church, graduated from the same institution, belonged to the same college society, are members of the same church and affiliate with the same political party, so there is absolutely no feeling between us. [Laughter.] I am only replying to him in kind and in the kindest way, and as he suggested mica as the moving cause for my position on this treaty, I would suggest that my colleague from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] has a large peanut-growing district. More peanuts are produced in his district, possibly, than in any district in the United States. Now, I do not insinuate that a little thing like a peanut would influence a great big man like my friend KITCHIN. [Laughter.] But it is a fact that Canada now levies a tax of 3 cents per pound on imported shelled peanuts and 2 cents a pound on unshelled peanuts, and by this treaty Canada is to reduce the duty on peanuts 75 per cent, and it should be remembered that she is the greatest purchaser of American peanuts. But, mark you, the duty of 19½ per cent protection on peanuts coming into the United States is retained in the treaty, which is the Payne-Aldrich protection duty.

Mr. KITCHIN says, in the McMichael letter, that the treaty will enlarge the peanut market and not hurt United States peanuts, because Canada produces none.

I do not say that this fact is the moving cause behind my colleague's zeal for the treaty, but I do say that it seems to me to be a little unfair for him to accept a protective tariff of 19½ per cent on his peanuts and then use every effort to take all the tariff off mica produced in my district and place it on the free list. [Loud applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] to even up the time.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN].

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, we in the State of California are somewhat familiar with the subject of reciprocity. We know from actual experience how detrimental reciprocity treaties are to home industry. We are protectionists in that State, for the doctrine of protection as applied to the products of our State has brought great material prosperity to that Commonwealth.

I was an insurgent in this House in the Fifty-seventh Congress when Cuban reciprocity was before it. At that time Cuba was producing about 600,000 long tons of sugar per annum. The beet-sugar industry in this country, and especially in the State of California, was an important and a growing one. We felt that if Cuban reciprocity should be enacted into law

it would materially injure the beet-sugar industry in that State. But Cuban reciprocity was enacted, and in 1910 1,800,000 long tons of sugar were produced in Cuba, much of it controlled by the Sugar Trust. The cost of sugar to the consumer has not been reduced a fraction of a cent, and the 20 per cent reduction on Cuban sugar under the Cuban reciprocity bill, which, according to the statement of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] on this floor the other day, amounts in all to about $77,000,000 up to the present time, has practically gone into the pockets of the Sugar Trust. The people of the United States as consumers have not profited a single cent as the result of Cuban reciprocity.

Some years before that the Hawaiian Islands entered into a reciprocity treaty with the United States, and sugar came free from those islands. The consumer did not get the fraction of a cent benefit, but a half dozen men became multimillionaires. They, and they alone, were the beneficiaries under Hawaiian reciprocity. So that we have had actual experiences that ought to have taught the American people a lesson on the subject of reciprocity agreements. During the McKinley administration some half dozen reciprocity treaties were negotiated with as many countries, and those treaties were sent to the Senate for ratification. They were negotiated by Mr. Kasson, of Iowa, on behalf of the United States. Every one of them contemplated the reduction of duty on some product of California, and the Californians in this House and in the Senate fought with all their might to prevent the ratification of those treaties. We helped to defeat them, and the people of California applauded our course. And I feel to-day that every other State in the Union is equally entitled to that measure of protection for its industries that those industries may require. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I was rather entertained the other day when this reciprocity question came up on the floor of this House by the colloquy that occurred between the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] and some of my Republican friends on this side of the Chamber who are opposed to the pending measure. It seems to me that some of my Republican brethren are not altogether consistent. They want to put wheat on a pedestal because it happens to be the product of their particular section of our country, but they are willing to sacrifice the industries of other sections, which said industries probably require protection just as much as does wheat. I believe that the industries of every section of this country, if they require protection, should be protected. I do not believe that because my district happens to produce something that requires protection that that commodity should be protected and that the duties on products of other districts should be lowered simply because my constituents have to purchase those commodities. That kind of near protection—"mercerized protection," if you please—does not appeal to me. Either the protection principle is right or it is wrong. I believe it to be right, and in my humble judgment it must either stand or fall as a principle and in its entirety.

The bill now before this House materially affects some of our industries in the West. We have in California a comparatively new one, an infant industry in the true sense of the word, one that has been built up within the last three or four years, the industry of manufacturing whale oil. Under this bill whale oil will be admitted from Canada absolutely free. Under the Payne bill it pays 8 cents a gallon duty. Whale oil is used largely in the manufacture of soap. Now, the ships that are engaged in that industry in the State of California are built in American shipyards. They cost about $80,000 apiece. The Canadian ships, on the other hand, are built in Norwegian shipyards, and they cost about $23,000 apiece. The crews that man the American ships get wages of about $75 a month per man, and the owners of the vessels have to feed the men. It is claimed that the expense of feeding the men is about $1 per day per man. The crews on the Canadian ships get about $40 a month per man, and they feed themselves, because they are principally Chinese and Japanese.

On the other hand, the men on the American ships are principally American citizens. Besides, the harpoons, bombs, and other paraphernalia used in this industry are manufactured abroad, and when brought into this country pay a duty to our Government. On the other hand, the same kind of implements brought into Canada for use on Canadian whaling vessels pay either a much lower duty or none at all. If this bill should pass, either the industry will be destroyed, so far as the United States end of it is concerned, or those engaged in the industry in this country will have to hie themselves to Canada, put their vessels under the Canadian flag, and thus give another blow to the American merchant marine.

The following letters set out the situation regarding the whale-oil industry quite fully:

THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF SAN FRANCISCO,
San Francisco, April 3, 1911.

Hon. JULIUS KAHN,
2712 Webster Street, San Francisco.

SIR: The inclosed copy of a letter received by this chamber from the Barneson-Hibberd Co., protesting against the enactment of the legislation which will permit the free entry from Canada of whale oil into the the United States, has received the unanimous indorsement of the board of trustees, and by their direction it is referred to you for your favorable and courteous consideration.

Yours, very truly, C. W. BURKS, *Secretary.*

BARNESON-HIBBERD CO., (INC.),
149 CALIFORNIA STREET,
San Francisco, Cal., March 31, 1911.

Capt. WILLIAM MATSON,
President Chamber of Commerce,
San Francisco, Cal.

DEAR SIR: We desire to invite your attention to a clause in the reciprocity act with Canada which, if passed, will permit of the importation of whale oil into the United States of America free of duty.

At the present time there is a duty of 8 cents per gallon on this article, and, as we are manufacturers of whale oil, we desire to obtain the assistance of your honorable body in an endeavor to have this article stricken out of the reciprocity act, for the following reasons:

We have invested up to this time the sum of $400,000 in steamers and plant in southeastern Alaska, which includes our two whalers. Our annual cost of operation is $150,000, all of which money is spent in San Francisco and on Puget Sound. To build boats for the purpose of this work we are compelled, under the laws of this country, to have them constructed in the shipyards of the United States, where they cost us $80,000 fully equipped for the purpose of whaling. At our station we pay a wage of 25 cents an hour and board to from 75 to 100 employees during the season.

On the west coast of Vancouver Island there are situated three whaling stations in operation, and at this time these people are building three more stations. They have just brought out from Norway 5 Norwegian-built whalers, making a total of 12 boats, which they will operate this season, and, we understand, plans are already drawn for more boats for next season. These boats cost them in the neighborhood of about £4,000 in Norway, or $20,000 American money. To operate their stations they employ Japanese and Chinese coolies, to whom they pay a wage of about $40 per month, these men boarding themselves, as against our cost of $75 per month and board, which amounts to $1 per day per man. Their expense of operating their steamers is also one-half of what it costs us to operate our boats.

At the time we formed the company for operating this whaling industry we went into the matter carefully, and while we fully realized the vast difference in the cost of operation on the American side, as compared to that on the British side, we concluded that the 8 cents per gallon duty on this product protected us enough so that we could make a success of the business. Should this duty be removed we will be powerless to operate in face of the competition of our opponents on the British side, and it will result in the total loss of our investment.

In addition to the above we invite your attention to the fact that we are compelled to use the Norwegian hemp line for our whaling and also Norwegian harpoons, guns, etc., on all of which class of goods we are compelled to pay a heavy bounty when bringing them into the country.

The Tyee Co. are the pioneers for making this class of whale oil in the United States, and in addition were compelled to create their own market.

When this company first commenced to manufacture this product we we not able to sell a single barrel in the United States, and were forced to send our output to Glasgow, where it was sold at a heavy loss.

In competition with the product of the cheaply operated foreign plants, as we have only 2 steamers against 12 of our competitors, you can readily see there is not much chance for this infant industry if it is not afforded this protection, particularly as at the present time the American markets are not taking care of our whole production.

We have gradually educated the consumers of America to the fact that they can use this product for the manufacture of soap, and at the present time the different soap manufacturers, both on the Pacific coast and Atlantic seaboard, are using the greater part of our output, but still making it necessary for us to dispose of a portion of our output in the foreign market at a loss.

Our annual output is about 10,000 barrels, on which the duty is $36,000. This amount represents more than our season's profit for the work of the entire plant, which is an investment of $400,000. If this duty is withdrawn, we will not only lose the profit, but our markets will be invaded by several times that amount of oil from British Columbia, and the value of our plant will thereby be entirely destroyed, as the markets at the present time will not take up all of our output; and if our competitors, with their cheap production, are allowed to come in and compete with us they will be able to drive us entirely out of business and destroy the value of our plant.

In view of the foregoing facts we respectfully ask that your body take prompt action to protest against the admission of whale oil into the United States from Canada free of duty.

We operate our whaling industry under the name of The Tyee Co.

Yours, respectfully,

BARNESON-HIBBERD CO.,
I. N. HIBBERD, *Vice President.*

Take the paper industry, and in that very connection let me call your attention to that feature of the Republican platform that has been so often referred to on this floor, that the measure of protection should be the difference between the cost of production here and abroad plus a reasonable profit. The report of the Tariff Commission, submitted by the President to the Senate on February 28, 1911, shows that as to news print paper alone in various sections of this country there is a variation in the cost of production of $14.19 a ton. In other words, news print paper can be manufactured in some sections of our country at $14 a ton cheaper than it can be produced in some other sections of the country.

Now, how are you going to get at the true measure of the difference in the cost of production of a commodity abroad and in this country when the variance in our own country is as great as that? [Applause.] This is what the Tariff Commission has to say about it:

COST OF PRODUCTION OF NEWS PRINT PAPER.

As will be seen from Tables 3 and 4, the total cost of production of news print paper in bulk at the mills varies from $25.38 to $39.57. This represents a variation of $14.19, equal to an excess of 55.9 per cent over the lowest cost. To account for this difference we find that the difference between the highest and lowest cost of ground wood is $10.75, and that $7.58 represents the difference in cost between the highest and lowest for sulphite, making a total difference in cost of pulp per ton of paper equal to $18.33, or more than the entire difference in the total cost of production of paper. The differences in the cost of production of pulp, both ground and sulphite, have been explained above.

The cost of other materials per ton of paper ranges from 31 cents to $3.08. These other materials are made up of fillers, alum, bleach chemicals, color, and sizing. The difference in the cost of these items per ton of paper is due partly to the difference in prices paid by various concerns and partly to the lack of uniformity in practice in the use of these materials resulting in a great deal of waste in some mills.

The cost of manufacturing labor per ton of product equals $3.25 on an average for the entire industry. It represents a variation from $2.19 to $6.06 per ton. * * *

Other costs, representing miscellaneous supplies, repair labor, operating expenses, etc., vary from $5.44 to $8.55, the average for the entire industry being $7.07. The most important item included in this group is the expense for repairs, consisting of repair materials and repair labor. On the item repair materials (Table 4) the cost per ton of paper varies from 6 cents to $2.14. This wide divergence has been referred to in the explanatory statement preceding the tables. Taking the unrevised figures, the high charge may be due to the fact that extensive repairs were made in a single year, instead of being distributed, or the differences may be due to divergence in equipment and age of machinery in the various plants.

The average cost of producing a ton of paper for the entire industry is $32.53. Nearly one-fourth of the tonnage investigated was produced at an average cost of $26.07 per ton; nearly one-half was produced at a cost of $32.99; and the remainder at an average cost of $37.25. All of these costs represent the charges actually carried on the books of the companies, including any profit charged on wood pulp, and without allowance for depreciation.

But a still more interesting statement, which shows the difference of the cost of production in the mills of the United States and Canada, is the following:

Table 9 gives the comparison of lowest cost, highest cost, and average cost in the mills of the United States and Canada. Attention should be called to the fact that in these tables * * * the totals do not equal the separate items, except in the case of the column for average cost. This is to be expected, as where lowest costs are given, the lowest figure is taken for each separate item, and no single mill has the lowest cost on all items. Consequently, the lowest total cost must be in excess of the sum of the preceding items. For exactly similar reasons, in the column giving highest costs the highest total cost will be below the sum of the separate items in the same column.

Lowest, highest, and average costs of production of pulp and news print paper in the United States and Canada.

Items.	Lowest cost per ton of product.		Highest cost per ton of product.		Average cost per ton of product.	
	United States.	Canada.	United States.	Canada.	United States.	Canada.
Ground wood pulp:						
Wood	$7.33	$5.74	$15.01	$9.71	$10.64	$7.07
Manufacturing, labor	.98	1.50	3.78	2.46	2.12	1.93
Other costs	.29	.82	7.00	3.30	2.02	2.14
Total cost in bulk at mills	10.13	9.57	20.07	14.72	14.78	11.13
Sulphite pulp:						
Wood	13.28	12.02	25.89	18.04	19.08	14.32
Manufacturing, labor	2.09	2.87	4.83	5.45	3.63	4.15
Other costs	7.48	7.29	13.02	9.51	10.01	8.87
Total cost in bulk at mills	24.11	24.09	38.43	33.00	32.72	27.34
News print paper:						
Ground wood pulp	7.79	7.18	18.54	10.88	12.61	9.22
Sulphite pulp	6.31	3.71	13.89	8.54	8.43	6.50
Manufacturing, labor	2.19	2.97	6.06	3.55	3.25	3.25
Other costs	5.75	8.44	11.63	10.12	8.24	9.42
Total cost in bulk at mills	25.38	25.17	39.57	30.27	32.53	28.39

From this it would appear that the difference in cost of production of news print paper in the United States and Canada is $4.14 per ton in favor of Canada. This does not include the reasonable profit referred to in the Republican platform, but simply the difference of cost of production. And yet the duty on news print paper is only $3.75 per ton under the Payne law. Small wonder that the paper manufacturers of the United States, with their $300,000,000 of invested capital, are vigorously protesting against this Canadian reciprocity measure. And I honestly believe that if it were not for this particular item of print paper and its twin sister, wood pulp, there would be "none so poor to do it"—the pending measure—"reverence."

The attitude of the Pacific coast paper manufacturers is well stated in the following letter:

WILLAMETTE PULP & PAPER CO. (INC.),
San Francisco, Cal., March 27, 1911.

Hon. JULIUS KAHN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please note the inclosed copy of a letter which we understand has been sent to the Senators and Representatives of the State of Washington by Mr. Howarth, president of the Everett Pulp & Paper Co. The arguments set forth therein have our thorough approval, and the facts as stated are not only correct as regards the effect upon the general paper industry, but are especially pertinent when considered with reference to the manufacture of news print paper.

The difference in cost of stumpage in Oregon or Washington and British Columbia is equivalent to about $2.50 per ton of finished paper in favor of British Columbia, and the exemption from taxes and from labor restrictions, also from duties upon articles used in manufacture, constitutes enough more difference to warrant the present tariff of $3.75 per ton. If that tariff should be taken off, British Columbia would have at least that advantage over manufacturers of the Pacific coast located within the United States.

We therefore ask that you do your utmost to protect one of the important industries of this coast by opposing the reciprocity treaty and leaving the duty on printing and other paper as it now stands, so that future expansion of the industry on this coast will not be confined entirely to British Columbia, and the capital which might otherwise be invested in the United States be diverted there.

Asking your thoughtful consideration of these questions and your support of the tariff upon our manufactured product, we remain,

Sincerely yours,

WM. PIERCE JOHNSON, *President.*

The President having called an extra session of Congress expressly for the purpose of considering the Canadian reciprocal treaty, we desire to lay before you facts bearing upon the same as affecting the pulp and paper industry.

As manufacturers of paper and pulp we are vitally interested in this so-called reciprocity, and danger lies in the different interpretations of the provisions which can be put upon same by Congress or the Treasury Department.

Paper makers might contend that paper or pulp can not come in free unless all restrictions are taken off by all the Provinces on wood cut on Crown lands, while the other interpretation would be by the publishers and users of paper that it can come in. Certain Canadian Provinces absolutely prohibit the export of pulp wood from Crown lands and refuse unconditionally to modify or in any way change from that position. There is sufficient wood and water power, other than the Crown lands of the different Provinces of Canada, to produce enough paper, mechanical and chemical pulp, to make inoperative many of our well-established concerns if Canadian paper products are permitted to come in free.

The whole paper industry of this country, in which there is invested some $300,000,000, would be in great danger in the future without a more definite understanding.

The manufacture of high-grade book papers, which next to newspaper is the most important in this country and in which great sums of money have been invested under the protective system, find a clause in the proposed treaty in the McCall bill "provided such paper and board valued at 4 cents per pound or less is to be admitted free."

The foregoing affects all paper and pulp industry of this country making paper from wood pulp below the value of 4 cents per pound.

Particularly in regard to the manufacture of book and magazine papers, of which grade this concern is the only one west of the Missouri and located on the Pacific coast, would we submit these facts.

During the investigation of the paper industry by the United States Government in 1908, a full report of which is now on file at Washington, D. C., this company made a sworn statement, as will be found on pages 1862 to 1866, inclusive, of such record, in which, on page 1865, we give reasons why the placing of newspaper, book, and magazine paper on the free-tariff list would mean the crippling, if not the annihilation, of our industry. (Excerpt from report hereto attached.) All of which reasons hold good to-day.

In consequence of the proposed free tariff being only with Canada, this makes our case more aggravated and furnishes stronger reasons for carrying out our contention, viz, the seeking of a location in British Columbia.

The further reasons other than those as contained in the attached excerpt are:

First. The concessions or subsidies offered by the British Columbia Government to encourage the establishing of pulp and paper industries in that Province, by which certain pulp-wood limits are assigned upon a nominal stumpage of 15 cents per cord for all pulp wood used during the first 21 years of operation, the stumpage to be paid thereafter being a matter of agreement, with privilege of cutting the timber on said wood limits into lumber upon paying a nominal rental as provided under timber limits, and a further stumpage charge of 50 cents per thousand on whatever is cut. In that way the best part of the tree is used for lumber and the balance for pulp and paper making, thus gaining two advantages.

Second. The granting in fee simple of water powers without cost other than cost of development.

The stumpage value to-day in the Pacific northwest of the United States of America for pulp wood not suitable for lumber is from 50 cents to 60 cents per cord, with yearly increase, and even if present concerns own their individual requirements, due to interest on investment and taxes, the difference at present values makes an advantage of about $1 per ton of paper made in favor of Canada, on pulp wood only, without taking into account the further advantage of lumber operation in connection with a pulp and paper mill. The stumpage value in Puget Sound district of the State of Washington to-day of similar class of timber to that in British Columbia, equally available to transportation by rail or water, is from $2 to $3 per thousand feet.

Third. Certain raw materials used by us in the manufacture of paper upon which there is a duty into the United States are admitted free into Canada, and which makes an increase in our cost of raw materials

compared with Canada of about $12,845 per year, or $1.50 per ton of paper produced, viz:

	Duty into Canada.	Duty into United States.	Increased cost to us.
English china clay	Free	$2.50 per ton	$3,750
Bleaching powder	Free	¼ cent per pound	4,800
Alum	Free	¼ cent per pound	795
Copper wire cloth	17½ per cent	45 per cent	1,000
Aniline dyes, ultramarine colors.	Free	30 per cent and 3 cents per pound.	1,000
Paper makers' feltings and jacketings.	30 per cent	44 cents per pound and 60 per cent.	1,500

Fourth. The employment of Japanese, Hindustani, and oriental labor, which are not employed in the States of Washington or Oregon in paper-mill operations, means an advantage in British Columbia of approximately $6 per ton of paper made.

It is surprising that in such an important matter, affecting as it does one of the largest industries of the country, viz, paper industry, the facts recited have been overlooked and, briefly stated, are:

1. Subsidies or concessions granted by Canada to encourage the locating of paper industries placed the United States paper industries at a disadvantage.

2. Unequal duties on raw materials entering into the manufacture of paper placing United States pulp and paper industries at a disadvantage.

3. The employment of cheap oriental labor.

4. The ambiguous language as to the export duty on wood used in the manufacture of paper, board, or wood pulp applying to Crown grant, pulp licensed, leased, or any other timbered lands.

The action of the President in suggesting practically free trade between Canadian Provinces and America on paper will, if followed by an act of Congress agreeing thereto, be a decided blow and serious menace to manufacturing of that kind of product on the Pacific coast of the United States.

At the time of the investigation by the United States Government in 1908 we made an exhaustive investigation of the conditions and advantages of location of pulp and paper industries in British Columbia, with the view of making all our additions in that Province, and we were then and are now prepared to consider seriously the removal of our plant to that country in case of the removal of the protective duty, for in addition to the adverse tariff action proposed by the President we are harassed on this coast by very stringent labor laws, labor commissions, and employers' liability laws, extraordinary taxes, both franchise and other, and, in fact, a generally arbitrary assailment of a legitimate manufacturing enterprise. By contrast the Canadian Government is extending all sorts of concessions to investors in that country.

A large plant is now under construction in British Columbia a little north of Vancouver, and will be absolutely unrestricted as to labor, whether white or oriental, will have practically no taxes to pay, and has received the most flattering concessions regarding timber limits from the Canadian Parliament.

If these suggestions of the President become law, we look for no further development of the paper industry on the Pacific coast of the United States.

We most respectfully ask your kind consideration of the facts as stated herein, and if after fully satisfying yourself that the general good of this country can be better served by the elimination of that feature of the Canadian reciprocal treaty affecting the pulp and paper industry we then believe your sense of duty will rightly direct your decision.

Yours, sincerely, ——— ———.

But, sir, this reciprocity measure strikes another important industry of the United States a serious blow. In the last Congress the cause of the New England fishermen was admirably presented by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] Now, the Pacific coast codfisheries represent an industry of no mean proportions. The men engaged in that industry on our western seaboard are just as bitterly opposed to this Canadian reciprocity bill as are their colleagues on the Atlantic seaboard. This is what one of the leading concerns in the codfishing industry on the Pacific coast has to say about the matter:

THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF SAN FRANCISCO,
San Francisco, March 14, 1911.

Hon. JULIUS KAHN,
United States House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: The inclosed communication received by this organization from the Union Fish Co., protesting against the enactment of Federal legislation having for its object the free entry of Canadian salt fish into the United States, has received the unanimous approval of the board of trustees.

In behalf of the board the undersigned begs to commend the matter to your favorable and courteous consideration.

Yours, very truly,

C. W. BURKS, *Secretary.*

———

SAN FRANCISCO, *January 31, 1911.*

Mr. C. W. BURKS,
Secretary Chamber of Commerce, San Francisco.

DEAR SIR: There is a matter which we would like to bring personally to your attention and to that of your officers and members of the chamber of commerce, but the absence of our president and vice president from the city prevent our doing so, and we are therefore compelled to present the subject to you in writing.

The matter referred to is in the nature of a protest against the Canadian reciprocity treaty now before Congress. This treaty provides for the free entry into the United States of green fish; that is, fresh fish, or fish salted and not dried, and would include codfish in bulk, as usually brought into port by regular codfishing vessels, and means a direct and unrestricted competition between the American codfishing firms and the codfishing vessels of Newfoundland, Canada, the Canadian Provinces, and British Columbia.

Our own interest lies, first, in our competition with the Atlantic coast. The present duty prevents any competition from there except with the American-caught fish. In very good years their nearness to the fishing grounds enables them to produce codfish more cheaply in Massachusetts than we can here, and enables them to sell quite close up to the Pacific States. When they have short catch we find a considerable market for Pacific-coast product through the Middle West and sometimes clear on to the Atlantic seaboard. Should this treaty become ratified the American codfish man on the Atlantic would be driven out of business entirely and the market there would be supplied by the Canadian and Provincial fishermen. The still shorter distance that they would have to go for their fish and, more particularly, the lower cost of labor in those countries would enable them to produce the fish so much more cheaply that they would not only displace the Massachusetts fishermen, but their fish would be shipped into our Pacific coast markets at such prices as would be almost sure to drive us out of the business. Any little trade that might otherwise remain to us would undoubtedly be absorbed by codfish caught in the North Pacific Ocean and the Bering Sea by vessels fitted out from British Columbia. The certainty of this would necessitate our either going out of the business or removing our headquarters to some British Columbia port and transferring our vessels to the British flag. This, of course, would enable us to import Canadian fishermen to the British Columbia side and prosecute our business over there, utilizing for our product the markets of the United States, which would be made free to us by this treaty.

The figures of the Pacific coast codfishing industry are given in the telegram annexed to this, which has been forwarded on to our Representatives in Washington, being as follows:

Amount invested in Pacific coast codfisheries	$1,000,000
Amount employed in outfitting, annually	150,000
Amount of disbursements at close of season, annually	250,000

Our interests, of course, are entirely on the American side of the Pacific coast. We are all American citizens, and are attached by ties of birth, loyalty, and patriotism to this country. We do not want to surrender our business and our investments in favor of any of the Canadians, nor do we want to remove ourselves and our investments into their territory.

Hence, our request to you that the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce voice our protest on behalf of our city and State and of the Pacific coast. We would add that we have forwarded telegrams to our Representatives, as per copies herewith, and in doing this we have been joined by all the other codfishing companies on the Pacific coast, and by some of the fresh-fish producers, who have themselves sent similar telegrams, all of which efforts we hope to have seconded by your body.

As a further general reason for this action we would add that there are even now too few American sailors and too few methods of increasing their number. That one of these few yet remaining is the deep-sea fisheries of the United States. And to ruin these or drive them from this country would be to remove this last nursery of the American seamen and still further lessen our chance and our hope of ever getting an American merchant marine or American sailors for an American Navy.

We trust that the reasons advanced in the foregoing will be sufficient to warrant official action of your body in making this protest and in urging it upon our Pacific coast Representatives, both in the House and in the Senate.

We remain, very truly, yours,

UNION FISH CO.,
J. W. PEW, *President.*
C. P. OVERTON,
Vice President and Manager.

Mr. Chairman, if we are to judge of the future by the experiences of the past, the farmers of the Northwest have every reason to be fearful of the consequences if this measure should become a law. With free entry of their cereal products into the United States and a greatly reduced rate of duty on practically all of their farm products, the output of the Canadian Provinces will increase enormously and will literally swamp the American farmer. The large increase of the production of sugar in Cuba after the enactment of the Cuban reciprocity law gave a staggering blow to the beet-sugar industry of the United States. Many of these beet-sugar refineries, seeing no future in the business in this country, sold out to the Sugar Trust, and it is universally known that the Sugar Trust now controls a large number of the beet-sugar refineries in this country. And so, in my judgment, this enormous increase of the products of the Canadian farmers will not reduce the cost of living to a single "ultimate consumer" in the United States, but it will largely increase the profits of the trust magnates. It will undoubtedly help to demoralize the farming industry of the West and the Northwest, just as the rapid development of those sections of our country demoralized the farming industry of New England and New York in the years gone by. But the New Englander and the New Yorker turned their attention to manufactures, and they have prospered. The farmers of the West and the Northwest have cheerfully stood for the protective tariff on the manufactures of the eastern section of our country, for they realize that with the mills, the factories, and the workshops busily engaged in turning out American wares there was a home market created for the products of the American farmers that would enable them to sell those products at remunerative prices.

If now the manufacturers of New England and elsewhere refuse to stand for the protection of the products of the American farmer against those of his Canadian competitor, those very manufacturers may awake to find that the American farmer, for his part, will refuse to stand for the protection of the products of the American manufacturer. The passage of this measure will, I fear, lead to reprisals. You are sowing the wind; take heed that you do not reap the whirlwind.

During the progress of this discussion I have heard many references made on this floor to the iniquitous trusts, and I believe that every effort should be made to destroy those trusts that seek to throttle and ruin competitors in order to be able to advance prices and control monopolies. Many of the gentlemen on the other side of this Chamber persist in charging up these trusts to that protective-tariff system that has brought such a great measure of prosperity to the American people. But let me remind them that England, which is generally looked upon as a free-trade country, is thoroughly honeycombed with trusts. In fact, it was there, I believe, where the trusts originated. And I would not be surprised to learn that much English capital is invested in American trusts. I would not be surprised to hear that English financiers and English capitalists own large percentages of the bonds and stocks of American trusts. Naturally, this English capital wants to see this Canadian reciprocity bill passed. I venture the prediction that the trusts, and the trusts alone, will reap all the reward if this measure shall be enacted into law.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BURKE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, when this measure was before the House in the last Congress I was opposed to it, but contented myself with simply voting against its passage, having faith in a Republican Senate that it would fail of enactment during that Congress, and that before the Sixty-second Congress would convene in regular session the sentiment of the people would be crystallized into such an opposition against it that the President would not again submit it. It happens, however, that the President, in his wisdom, has assembled the Congress in special session and has submitted this measure and urged its ratification. It is with great reluctance that I am compelled to oppose any proposition put forward by the President of my own party, and by one for whom I entertain as great an admiration and respect as I do for President Taft. I do not blame him for favoring this measure, and am disposed to take the same view as my good friend from Wyoming has taken in his remarks to-day, and that is to give him the credit of doing what he believes to be his duty, and having secured the best agreement that could be obtained, and being in a sense committed thereto, he has felt that he ought to submit it to Congress and recommend its acceptance. In doing this I say he is probably following what his conscience suggests to be his duty in the discharge of the high obligation resting upon him as the Executive, but having done what he has, namely, sent the agreement with his message to Congress, his obligation for the present ceases, as stated by the gentleman from Wyoming, and it is now for Congress to exercise its judgment and perform its duty as the Members thereof may in their best judgment decide. As one Member of the House, actuated by a feeling that otherwise I can not honestly and conscientiously discharge that duty in justice to my constituents and the people of the whole United States, I shall not only oppose it but vote against it, as I did in the last Congress. My reasons for opposing the proposition, and why in my opinion it should not be accepted, in a very brief way are as follows:

It is a measure inconsistent with the position of the Republican Party, as repeatedly declared in its platforms, and its enactment will be an injury to the agricultural interests of the country, and that will mean disaster to our general welfare, for you can not legislate against the prosperity of our farmers without indirectly affecting all our industries and injuring all of the people. That it is not a Republican measure admits of but little argument, and I shall not enter into any extended discussion to demonstrate this fact. I maintain, without fear of successful contradiction, that the Republican Party has never declared for reciprocity upon noncompeting products, neither has any great Republican, prior to the presentation of the pending proposition, ever taken any other position. President McKinley, in his inaugural address in 1897, defining reciprocity, said:

> The end in view 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 to our own people, but tend to increase their employment.

Charles Emory Smith, who was Postmaster General in the McKinley administration, in defining it, said:

> When rightly understood, the principle is axiomatic. Brazil grows coffee, but makes no machinery. We make machinery, but grow no coffee. She needs the fabrics of our factories and forges, and we need the fruits of her tropical soil. We agree to concessions for her coffee; she agrees to concessions for our machinery. That is reciprocity.

This, I think, most clearly and accurately states the position of the Republican Party on what reciprocity is, and that is what the people have been taught to understand is meant by it.

Much is said about President McKinley's last speech at Buffalo, and it is asserted by the proponents of this measure that in that speech he modified his position on the subject of reciprocity, but a reference to his words fails to disclose anything to indicate that he would favor the reciprocity proposed by this proposition, and this one statement clearly indicates to the contrary, namely:

> We should take from our customers such of their products as we can use without harm to our industries and labor.

He could not have made that statement if he intended that he would favor a measure that would benefit and promote the manufacturers of the country at the expense of the farmer, and if anything is to be gained by accepting this measure it will be by the manufacturers.

That it is not a Republican measure is further demonstrated by the fact that in the last Congress it was opposed by a majority of the Republican Members of this House, 87 voting against it, while only 78 voted for it. The Democrats made it their party measure by adopting it in a caucus, and on the passage of the bill, with the exception of five, they all voted for it. A Republican Senate refused to consider it.

In this Congress I apprehend a majority of the Members on this side of the House are still opposed to it, and most of them will so vote, while the Democratic majority has again declared for it in a caucus and it is said that nearly all of them will vote for it.

The distinguished gentleman from Missouri who to-day is the recognized leader of his party, in fact the most prominent Democrat in the country and who may be chosen in the next campaign as the standard bearer of his party, and I am sure he has the respect and the good will of every Member on this side of the House, a man who is recognized as a partisan in politics, at present the Speaker of this House, in a newspaper interview on the 5th instant, stated that this is a Democratic measure, and I know of no one better capable of properly christening it from a Democratic standpoint than he, and therefore, so far as I am concerned, I am willing to accept his denomination of it and to regard it as a Democratic measure and to accord to him and his party the full responsibility for its enactment and the full benefit of any good that may come therefrom.

I may say in passing with reference to the distinguished gentleman, to whom I have just referred, that he represents the true position of Democracy upon the tariff question, as will appear by his frequent utterances in this House during the last 20 years. If he can have his way in dictating the legislation that will be enacted by this Congress relative to the tariff, it will mean his defeat in the next election, if he is nominated for the presidency, and the retirement of his party from control of this House for many years to come.

The distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, in a three-hour speech in this House on Saturday last, declared it to be Democratic doctrine, as did the distinguished gentleman from New York, who declared himself for absolute free trade with all the world.

I have the honor of representing, in part, in this body an agricultural State and an intelligent people—a people who read and think for themselves and a large majority of whom usually vote the Republican ticket. In 1896, however, I regret to say, we elected for the first and only time in the history of our State two Members of this House who occupied seats on that side of the Chamber, and our electoral vote was cast for the Democratic candidate for the presidency.

In 1898 we redeemed the State and sent to the House two Republicans, of which I had the honor of being one. As our people had an opportunity to experience the benefits of Republican legislation, the McKinley tariff law, and to contrast the times with the four years of Democratic misrule, from 1893 to 1897, they became stronger and stronger in their Republican faith, each year giving a larger majority to the Republican ticket. I will not take the time to go into details as to our wonderful progress during the last few years, but I do want to mention that the last census discloses that in 10 years there has been an increase in the value of farm lands in South Dakota of 376 per cent, and there is also a very large increase in the value of farm buildings, farm implements, and live stock; our bank deposits are enormous and our people as a whole are prosperous and happy.

As an evidence of the conditions in our own State at present relative to the value of farm lands, I want to say that within

the past 30 days the commissioner of school and public lands disposed of about 20,000 acres of school land in the different counties, all unimproved, and it sold at an average price of $52.60 per acre, and most of it was purchased by the farmers living in the localities, buying it for actual farming purposes.

Much has been said about the Payne tariff act passed by the last Congress. It was criticized and condemned probably more than any other tariff measure ever enacted, due largely to a hostile press. My colleague and I in the last campaign went before the people of our State and defended the measure, and, while admitting that it is not perfect, we declared it to be the best tariff act ever enacted, and we had the satisfaction of being returned to this House by an increased majority of about 5,000 over the majority we received in 1908, notwithstanding that was a presidential election. We each had a majority of more than 32,000 over our Democratic opponents. This shows what our people think of the Payne tariff law. They will be satisfied at least for the present if it is left alone. The President, in his Winona speech, denominated it the best tariff law ever enacted, and certainly there was no reason to believe that he would suggest any legislation changing or affecting the agricultural schedule, at least not in advance of a report from the Tariff Board, or until there is evidence that the schedules are too high. In presenting this proposition, judging from the President's speech at Springfield in February, he assumed that the tariff plank in the platform of the last Republican convention carried to its logical conclusion would lead to substantial free trade with Canada, and in his speech he said:

> With that in view, still adhering loyally and sincerely to the principles of protection where it is needed to maintain our important industries, I did not hesitate to give the widest latitude to the Secretary of State and the commissioners who represented this country in offering to Canada a reduction of duties on goods and products coming into this country from Canada in consideration of the establishment of the same duty, or freedom of duty, on similar goods going into Canada.

He also said:

> The conditions of production and of manufacture in the United States and in Canada are substantially the same.

In other words, he assumed that conditions here and in Canada are the same. In this he is in error, as can easily be demonstrated, but I will only briefly comment thereon. Owing to an advantage in the tariff the Canadian farmer can buy manufactured articles lower than can the American farmer; he also has an advantage in cheaper land, cheaper farm labor, and, against our eastern farmers, a soil that does not require fertilization. The National Grange asserts that by official reports it is established that the average value of farm lands in Canada is less than one-half the value of lands in the United States, and that the wages of farm labor in this country are from 20 to 25 per cent higher than in all of Canada except in the northwestern Provinces, where the wages are about the same as in our Northwestern States.

We hear it said that wheat is not affected by the tariff and that the price is fixed by Liverpool. No one will deny but what there has been an average difference of 10 or 11 cents in the price of wheat in Minneapolis and Winnipeg in favor of Minneapolis, and it dropped to less than four when it was known that this treaty was in negotiation and to less than 2 cents within a few weeks after the treaty was signed. My distinguished friend from North Dakota [Mr. HANNA], who speaks from personal knowledge on the subject of the price of wheat, gives us the prices at Portal and North Portal, the two places being one and the same—Portal in North Dakota and North Portal in Canada, across the street. On December 31, 1910, the price of wheat on the North Dakota side was 86 cents, while on the Canada side it was 75 cents, a difference of 11 cents in favor of the United States. That prices on farm products are high it is admitted, and yet not higher in proportion to labor and practically everything else.

Mr. HANNA also gives us the prices paid on January 9, 10, and 11, 1911, on barley and flax between points in North Dakota and Canada, only a short distance apart, and without repeating all of the towns that he mentions I will simply compare Pembina, in North Dakota, and Emerson, in Canada. The price paid for barley on the dates named at Pembina was 67 cents; Emerson, 42 cents; flax, Pembina, $2.32; Emerson, $1.93.

I want to briefly refer to the barley industry of this country and how it has developed since it was protected by a duty of 30 cents per bushel, and show what an injustice it would be to the barley growers of the United States to take away from them that duty and compel them to grow barley in competition with Canada.

In the report of the Tariff Board, submitted in response to Senate resolution of February 23, 1911, Senate Document No. 849, on page 99, Table 15, it gives the production of barley and farm prices in 1910, per bushel, in specified States, compared with Canada. The table is as follows:

Barley—Production and farm price in 1910, per bushel, in specified States, compared with Canada.

	Production.	Average yield per acre.	Farm price per bushel.
United States:	*Bushels.*	*Bushels.*	
Maine	248,000	31.00	$0.760
New Hampshire	52,000	26.00	.770
Vermont	465,000	31.00	.680
New York	2,207,000	28.30	.700
Michigan	1,742,000	26.00	.580
Wisconsin	22,429,000	25.90	.640
Minnesota	26,985,000	21.00	.600
Iowa	15,045,000	29.50	.560
North Dakota	5,428,000	5.50	.550
South Dakota	18,655,000	18.20	.510
Montana	1,456,000	28.00	.620
Total	162,227,000	22.40	.578
Canada:			
Prince Edward Island	159,600	28.00	.572
Nova Scotia	264,000	30.33	.766
New Brunswick	73,000	35.29	.670
Quebec	2,547,000	24.49	.713
Ontario	20,727,000	29.75	.533
Manitoba	13,826,000	20.21	.390
Saskatchewan	3,598,000	26.18	.358
Alberta	3,953,000	20.32	.383
Total	45,147,600	24.62	.474

It will be noted that there is an average difference in price of 10 cents per bushel. The production in the United States, in round numbers, as shown by this table, is 162,000,000 bushels, which is about double the production prior to the enactment of the Dingley law, putting on a duty of 30 cents a bushel. The Tariff Board confirms this statement, and I quote the following from page 105:

> Previous to 1897 the rate of duty on barley was 30 per cent ad valorem. By the law of 1897 this duty was changed to 30 cents a bushel. Under the former rate of duty there were large importations of barley from Canada to the United States. In 1894 more than 2,000,000 bushels were imported; in 1897, over 1,000,000 bushels. After the imposition of the duty of 30 cents per bushel the importations dropped to somewhat more than 124,000 bushels, and in 1909 only 2,420 bushels were imported.
>
> The price of barley in Canada is generally below the price in the United States.

I would like some one to tell me how, in the face of these statistics and the statements of the Tariff Board, the enactment of this measure is not going to harm the farmers of the United States who are engaged in raising barley. Perhaps those who support this proposition can justify it on the grounds of lower prices. I presume they are concerned to cheapen the manufacture of beer, in order to increase the profits of the brewer, for certainly no one will contend that to cheapen barley 10 cents a bushel will affect the price of a glass of beer.

We hear a great deal about lower prices. We had low prices from 1893 to 1897, but no one will say that anyone was benefited thereby. What difference does it make how low prices are if you have no money? A man when he is hungry must eat, and the price does not cut any figure if he has not the wherewith to buy a meal. I maintain that when prices are high prosperity usually prevails and there is little complaint of lack of money to buy with, and the people live better than ever before. Who, if anyone, is going to benefit if this measure is enacted into law? Principally the packing houses, the millers, the brewers, the large users of wood-pulp manufactures, and those who will directly profit by the transportation of Canadian farm products. I doubt if it will directly benefit the ultimate consumer, for in my judgment the tariff on food products is too small to directly affect the retail price. No one will say that 10 cents on a bushel of wheat will cheapen the price of a loaf of bread or even a sack of flour, and so by cheapening the price to the producer, if there is any gain, it is to the manufacturer and the middleman.

I said that I represent an agricultural constituency and a thinking people. The American farmer generally thinks for himself, and I want to say to those who represent manufacturing and city constituents that before they strike down the small amount of protection that the farmers now enjoy they had better think twice, for there is likely to be retaliation, and you who believe in protection want to remember that you never would have had any McKinley law or any Dingley law and that the Payne law would not now be upon our statutes if it were not for the farmers of our country.

Mr. Chairman, the farmers of the Northwest, particularly in the States of Minnesota and North and South Dakota, have recently been holding conventions in the different parts of those States and adopting resolutions showing what they think of this measure, and now that this debate is about to close, and before a vote is taken on this bill, it seems to me proper and appropriate that the farmers of the Northwest should be heard. Therefore in order that they may have that opportunity, in order that this House may know their position, and in order that the country may know it, I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read a copy of the resolutions adopted by the farmers of Brown County, at Aberdeen, in my State, on Friday last, the resolutions being substantially the same as those adopted in mass conventions by the farmers of the other States that I have named.

The Clerk read as follows:

We, the farmers and business men of Brown County, S. Dak., in mass meeting assembled, do most earnestly and sincerely protest against the ratification by Congress of the pending treaty with Canada in its present form.

In doing so we hereby announce and publish the following reasons:

First. That the treaty is unfair, unjust, and discriminating against the agricultural interests of the United States, giving these interests practically nothing in return for what it deprives them of.

Second. That it will inure to the disadvantage, loss, and suffering of our producers without any prospect of cheaper manufactured products to the consumer.

Third. That the removal of the duty on wheat will accrue solely to the benefit of the miller, that of barley to the brewer, that of flaxseed to the linseed mills, and that of live stock, hogs, poultry, and dairy products to the packers and middlemen, and while not benefiting the consumer will mean a great loss to the producers.

Fourth. It creates an unfair competition, inasmuch as it will compel our farmers to compete in our own markets with cheaper-produced products of alien competitors. We contend that our home market belongs in the first instance to our own citizens.

Fifth. This pact, if agreed to, will retard and set back the progress toward a higher and better standard of farm life, which has become so noticeable during the recent prosperous times; it will tend to bring on again that struggle for existence, so well remembered by our pioneer farmers, a struggle in which many went under; it will lessen the opportunities for a better education of our farmers' children, and thus encourage them in leaving the farm.

Sixth. It will lessen the purchasing capacity of our American producers to the extent of millions of dollars annually by depriving them of a legitimate and fair price for their products. All of this will represent a corresponding loss to the commercial interests of our country, as the farmer's profit invariably finds its way into all the channels of trade. Our commercial and manufacturing interests stand to lose as much in this way as they will gain by the expansion of their business.

FARMERS MAKE COUNTRY.

Seventh. Our American farmers, by their thrift, energy, and frugality, have made this country what it is; they have made it possible for the great commercial interest to become wealthy and powerful; without the farmer this would have been impossible. In view of this our commercial interest should now stand by the farmer. To do otherwise lays them open to the charge of commercial greed and selfishness.

Eighth. The term "reciprocity" as applied to the Canadian treaty is a misnomer. Reciprocity means an equitable trade or exchange between two countries of products one country produces and the other does not or which it produces only in insufficient quantities. We produce everything in this country that is produced in Canada.

Ninth. It constitutes an agreement made secretly and without regard to any settled polices of our tariff laws. It means free trade for the farmer and protection for the manufacturer, and as such is discrimination in its rankest form.

Tenth. That in trading off our home market of more than 90,000,000 people, a market that is, and has been, abundantly supplied by our own producers, a market that has been built up by American thrift and frugality, and which, by every inherent right and heritage, belongs to our producers, for that of 8,000,000 Canadians, with its doubtful increased advantages to commercial and manufacturing interests, would not only be unfair and unjust to our own producers, but foolish and reprehensible.

Eleventh. This proposed treaty, when divested of its sentimental features, can and will appeal only to those who are selfishly interested and who expect to gain thereby. As a whole, it will be a damage rather than a benefit to our country. We are opposed to its passage in any form which puts agricultural products on the free list and protects manufactured interests.

Twelfth. We repudiate the action of President Taft, large manufacturing, chambers of commerce, and the management of the Great Northern Railway, in attempting to force the so-called reciprocity agreement through Congress without giving the people at large an opportunity to give it due consideration or to express their opinions. We regret exceedingly that the city press has failed to give publicity to both sides of this most important question.

WILL NOT REDUCE LIVING COST.

Thirteenth. The proposed pact would not reduce the cost of living. It would not benefit the laboring man, the mechanic, or artizan in the great cities, as the exorbitant prices paid by them for produce is not occasioned by the price received by the farmer, but is the result of the excessive charges made by the railroads and middlemen. The farmer only receives 35 per cent of the price paid by the consumer, while the transportation companies and middlemen receive the other 65.

Fourteenth. We hereby express our thanks to all those newspapers of our State who in this controversy have risen above considerations of selfishness and have defended farming interests against this threatening danger, and we mention expressly the Aberdeen Daily News, and we also thank those citizens who have interested themselves in calling this meeting.

Fifteenth. We urge on all of our citizens who are in favor of fair play and equality before the law to make continuous and effective agitation against this treaty.

Sixteenth. That copies of these resolutions be sent to the President of the United States and to each of our Senators and Representatives in the Congress.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, it is evident that this measure will pass this House, but let it pass unassisted by Republican votes and be understood that it is Democratic doctrine. I appeal to the Republican membership of this body to stand loyally by the principle of protection which hitherto has been applied by Republican administrations to American industries without discrimination as to class. Let us keep fath now with the American farmer, who has been the bulwark of the Nation since the foundation of the Government and without whose allegiance no Republican administration ever was inaugurated at the National Capital. Our defeat will be but temporary if we remain true to Republican policies, policies that have made the Nation great beyond the dreams of prophets. Let us on this side of the House realize that dishonor can come to us in defeat only to the extent of our acceptance of this strange faith. Those who stand faithful in this trial will retain their self-respect and in the near future will form the nucleus of an invincible party that will again carry the Republican banner to victory.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I regret that only a few minutes' time has been allotted to me to discuss this great question which is now before the House. Had I been permitted to enter into this discussion earlier, the limited time now given me would have been more appropriate, for I should not have desired to have said as much as I now feel like doing, for as each day and hour goes by many facts and statements are made, wholly or partially true. On the other hand, much misinformation has been spread upon the records. Hence to even do the subject partial justice would require hours instead of minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in what I shall say I shall endeavor, as far as possible, to refrain from indulging in any statements of a partisan nature. This proposed legislation deals with matters that are purely nonpartisan, for it is a subject in which the American people as a whole are vitally interested. Much has been said during this discussion on both sides of the Chamber as to who is responsible for the initiation and the continued insistence of this legislation. Aside from any political advantage to be obtained therefrom or any responsibility therefor, be it a Republican or Democratic measure, it is immaterial, as far as its beneficial or nonbeneficial qualities to the American people as a whole are concerned. While it is a fact that this measure during the last session of Congress was presented to us by our esteemed President and was reported to the House by a Republican Ways and Means Committee and passed by this branch of Congress while the majority was Republican, yet it failed of ultimate passage. Now it comes before us from a Democratic source, reported by a Democratic Ways and Means Committee, and indorsed by the majority party as a caucus measure. On our side of the Chamber there is a great division of sentiment as to its merits, and with less division on the Democratic side. Be it Democratic or Republican, to my mind it is manifestly unjust, and wherever the votes come from, North or South, East or West, Democratic, Republican, or Socialist, if this so-called reciprocity measure is enacted into law, I believe it ought to be named the legislative mistake of 1911. I predict that every man who votes for it will in the future regret that he did so.

All of our great leaders have designated and proclaimed reciprocity as a trade agreement between foreign countries in noncompeting products. That is, products that are indigenous to one country and not to the other. In no instance have I been able to find where free trade between two countries in the same products was ever considered or designated as reciprocity. This pact or trade agreement is chiefly confined to agricultural products between the Dominion of Canada and the United States upon a free-trade basis. Hence, our farmers are asked to compete with the farmer of the great Dominion lying immediately to the north.

The great industries of our country have been fostered and built up under the protective system for more than 50 years. At this time in nearly all the manufacturing industries we are equal to, if not greater, than any in the world. Originally our industries were small and needed protection against the older countries of Europe, and the great majority of our people cheerfully granted this aid. The agriculturist and the professional man, the clerk and the laborer were of one mind, believing it to be better to convert the raw material into the finished product within our own borders than pay for transportation to and from the foreign factory. By this protective system we have

been enabled to pay the laborer in our factory just wages, thus enabling him to purchase the produce of the farm at a living price.

For many years our farmers have been told that with the increase of our manufacturing industries and the many workmen who would be employed that the time would come when consumption on this continent would equal the production of their farms and thus they would greatly profit thereby. That doctrine has proven true. At this time the production of the farm is very little, if any, in excess of home consumption. Heretofore while the tariff schedules show that a high protective duty was placed upon the cereal and live-stock production of the farm, yet until recently the direct benefit to the farmer was only negligible, for he had no competitor. Within the past few years, however, our neighbor on the north, with his vast area of fertile land, is producing millions of bushels of all kinds of grains and great herds of live stock. This Canadian production is also at greatly reduced cost. While the cost of labor is comparatively equal, yet the value of the farm lands is hardly one-half in Canada to that of our own, while the production per acre, owing to the newness and fertility of soil, is about one-third greater.

Let us examine as to the magnitude and quality of our Canadian competitor. There are five great fertile Provinces in Canada, any one of which is almost equal in area to four or five of our Middle West States. I shall describe only three of them, however. Manitoba has 27,000,000 acres of as fine tillable land as any on this continent. Saskatchewan, with its total area of over 160,000,000 acres, has 86,826,200 acres of tillable land surpassed by none, while Alberta has 100,000,000 acres of the same kind of land. The average production of wheat per acre during the year 1909 in all of these three Provinces was 21.1 bushels; that of the United States for the same year was 15.8 bushels per acre. Thus it appears from these figures that the productive quality of the Canadian land is much greater than our own. This same ratio of productiveness applies to the yield of barley, oats, and flax, while the value of the land per acre is almost double in the United States as compared with Canada. There is but one conclusion—the American farmer can not successfully compete with his Canadian neighbor. But one result can follow—the Canadian land must raise in value or the American land must decline. Probably one will go up and the other down, to the great detriment of our people and the advantage of our neighbor. The statistician and the expert in figuring percentages inform us that the Canadian in the past has produced very little compared to us; but let us examine into the truth of this assertion. The Canadian crop of wheat in 1909, in round numbers, was 167,000,000 bushels, grown upon about 8,000,000 acres of land. The total yield of oats for that year was 353,466,000 bushels; barley, 55,398,000 bushels; and flax, 2,232,000 bushels. To show the rapidity with which the cereals of the Canadian farmer in the Province of Saskatchewan alone have advanced in the total yield, I will insert in the RECORD, with permission of the House, the following table:

Growth of wheat production, Saskatchewan.

	Wheat.	Oats.	Barley.	Flax.
1898	4,780,440	1,589,412	182,859	.....
1899	6,083,508	2,518,248	160,604	.....
1900	3,443,671	1,604,561	150,822	.....
1901	11,956,069	5,517,886	354,703	.....
1902	13,110,330	6,975,796	298,632	153,709
1903	15,121,015	9,164,007	655,593	285,697
1904	15,944,730	10,756,350	589,336	166,434
1905	26,107,286	19,213,055	893,396	398,399
1906	37,040,098	23,965,228	1,316,415	710,689
1907	27,691,601	23,324,903	1,350,265	1,364,716
1908	50,654,529	48,379,838	3,965,724	2,589,352
1909	90,215,000	105,455,000	7,833,000	4,448,700

It may be interesting to note that in this Province, in 1898, with only a very small portion of its land under cultivation, there was raised only 4,780,000 bushels of wheat. Eleven years later, with only about 12 per cent of her occupied land under cultivation, there was raised over 90,000,000 bushels of wheat. The increase from 1908 to 1909 was nearly 40,000,000 bushels. The increase in the yield of oats from 1908 to 1909 in this Province, in round numbers, was 57,000,000 bushels.

Without reading this schedule, I call the attention of the House and country to it, that it may be seen how rapidly production in Canada is increasing. Should this proposed measure become a law and the Canadians be given the great advantages of our home market, it would be folly to assert that this ratio of increase in production would not continue.

Mr. Chairman, this is the free-trade competition that we are tendering to our agriculturists. We are asking them to share with the stranger the market which they have built up by over a hundred years of sacrifice and toil. We say to the Canadian: Enter into this paradise, with your immense area of cheaper and more fertile lands, and reap the reward which should belong to our own people, without price. I for one, Mr. Chairman, can not subscribe to this doctrine.

The section of the country from which I come and the district I represent is in the spring-wheat, barley, and oats belt of the great Northwest. It is sometimes designated as the home of the No. 1 hard and No. 1 northern wheat. My own State of Minnesota is the banner wheat-producing State of the Union. This Northwestern section can have only one competitor, and that is the Dominion of Canada, for that is the only other territory on this continent where this most excellent quality of grain is grown. It is frequently asserted on the floor of this House that Liverpool fixes the price of our grain, and especially of wheat. This I deny. The price of this wheat is now and always has been fixed at Minneapolis and Duluth, Minneapolis being the largest primary wheat market in the world and its flouring mills the greatest. Liverpool does at times have a tendency to fix the price upon a considerable portion of the winter wheat and other soft grades of wheat raised in the United States.

But for the No. 1 northern and No. 1 hard spring wheat it never has and never will, unless perchance it does after the passage and enactment into law of the measure now under consideration. Without wearying the House with voluminous statistics I assert that for many years past the price on this grade of wheat has been higher in Minneapolis than in Winnipeg or Port Arthur on an average of at least 10 cents per bushel. Frequently during many years the differences in price has been as great as 15 cents. Again, I am informed that the distance from Winnipeg to Liverpool is about 500 miles nearer than from Minneapolis to Liverpool, with equal rail and water transportation facilities. Such being the case, if Liverpool fixes the price and Liverpool is the destination for the surplus grain of Canada, why is it that the Minneapolis and Duluth price is from 10 to 15 cents per bushel higher? Why is it that all along the border line between Canada and the United States at every point where wheat is purchased the Canadian price is from 9 to 15 cents per bushel lower than on the American side? I assert that this difference in price did exist just prior to the day when this Canadian reciprocity agreement was submitted to the House for its consideration on January 26, 1911. At many points where this difference in price existed the distance between them was only from 2 to 30 miles.

Mr. Chairman, in proof of my statement I shall insert in the RECORD a statement showing comparative prices in wheat and barley in the United States and Canada.

Comparative prices of wheat and barley in United States and Canada.

WHEAT.

Date.	Name of town in United States.	Price per bushel.	Name of town in Canada.	Price per bushel.	Difference in price.	Distance apart.	Tariff per bushel.
						Miles.	
1910. Dec. 31	Kermit	$0.90	Estevan	$0.76	$0.14	15	$0.25
1911. Jan. 10	Pembina	.97	Emerson	.82	.15	4	.25
10	Neche	.96	Gretna	.81	.15	2	.25
1910. Dec. 31	Portal	.90	North Portal	.75	.15	(1)	.25
1911. Jan. 11	Walhalla	.96	Haskett	.83	.13	6	.25
1910. Dec. 31	St. John	.91	Boissevan	.81	.10	15	.25
31	Hannah	.90	Snowflake	.77	.13	4	.25
31	Neche	.91	Gretna	.81	.10	2	.25
31	Sarles	.89	Clearwater	.75	.14	(1)	.25
1911. Jan. 10	Westhope	1.00	Colter	.85	.15	15	.25
10	.....do	1.00	Lyleton	.84	.16	20	.25
10	.....do	1.00	Malita	.86	.14	30	.25
10	St. John	.96	Boissevan	.86	.10	15	.25
10	Hansboro	.90	Cartwright	.77	.13	8	.25
1910. Dec. 31	Antler	.91	Lyleton	.78	.13	5	.25
1911. Jan. 10	Portal	.92	Boscurvis	.75	.17	15	.25

BARLEY.

1911. Jan. 10	Pembina	$0.67	Emerson	$0.42	$0.25	4	$0.30
10	Neche	.66	Gretna	.38	.28	2	.30
10	St. John	.66	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....

[1] Just across line.

This statement was compiled by Senator McCumber, of North Dakota, the figures having been obtained by him from responsible parties at the points designated and indicating the actual cash price paid for wheat on the days mentioned.

I wish particularly to call attention to that portion of the schedule pertaining to Portal and North Portal, showing the comparative prices on both wheat and barley, Portal and North Portal being a village on the border line between Canada and the United States. North Portal is on the Canadian side and Portal on the American side, with only a street dividing them. On December 31, 1910, the price of wheat in Portal was 90 cents per bushel, and on the same day the same wheat in North Portal was 75 cents per bushel, a difference of 15 cents. You will notice that this difference of about 15 cents per bushel exists between all the points mentioned in the schedule. Does Liverpool fix the price?

Mr. Chairman, the message of our President and the bill under discussion was submitted to Congress January 26, 1911. On that date the price of this grade of wheat in Minneapolis was $1.04⅝ per bushel, and in Winnipeg on the same day it was 94¼ cents. Two days after, on January 28, 1911, the price of this grade of wheat in Winnipeg went up 1½ cents a bushel, and in Minneapolis it went down 5 cents a bushel. The cause assigned for this sudden change was noted in the Minneapolis Journal as due to the possibility of this reciprocity bill being passed. A few days later in these same markets the Minneapolis price went down to 98⅝ cents and the Winnipeg price remained virtually stationary. On February 11, and after about a 10-cent decline in the Minneapolis market, the Minneapolis Journal, which reports the daily proceedings of the market, stated:

> This decline has put the United States nearer an export basis, but still further declines will be necessary to allow this country to enter the European markets with any profit, and many of the local traders of the chamber of commerce predict that domestic prices would continue to decline until this country was put on an export basis.

Mr. Chairman, this is what this form of reciprocity means to the farmers of the Northwest, who are producers of this grade of wheat. All that I have said with reference to wheat applies with equal force, if not greater, to barley.

Mr. Chairman, it is a common statement outside of this Chamber that one of the great blessings which the farmer will receive under the provisions of this pact is free lumber. In my limited time I shall not attempt to fully discuss the provisions in regard to lumber in this bill. In brief, I will say that the duty upon partly finished or finished lumber is somewhat reduced, while rough boards are placed on the free list. This can be of little benefit to the farmer, since unfinished boards are used by him in small quantities only. His house is constructed chiefly of finished lumber. The difference in weight is considerable, the finished product being scarcely more than three-quarters of an inch in thickness, while the rough board is a full inch. Hence the item of freight is so considerable that very little of it would be imported any considerable distance. It might be imported from Canada to the nearest American mill free and there finished by planing and otherwise, and then sold to the American consumer under the tariff schedule of rates prescribed for that grade. I am unable to see how the American consumer can possibly receive any benefit from the removal of the tariff on rough boards.

Mr. Chairman, right here I will digress a moment from the subject I have been attempting to discuss. During the discussion this afternoon a friend of mine on this floor, in a serious but friendly manner, somewhat criticized me as to my ideas on the subject of protection, and particularly called attention to a controversy between myself and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Kitchin] concerning free lumber. During that controversy the gentleman from North Carolina asked me if I voted for free lumber at the time our recent tariff bill was under discussion. Upon my informing him that I did and that I should do so again if opportunity presented, the gentleman from North Carolina stated that he voted for free lumber and would do so again. Mr. Chairman, I am proud of the vote I cast for free lumber and trust that I may be given the opportunity to do so again, for I firmly believe that the lumbering interests of this country do not at this time need any protection.

In this connection I wish to say that the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin a few years ago had immense quantities of very fine pine and other timber suitable for manufacture of lumber, and there still remains considerable. We have many of the finest and best equipped sawmills in the country, Minneapolis being at one time the great lumbering center of the United States. In my State we have some of the leading lumbermen, and I mention in this connection the names of Mr. Weyerhaeuser, Thomas Shevlin, C. A. Smith, and T. B. Walker. I am informed that these men are among the leading manufacturers of lumber and stumpage owners in the United States. I speak of them for the purpose of showing that by reason of the conditions surrounding them and aided by a high protective tariff they succeeded admirably in their enterprises. I do not know the opinion at this time of any of these gentlemen on the subject of the lumber tariff, whether they all desire its retention or not, yet Mr. Shevlin has expressed himself on the subject recently and has stated that he did not think that any further protection on lumber was needed.

Now, Mr. Chairman, believing that Mr. Shevlin is correct, and according to my settled convictions on the subject of a protective tariff, that it should be withdrawn whenever and wherever it is unnecessary, I therefore voted against further protection, and shall continue to do so in the future until conditions change materially from what they are at present.

Mr. Chairman, my people and myself were among the early pioneers in the great State of Minnesota. Aside from a few small cities and villages along the border the great interior was one vast wilderness of timber and prairie land occupied almost solely by the Indians. Our settlement was made near the center of this magnificent area in the timber belt. I know personally the hardships and trials of a pioneer on a timber farm. For more than 50 years these farmers have worked unceasingly from early morn until late at night in order to subdue nature, build up their farms, and make a home for themselves and families. To-day they are enjoying the fruits of their labor.

I will venture the assertion concerning the farmers of the Middle West and the great Northwest who went upon their farms 50 or 75 years ago that if you will estimate their services at 50 cents a day and the services of the housewife and grown sons and daughters at 25 cents per day, their total earnings would greatly exceed the present value of their farms. They own their farms simply and solely because they have worked unceasingly all the day and part of the night, and thus have improved their farm and home, and to-day they are beginning to reap the reward for their labor. The great home market is and ought to remain their market, and not given over without compensation to the stranger across the border.

My friend the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Ferris] is in favor of this bill and asserts that the farmers of his State are prosperous and desire its enactment into law. Mr. Chairman, the farmers of Oklahoma have only recently occupied their land and under the most favorable condition. It is only within the past few years that they began the arduous task of developing their farm and building their home. From the very first—and I am glad it is so—they enjoyed this splendid home market which had been provided for them many years before, and they are now reaping the speedy benefit of what their predecessors in adjoining States had worked for generations to build up. It is only within the last few years that the grain and stock raiser in the United States had any competitor. The Canadian competitor had not developed. Until this recent development and enormous production became manifest, the protection accorded the farmer by our tariff laws was of negligible value, yet he was informed, and I believe correctly so, that the building up of the manufacturing industries would ultimately be of great benefit to him, for the reason that it would give him a sure and more profitable market for his grains and live stock. Now the time has come when that condition has arrived. In fact, consumption in the United States about equals production. It is proposed in this bill to strip the farmers of all protection whatever, force him backward, open up this great market to the stranger, while he is compelled to sell his product in the cheapest market and purchase the product of the factory in the highest.

This, my friend, is unjust, inequitable, and to my mind wholly unwarranted. I shall never vote for such a measure.

Some of my political friends have come to me and said, "Davis, you have been talking for revision of the tariff downward." I responded, "Yes; and always have been since the day of my election to Congress." They then said, "Why do you propose to vote against this measure, because it certainly is a revision downward, and it is an entering wedge for further revision downward?" True, it is an entering wedge, but is this the proper time and proper place to force an entering wedge? More than 50 years ago the East, the manufacturing section, began its very successful enterprises under a high protective tariff system. It has reaped rich benefits therefrom. Now that the farmers are just beginning to receive a part of this benefit, it is proposed to strike them down and enter the wedge and crush those who have received the least from this system. Yes, my friends, I believe in this entering wedge, but why not begin in such schedules as the woolen, cotton, sugar, steel, and other related ones? Give to the farmer cheaper clothing, cheaper

building materials, cheaper fuel, at the same time you are demanding of him cheaper food products. Thus you will benefit the great mass of the producers and consumers alike. But, say, our Democratic friends, we propose to follow this reciprocity measure by another placing many articles of consumption for the benefit of the consumer on the free list. That sounds well, and if it could be accomplished, in my judgment, it would be well. Yet the discussion thus far has revealed the fact that our Democratic friends and all assert the great improbability of the passage of this other measure. While it may pass this branch of the Congress, yet obstacles apparently unsurmountable probably will defeat it during the life of the Sixty-second Congress. Hence I pause and shall not vote for the bill under discussion or any similar measure until conditions warrant the belief of the passage of the other.

When this trade agreement was presented by the President to the Congress during the last session of the Sixty-first Congress, considerable stress was laid in the message accompanying it upon the necessity of lessening the cost of food products to the consumer. In fact, that was the main consideration assigned for urging the passage of this bill. From the context of the message the President assumes that while the consumer would be much benefited yet the producer of grains and live stock would not be injured.

It is difficult to comprehend how the consumer can be furnished a cheaper food unless some one produces and sells it cheaper. While it is very apparent that the cheap land of Canada can and does produce food products in greater quantity per acre and at less cost than the American farm, yet it has not been shown that the consumer will receive any benefit. The reason for this lies in the fact that while the farmer in the two countries must sell his produce on equal terms in a free-trade market, the manufacturer of flour still retains a high protective duty. The 4½ bushels of wheat which enters into the manufacture of a barrel of flour, after it becomes flour, the miller is protected in at the rate of 50 cents a barrel. While the farmer's fat cattle must be sold in this cheap competitive market, yet the meat therefrom in the hands of the American packer receives the benefit of 1¼ cents per pound when dealing with the consumer. Such is the case with all other products of the farm. In all instances the interest of the manufacturer is highly protected, to the disadvantage of the consumer, while the producer of live stock and grains must sell in the cheapest market, to his loss, which in no way benefits the consumer. Many examples might be given showing that the farmer receives very little benefit, even under existing conditions, from the high price paid by the consumer. For example, at present prices throughout the United States the farmer's wheat nets him about 80 cents a bushel. The flour from this bushel of wheat will make at least 60 loaves of bread, which retails to the consumer at 5 cents a loaf, showing that the consumer has to pay $3 for what the farmer receives but 80 cents. A bushel of oats, for which the farmer receives from 30 to 35 cents, will make 23 packages of Quaker Oats, which retails to the consumer at 10 cents per package, or $2.30.

Mr. J. R. Cahill, an investigator for the labor department of the Board of Trade, London, England, came to this country to investigate cost of living. After visiting several of our large cities and before his departure he stated that he found that the consumers in this country paid 5 cents for a 14-ounce loaf of bread, while in London a 64-ounce loaf retailed for 10 cents, the London loaf being made out of American flour. Thus the fact is apparent that the middlemen, including the miller and retailer and the baker, should not be overlooked in our effort to lessen the cost of food products to the consumer. I might cite many instances as showing that the price paid the farmer is very small compared to that paid by the consumer.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this measure for another good reason. Ever since the passage of the Morrill Act of 1862 the Federal Treasury has materially assisted in the establishment of agricultural colleges and experiment stations in every State in the Union. In addition thereto each State has contributed immense sums to educate the agriculturists in scientific farming. Our great Department of Agriculture, with all its ramifications—which, in my judgment, is the greatest department of our Government—employs thousands of scientists and spends millions of money annually to further the science of agriculture. Hundreds of millions of dollars have been appropriated by the National and State Governments in furthering agricultural education. While this system was inaugurated by the Federal Government, yet the various States have responded nobly, and are continuing to do so. Increased agricultural production of superior quality is of the greatest consideration. Its benefits are numerous and manifold. The building up of the home in rural communities, dignifying the labor of the farm, so that it becomes a science, adds to the health, wealth, prosperity, and manhood of the yeomanry, aside from generally benefiting our entire population. Again, it is apparent to all that the congested population of our larger cities is an actual menace to the welfare of our country. The best solution of this problem is to keep our agricultural population in the highest possible state of prosperity and happiness. This can not be done by the enactment of the legislation contemplated by this bill. In my judgment this proposed legislation would defeat the very object for which the Department of Agriculture, schools and colleges of agriculture, and experiment stations were established. Should this legislation be enacted, the slogan "Back to the farm" or "Remain on the farm" would lose its force. Depreciate the value of the land and the price of the products therefrom and inevitably the migration from country to city will greatly increase.

Our President in his message has alluded to the sentimental side of this proposed legislation. The Canadian is pictured in glowing terms. It is urged that this proposed agreement should be entered into because of the Canadian's racial affinity to us as well as his proximity to our border. His temperamental and social similarity and kindly feeling toward us is put forward as a further argument for the enactment of this measure.

No standing army need guard our borders against him, no battleships need float the great inland seas that divide us; but, on the contrary, we should welcome and invite him to enter our land and partake of this great home market without price. This, to my mind, is unjust to our own people, and furnishes no reason for the passage of this bill. I assert and believe that while the Canadian is peaceably disposed and one whom we should at all times treat kindly and justly, yet, at the same time, the welfare of our own people should be uppermost in our minds. I do not understand that by this legislation we propose to make him one of us, for he belongs to another nation. His Government is a monarchy. His allegiance is to his King, and not to our Government or its institutions. His allegiance binds him to give preference to the British Crown, and while he will accept our hospitality and the great benefit which he will derive from this proposed legislation, he will be a stranger to us in all things governmental.

I am strongly opposed to this bill and shall vote against it. Yet, if it must become a law—which seems probable—then I trust that a divine Providence who shapes the destinies of nations may so use this so-called reciprocity treaty, this entering wedge, to further amalgamate these two countries and eventually make them one, with but one flag—the Stars and Stripes. [Applause.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON].

Mr. KENDALL. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman from Minnesota proceeds, I desire to suggest that this debate has now been proceeding since last Friday, and I am wondering whether we could not prevail upon the gentlemen who are managing the enterprise to take the committee into their confidence as to when a vote may be expected. It seems to me that that is a proper inquiry to make at this time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I am in hopes that we can take the bill up under the five-minute rule at 3 o'clock tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. KENDALL. Is it the design of the gentleman to conclude debate to-night?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say candidly to the gentleman that I have had an understanding with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] to close the general debate, except the closing speeches, to-night, and that to-morrow, when the closing speeches are made, we will then take it up under the five-minute rule for consideration.

Mr. KENDALL. What time this evening will the committee rise?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am willing to let the debate go on. I hope we will get through by 6 o'clock.

Mr. KENDALL. Mr. Chairman, I think it is proper for me to say to the gentleman that if the committee continues after 6 o'clock a quorum of the committee ought to be present.

Mr. JAMES. I would suggest to the gentleman from Alabama——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the proceedings are by unanimous consent.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, by unanimous consent I will say to the gentleman that I have tried to be very liberal with that side of the House. I have not only yielded to the other side of the House, but I have yielded to gentlemen on that side of the House who were in favor of the bill. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has had considerably more time than we have had, and I was in hopes, as the debate has run

for many, many hours longer than it was allowed to run when it was before the House at the last session, that the gentleman would allow it to run longer without interruption in order that as many Members may have an opportunity to get in as possible.

Mr. KENDALL. I think no possible complaint can be made against the gentleman from Alabama with respect to time allowed for discussion. The only thing in the matter to me is this, that where the discussion is so general, that a quorum of the committee ought to be present to hear the arguments—that is, after 6 o'clock.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I regret very much if the gentleman sees proper by reason of no quorum here to cut off any Member's privilege to be heard, but the responsibility will then rest with him and not with me.

Mr. KENDALL. Mr. Chairman, that is not my proposition at all. There is no need of haste with reference to concluding this discussion and limiting men to two, three, or five minutes and from the clamor for opportunity to discuss this bill. I think we ought to take another day.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, the complaint heretofore made by gentlemen on that side of the House was that they had not had time enough to debate questions up for consideration. Now the complaint is because they have too much.

Mr. KENDALL. Not at all. The gentleman, with his usual obtuseness, fails to understand the substance of my complaint. What I am suggesting is that these arguments are of importance to the country and there ought to be a quorum to listen to them.

Mr. JAMES. The gentleman, with his usual desire to make complaint when there is nothing to complain about, is pursuing his old course.

Mr. DALZELL. As this matter is proceeding by unanimous consent, I desire to say that, as debates go in this House, the gentleman from Alabama has been exceedingly fair from the beginning to the end of this debate. [Applause.] He has not only been fair, but he has been generous in this respect, that while he believes it to be the wish of his side of the House, which is in the majority, to close this debate substantially tonight, he has permitted the people whom I represent to continue until each of them has had an opportunity to be heard, even though slightly, and if there is any complaint to be made, as I have no doubt there is complaint being made, the complaint is due to me for my distribution of the time on this side, in which I have endeavored to be as fair as circumstances would permit. [Applause.]

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I rise to inquire what arrangement has been made with regard to extension of remarks?

The CHAIRMAN. Permission was given in the House to all persons who have spoken to extend their remarks. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this bill because I regard it as a very unjust and unfair bill from the standpoint of the people for whom I especially speak, and it is also unfair and unjust in other particulars as relates to the whole people of the United States. My district is specially interested in this, and we think we know something about the facts embraced in this agreement, or this arrangement, because my district, on the northern boundary, joins Ontario and Manitoba. I have lived within a short distance of that line for more than 30 years, and have observed the difference in the conditions of employment and of production and prices on both sides of the line. I will not take time to go into a discussion of the proposition which has been advanced here by some of the alleged friends of the farmers that the prices of wheat are just as high in Canada as in the United States. I know absolutely from personal knowledge and experience that it is not so. They are mistaken, and there has been a difference on this side to the advantage of the farmers on wheat alone of more than 10 cents a bushel, and sometimes a great deal more, for many, many years.

I do not think we can take the time here to analyze the reasons for this. The principal reason is that the wheat that we raise in the Northwestern and boundary States is spring wheat, is hard wheat, and that is principally consumed in the United States to mix with other kinds of wheat so as to make a more valuable and strong flour for bread making, and it commands a higher price than soft wheat, and, therefore, commands a price that is very much above the price at Liverpool.

I will say, further, that it seems to me that this bill is unfair to the people at large, to the consumer in every occupation of life. It is strange to me that the Democratic Party has not discovered that they are on the wrong track so far as legislation for tariff reform is concerned in this instance. They are, so to speak, trying to reduce the tariff by raising it, for the reason that in this bill you are taking away the duty on the raw material, the price of which was higher by reason of a protected market at home, and you do not remove the manufacturer's differential, or you very slightly change it.

Now, it is self-evident that there are two ways of increasing the protection of the manufacturer by changing customs duties. One is by leaving the duty as it is on the manufactured article and reducing the duty on the imported raw material; the other by raising the duty on the finished article while leaving unchanged the duty on the raw material. When I first came here it was at the beginning of the Fifty-eighth Congress. An extra session was called by the President to ratify the Cuban treaty. And I want to say right here that that was a treaty and not a pact or agreement which has no authority or validity in law. It was a treaty ratified by two-thirds of the Senate and printed in the statute books of the country, and we were called upon to put that into execution by proper revenue laws.

The Democrats were led by Mr. JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS and Mr. De Armond. It was my first experience in this House, and I remember it as if it were yesterday. What was the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi? Why, to amend the bill, to carry the treaty into effect. But here you say this "pact" can not be amended. What was the amendment then proposed? It was to wipe out the differential of the Sugar Trust, which amounted to 1¼ of a mill per pound—12½ cents upon 100 pounds. And they alleged in forcible and eloquent speeches that that 12½ cents on 100 pounds was the cause of the great monopoly, the Sugar Trust, having a strangle hold upon the Republican Party, and if we could wipe out the refiner's differential we would liberate the people of the United States from the grasp of the sugar monopoly. What a change has come over the spirit of our dreams! The leader of the Democratic Party comes up here now and proposes a differential of $1.25 a hundred, or 1¼ cents a pound, on beef and removes the duty entirely upon the raw material. Why, if it had been suggested to the Democratic floor leader at that time that we were to take off this duty on raw sugar entirely, thereby making the entire duty flow into the pockets of the Sugar Trust, he would have justly said that we were candidates for an insane asylum. And yet here is a proposition that is more than ten times as bad, because the differential is increased from 12½ cents per 100 pounds to $1.25 per 100 pounds on raw material absolutely free. Have you ever thought of that? The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] struck the keynote when he said this raised the duties of the Payne bill. Of course it does. It does not do it directly, but indirectly, by removing the duty on raw material all around.

And you do not seem to know it yet. I would like to have somebody debate the merits of this bill and answer this, because I have not heard any discussion of it on the floor so far. The carcass of a steer on the hoof, say, weighs 1,200 pounds, and when dressed it weighs 800 pounds. It costs $1 to slaughter that in the slaughterhouse. You can hire it done for that price. And here is a differential to the manufacturer of $10—1,000 per cent—10 times more than the total cost of production. What are you thinking about?

This bill was never prepared in the Committee on Ways and Means. It must have been prepared by some amateur clerks up in the department. Who can tell how many jokers there are in it? But the thing goes on. It is not meat alone. There is flour, as has been pointed out. There is 50 cents a barrel on flour, and the total tariff on the raw material is wiped off. And so it is with barley. The brewer gets his barley free, as does the maltster, but there is a duty on the beer and the malt. The effect of this is not to reduce duties, but to raise them, and you build a tariff wall around the manufacturers who are organizing trusts a mile high—higher than it has ever been before. It is a reward for combination, monopolistic combination, by the strength of which it is sought to rob the ultimate consumer in every walk of life. Cheap food, cheaper cost of living! Free raw material with duties on the finished product is revision downward, not for the consumer but for the trusts at the expense of the Treasury. You are tying us hand and foot and delivering us over to the meat trust and the flour trust and every other trust in the country. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, there is one remarkable thing that I have noticed in this debate, and that is that there is a dispute between gentlemen on that side and on this side as to whether this is a Republican or a Democratic measure. Why, bless your soul, it is neither one nor the other. It has all the faults of protection gone mad and of destructive free trade. It is the Democratic donkey, tail end first, and the rear end of the Republican ele-

phant. [Laughter and applause.] That is what it is. It has all the faults of both sides and none of the merits. [Laughter.]

A great deal has been said to the effect that we can not amend or change this bill because, as has been said, it is a pact. There is something sacred about the word "pact." What is this agreement? Has anybody signed it? No. It is a verbal agreement, and the Canadian minister writes, "That is my understanding," and our Secretary of State says, "Yes; that is right; that is my understanding." It is not an instrument in writing, and yet they come in here and say it is so sacred that you can not change it by crossing a "t" or dotting an "i."

It is said in the letter of the Canadian ministers to the Secretary of State, "It is agreed that the desired tariff changes shall not take the formal shape of a treaty but that the Governments of the two countries will use their utmost efforts to bring about such changes by concurrent legislation at Washington and Ottawa." Both the President and the ministers knew that there could be no treaty because the treaty power—the President and two-thirds of the Senate—would not agree to any such proposition. Now while I contend that the action of the President in agreeing to use his "utmost efforts" to secure this legislation was outside and beyond the limitations of the Constitution which vests the legislative power in Congress and requires that all bills raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives, yet I admit that the Canadian ministers were differently situated as to their Government, and for this reason: They, like Great Britain, are under the parliamentary system where there is almost complete merger of executive and legislative power in the House of Commons. The premier is a member and leader of the House, and virtually chief executive at the same time. The ministers of the Canadian Government who occupy this dual position might with propriety make this agreement, while on account of our Constitutional limitations the President seems to be without legal authority to do so.

While the President may recommend to our consideration such measures as he shall "judge necessary and expedient," he may not use the appointing power to persuade us, or his power to call or adjourn Congress to secure this or any other proposed legislation.

If he has authority to make such an agreement regarding trade and to carry it out in this manner, he would have the same right as to other subjects—such as the liquor traffic, marriage and divorce, child labor, strikes, and so forth. Would not the inevitable result be that our fundamental law would be so changed as to give the President not only the negative in legislation but the initiative also, and the power of the Presidency increased at the expense of the Congress? Laws would be submitted to us complete in form, and all we would have the right to do would be to say yes or no.

It is a tendency to merge both the legislative and executive power in the President, a tendency directly opposite to the change which has gradually taken place under the British Constitution, where the executive power has been merged in the House of Commons.

The one augments the power of the people, the other leads to autocracy.

The letter of the Canadian ministers speaks of the "Governments of the two countries," just as if it were a treaty, and it is not even preliminary to a treaty. While the ministers may be the "Government" of the Dominion, it is incorrect to speak of the President as the "Government," except when he is executing the treaty-making power, which confessedly was not intended. The object of this agreement was legislation by Congress and Parliament and not a treaty.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes; I will yield for a question.

Mr. FINLEY. Where does the gentleman think the President stands on this proposition?

Mr. STEENERSON. The President has evidently been misled, and he has succeeded in deluding the Democrats more than they have ever been deluded before, and more than I hope they will ever be deluded again. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Where and how did this bill originate? According to the President's message, it originated when the question of enforcing the maximum and minimum provisions of the Payne law against Canada came up. The first words of the reciprocity message reads as follows:

In my annual message of December 6, 1910, I stated that the policy of broader and closer trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, which was initiated in the adjustment of the maximum and minimum provisions of the tariff act of August 5, 1909, had proved mutually beneficial and that it justified further efforts for the readjustment of the commercial relations of the two countries.

The maximum and minimum provision is one that levies a 25 per cent higher rate of duty on commodities coming from a country that discriminates against our goods and refuses to treat us as fairly as the most favored nations are treated. Apparently, Canada refused to so treat us, but our Government did not enforce the penalty required by the act of Congress in question, but began to negotiate. It was a delicate situation, no doubt, but these Canadian friends of ours persisted in refusing to relieve us from discriminatory treatment in their markets.

Here is what the Canadian minister says of the origin of this matter and what happened.

Referring to his first meeting with Mr. Taft in connection with the operation of the maximum and minimum tariff imposed by the Payne bill, among other things Mr. Fielding stated the following, as given on page 2500 of the official record:

[Extract from speech made by Hon. W. S. Fielding, minister of finance of the Dominion of Canada, before the House of Commons, as reported in the House of Commons Debates, under date of Thursday, January 26, 1911.]

I will frankly say that I do not think Mr. Taft ever desired to impose the maximum tariff upon the products of Canada. The misfortune was that Congress had imposed the tariff. It was not a question of Mr. Taft doing it, as Congress had put that tariff on and declared that on and after a given date the products of all countries not exempted by special action of the President should become subject to the maximum tariff. The maximum tariff existed and was coming into operation in a few days. It was not a question of Mr. Taft putting it on, but of Mr. Taft being induced to take it off, as he had the power to do. * * * As I have already said, it was not a question of putting on the maximum tariff, it was a question of taking it off, and I found that the President of the United States was willing to take it off, if we could give him some decent excuse to do so under the terms of the American tariff law. We made a few changes, a few concessions of no earthly importance, so small and trifling that I am sure hardly any of us in the House could remember to-day what they were. But they served the purpose; they were enough to give Mr. Taft the reason and excuse he desired; and, accordingly, he issued his proclamation that Canada should not be placed under the disadvantage of the maximum tariff, which, if applied, would undoubtedly have done harm on both sides, most certainly to large business interests in Canada. Out of the negotiations at that time have sprung the larger negotiations of a more recent date.

I think by this time the farmers of the United States regret there ever was a maximum and minimum provision in the tariff law. That the opening up free of a market of 92,000,000 people—the greatest and most profitable market in the world—should be the reward of the Canadians for refusing to give us the most-favored-nations treatment will go down as the most remarkable diplomatic achievement in all history. After this, is it any wonder that some people say that the absorption of the United States by the British Empire is far more likely than our annexation of Canada?

We have had experience on the point that it is not every "revision downward" that benefits the people. Did free hides lower the price of shoes? No; not at all. What did it do? It lowered the farm price of hides all over the country, and every farmer in the land can tell you so. What else did it do? It deprived the United States Treasury of the two or three million dollars a year it had theretofore collected on imported cattle hides and turned it into the pockets of the shoe and leather trust, just exactly as this reciprocity arrangement will first reduce the farm price of all that the farmer produces and deprive the Treasury of the five or six million dollars a year heretofore received from duties on Canadian imports and turn it all over to combinations and trusts in this country. Our experience was exactly the same when we had a reciprocity treaty with Hawaii, whereby their sugar was admitted free. The Treasury lost the revenue and the people paid just exactly the same for sugar as they did before.

According to the logic of the advocates of this bill, that man in New York who invented the springs to put in the scales of the customhouse so as to underweigh the sugar imported was really engaged in a meritorious work; he was trying to reduce the cost of living by getting in cheaper sugar. He certainly reduced the duties; he revised the tariff downward—to the Sugar Trust. The trouble was that the trust forgot to pass the reduced price on to the consumer. He was engaged in doing exactly what this bill proposes—increasing the difference between the price at which the manufacturers' raw material and his finished product can be brought in.

The representatives of manufacturing interests in the East are again learnedly arguing that this pact will not injure the farmer, but the farmers think they know their own business as well as anybody. The device of assuming the guise of farmers' friend for an ulterior purpose will not work, for that trick can be played only once in an evening. To show just what the farmers think of reciprocity, I will insert in the RECORD resolutions passed in a mass meeting in Kittson County, right on the boundary line of Canada, and a mass convention

held recently at St. Paul, and also a letter from Justus C. Berg, one of our most prominent and representative farmers.

I say to you as earnestly as I can, that the injurious effects of this law go beyond the comprehension of most of us. It strikes at the industries of 30,000,000 people, and I believe eventually it will increase instead of diminish the cost of living to every man, woman, and child in the United States. How can a Congress elected by the people enact such a law in the exercise of their unbiased judgment? Well might we exclaim—

O judgment! thou art fled to brutish beasts,
And men have lost their reason—

if they will approve so monstrous a proposition as this. [Applause on the Republican side.]

APPENDIX.

A BIG MEETING—FARMERS AND BUSINESS MEN HOLD BIG ANTICANADIAN RECIPROCITY MEETING.

HALLOCK, MINN., *April 14, 1911.*

The mass meeting called by President P. H. Konzen, of the Hallock Commercial Club, last Saturday to draft resolutions against the pending Canadian reciprocity and to elect delegates to attend the State meeting at St. Paul, was probably one of the most enthusiastic and well attended public meetings ever brought together in Hallock. Fully 200 representative farmers from different parts of the county were present as delegates, and with the number that attended from town, the courthouse was crowded full. Though nonpolitical, the gathering was made up of men of different political ranks, and for once our Republican friends admitted that the pending Republican Canadian reciprocity pact was one of the most barefaced pieces of class legislation ever attempted upon an intelligent people, and they stood shoulder to shoulder with Democrats in denouncing it as unpatriotic, unjust, and discriminatory—sacrificing the interests of the agricultural masses to the insatiable greed of the capitalistic and manufacturing classes. The only objectionable feature about the whole meeting was that the committee on resolutions, in commending the stand taken by our United States Senators and Congressmen, either willfully or unintentionally left out the name of Congressman W. S. HAMMOND, the only Democratic Member from Minnesota, who worked as hard as any other Minnesotan for the defeat of the bill. P. H. Konzen was chosen presiding officer of the meeting and C. J. Estlund was chosen secretary, and the two were elected delegates to the St. Louis meeting, which met at the old Capitol Building last Tuesday, and, according to the Minneapolis Tribune of the 11th, we note that Mr. Konzen had been chosen by the St. Paul convention a member of the delegation whose duty it will be to carry the convention's protest to Congress at Washington, D. C. Here are the resolutions:

PREAMBLE AND RESOLUTIONS.

We, the people of Kittson County, Minn., in mass meeting assembled, believing that Canadian reciprocity, as proposed by the McCall or administration bill now pending before the United States Congress, is unjust and unequal, in that it brings the products of the farm into direct competition with like products of agricultural Canada, while providing no compensatory benefits in any of the articles of manufacture which we buy and consume, do hereby most earnestly protest against the passage of the said reciprocity pact, and unanimously unite in voicing our denunciation of the said act as unpatriotic, unjust, diabolical, and discriminatory, sacrificing the interests of the agricultural masses of the country to the insatiable greed and predatory aggrandizement of the capitalistic and manufacturing classes. And in furtherance of said protest, be it

Resolved, That we regard the said reciprocity treaty as inimical to our best interests and destructive of the only vestige of benefit that the farmer has ever received, or ever expects to receive, from the protective system which he has patriotically helped to maintain for what he conceived to be for the best interests of our common country.

Resolved, That we view, in the passage of the Canadian reciprocity act, a deliberate purpose to discriminate against the farming interests and to sacrifice its rights to the Moloch of corporate greed.

Resolved, That we regard the said act as a direct slap at the rural districts, and therefore shall hold any Member of the United States Congress who supports the same as hostile to our interests and our cause.

Resolved, That we believe that the large cities of our State—St. Paul, Minneapolis, and Duluth—in their strenuous efforts in behalf of the passage of the said reciprocity act, evince a reckless disregard for the rights of the toiling millions upon the broad farming domain of this and those other Western States whose wealth of golden grain and other products, pouring in a torrential stream into their laps, has contributed in no small degree to their prosperity and greatness; and that we view their zeal and activity in that behalf as an exhibition of sheer selfishness and without palliation in rhyme or reason other than that of local benefit at the expense of the rural interests.

Resolved, That we commend the stand taken by our United States Senators, Hon. KNUTE NELSON and Hon. M. E. CLAPP, and by our Representatives, the honorable Messrs. STEENERSON, VOLSTEAD, DAVIS, LINDBERGH, and ANDERSON in opposition to this most unjust and one-sided measure, and we most earnestly urge them to a continuance of such opposition, to the end that the said proposed bill may either be entirely defeated or at least so modified as to yield compensatory benefits to the agricultural interests of the country, for the protection of which they alone, as a class, are sought to be deprived.

Resolved, That the secretary of this meeting be instructed to forward to each of our United States Senators and to each Member of Congress from this State, as well as to the chairman of the mass meeting held at the old capitol building in the city of St. Paul on Tuesday, the 11th day of April, A. D. 1911, a copy of these resolutions.

ELMER C. YETTER.
W. E. FORD.
GEORGE BAKER.

RESOLUTION OF PROTEST.

We, farmers and business men of Minnesota in mass meeting assembled, do most earnestly and sincerely protest against the ratification by Congress of the pending treaty with Canada in its present form.

In doing so we hereby announce and publish the following reasons:

First. That the treaty is unfair, unjust, and discriminating against the agricultural interests of the United States, giving these interests practically nothing in return for what it deprives them of.

Second. That it will inure to the disadvantage, loss, and suffering of our producers without any prospect of cheaper manufactured products to the consumer.

Third. That the removal of the duty on wheat will accrue solely to the benefit of the miller; that of barley to the brewer; that of flaxseed to the linseed mills; and that of live stock, hogs, poultry, and dairy products to the packers and middlemen, and, while not benefiting the consumer, will mean a great loss to the producers.

Fourth. It creates an unfair competition, inasmuch as it will compel our farmers to compete in our own markets with the cheaply produced products of alien competitors. We contend that our home market belongs, in the first instance, to our own citizens.

Fifth. This pact, if agreed to, will retard and set back the progress toward a higher and better standard of farm life which has become so noticeable during the recent prosperous times; it will tend to bring on again that struggle for existence so well remembered by our pioneer farmers, a struggle in which many went under; it will lessen the opportunities for a better education of our farmers' children, and thus encourage them in leaving the farm.

DECLARES PACT WILL CAUSE LOSS.

Sixth. It will lessen the purchasing capacity of our American producers to the extent of millions of dollars annually by depriving them of a legitimate and fair price for their products. All of this will represent a corresponding loss to the commercial interests of our country, as the farmer's profit invariably finds its way into all the channels of trade. Our commercial and manufacturing interests stand to lose as much in this way as they will gain by the expansion of their business.

Seventh. Our American farmers, by their thrift, energy, and frugality, have made this country what it is; they have made it possible for the great commercial interests to become wealthy and powerful. Without the farmer this would have been impossible. In view of this our commercial interests should now stand by the farmer. To do otherwise lays them open to the charge of commercial greed and selfishness.

Eighth. The term "reciprocity" as applied to the Canadian treaty is a misnomer. Reciprocity means an equitable trade or exchange between two countries of products which one country produces and the other does not, or which it produces only in insufficient quantities. We produce everything in this country that is produced in Canada.

Ninth. It constitutes an agreement made secretly and without regard to any settled policies of our tariff laws. It means free trade for the farmer and protection for the manufacturer, and as such is discrimination in its rankest form.

ASSERTS RIGHT TO HOME MARKET.

Tenth. That in trading off our home market of over 90,000,000 people, a market that is and has been abundantly supplied by our own producers, a market that has been built up by American thrift and frugality, and which by every inherent right and heritage belongs to our producers, for that of 8,000,000 Canadians, with its doubtful increased advantages to commercial and manufacturing interests, would not only be unfair and unjust to our own producers, but foolish and reprehensible.

Eleventh. This proposed treaty, when divested of its sentimental features, can and will appeal only to those who are selfishly interested and who expect to gain thereby. As a whole, it will be a damage rather than a benefit to our country. In its present form it should not be ratified.

Twelfth. We repudiate the action of President Taft, large manufacturing concerns, chambers of commerce, and the management of the Great Northern Railway in attempting to force the so-called reciprocity agreement through Congress without giving the people at large an opportunity to give it due consideration or to express their opinions. We regret exceedingly that the city press has failed to give publicity to both sides of this most important question.

BLAMES THE MIDDLEMEN.

Thirteenth. The proposed pact would not reduce the cost of living. It would not benefit the laboring man, the mechanic, or artisan in the great cities, as the exorbitant prices paid by them for produce is not occasioned by the price received by the farmer, but is the result of the excessive charges made by the railroads and middlemen. The farmer only receives 35 per cent of the price paid by the consumer, while the transportation companies and middlemen receive the other 65.

Fourteenth. We hereby express our thanks to all those newspapers of our State who in this controversy have risen above considerations of selfishness and have defended the farming interests against this threatening danger, and we mention expressly the Northwestern Agriculturist, the Farm, Stock, and Home, and the Farmer, and we also thank all members of our legislature and other citizens who have interested themselves in calling this meeting.

Fifteenth. We urge on all our citizens who are in favor of fair play and equality before the law to make continuous and effective agitation against this treaty.

Sixteenth. That copies of these resolutions be sent to the President of the United States and to each of our Senators and Representatives in the Congress.

HENDRUM, MINN., *April 11, 1911.*

Hon. HALVOR STEENERSON,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: I feel moved to address you and thank you for the stand you took last session of Congress in opposition to the Canadian reciprocity agreement, and hope you will do all within your power to prevent its passage this session.

In my capacity as an officer of a farmers' organization covering three of the Northwestern States and other local cooperative concerns I have come in contact with many representative farmers.

I was deeply impressed with the spontaneous opposition the introduction of this Canadian agreement created. This opposition is nearly, if not entirely, unanimous among the farmers of the Northwest. The reasons for this opposition are common and identical. And I can assure you that no mending or changing of the reciprocity bill, even to absolute free trade with Canada, will change the common conviction that this measure is being forced upon the farmers as an excuse for conditions for which they can not justly be held responsible.

The sentiment is so rapidly gaining force that should this bill or any other bill placing agricultural products on the free list pass, the only consistent course for the farmers to take is to stand for absolute free trade with the entire world, and compel, if they can, this country to resort to direct taxation.

It is conceded by all parties that the agricultural sections of the Central and Northwestern States have been the manufacturers' stanchest supporters in building and supporting the policy of high protection. Is this our reward? If so, we have come to the parting of the ways. We have stood for protection in the past, and have been the least benefited. Now that the time has come when we to a limited degree share its benefits, are they to be taken away from us?

Production on land already under cultivation can easily be multiplied by three if farming is sufficiently profitable to warrant the necessary preparation and investment of capital. I believe with others that have studied agricultural conditions carefully that the United States will be self-supporting for generations to come if farming should prove sufficiently profitable to be attractive.

No vocation, or profession either, attains a high degree of efficiency unless its remuneration is commensurate with capital and energy expended. Nor are the American farmers an exception to this rule. To make farming attractive it must have the means to make it comfortable, and that makes for contentment—in other words, share the Nation's prosperity.

Economists and sociologists view with serious apprehension the movement from the farm to the larger cities. The bill in question, or any other legislation adverse to the farmers, can only augment this movement. There may be a few of us so situated that we need not continue in an unprofitable business, but what per cent of the farmers are so situated?

The only excuse offered in introducing or recommending this Canadian reciprocity agreement was that it would reduce the cost of living. But have the consumers of farm products any assurance that their wages will not be correspondingly reduced? If the farmer suffers, will it not sooner or later react on the city laborers? The adjustment will surely follow when the country boys offer themselves on the labor market in competition with others that sell their labor.

These are a few points the farmers would like Congress to consider carefully before they pass a bill that is unpopular to nearly one-third of the country's voters.

If we can assist you in any way, you have but to address us.

Yours, respectfully,

JUSTUS C. BERGH.

Mr. ANDERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, the agreement or informal treaty between the United States and the Dominion of Canada which it is intended to ratify on the part of the United States by this bill proposes to change the economic and commercial relations of the two countries upon the basis of alleged mutual and reciprocal advantage. Stripped of its sentimental considerations, it presents a purely business proposition of whether or not the commissioners have made an intelligent bargain.

Briefly stated, for the purpose of the determination of this question, the bill presents a proposed reciprocal free list, which includes only the raw products of the farm, such as wheat, oats, rye, barley, flax, butter, and cheese, designated as Schedule A, and a proposed reciprocal dutiable list which contains certain specified articles of manufacture, designated as Schedule B.

The proposition is not a new one, and fortunately may, at least in part, be determined by the light that is furnished by the experience of the past, and it is worth while in this connection to consider the trade relations which have heretofore existed between the two countries.

In 1854 the Democratic Party, flushed with victory, as now, presented a proposed reciprocal agreement between the two countries for the assent of Congress which provided for free trade between the two countries in natural products. This treaty was identical with the free list proposed in this agreement, with the exception that it included flour and breadstuffs; fresh, smoked, and salted meats; hides; stone and marble; ores and metals; lumber of all kinds; rice; gypsum; unmanufactured tobacco; and rags, and in this respect offered to the consumer and the farmer some advantages which this treaty does not.

It will be noted that in the treaty of 1854 not an article the value of which had been enhanced by manufacture was included in the agreement.

The contemporaneous statesmanship of that period is unanimous as to the disastrous effects upon the commerce of the United States of the treaty of 1854, and upon its final abrogation in 1866 the resolution providing for its abrogation was supported by such men as John Sherman, of Ohio; Senators Morrill, of Maine; Chandler, of Michigan; Doolittle, of Wisconsin; Henry Wilson, of Massachusetts; and many others. Manufacturing New England was among the first to demand the abrogation of the treaty.

The resolution to abrogate the treaty passed in the Senate by a vote of 38 to 0. In the debate upon the resolution to abrogate the treaty Senator Foote, of Vermont, said:

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 people of the American States. The very title of the treaty itself 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 injures the other. Such are the practical results of the 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 propose now to consider some of the effects of the treaty of 1854 upon our commerce. In the four years immediately preceding the going into effect of the treaty our importations from Canada, free of duty, amounted to $4,107,392. Those paying duty amounted to $15,002,034, or nearly four times greater. In the four years immediately succeeding the commencement of the treaty our imports from Canada, free of duty, increased to $59,419,926, while those subject to duty decreased to $2,150,394, or 1 in 28, a total importation of $61,570,320, as against $19,110,026 in the four years preceding the treaty. On the other hand, our exports to Canada dwindled from $20,771,691 in 1855 to $15,243,834 in 1866, and in the same period Canada's exports to us increased from $12,000,000 to $46,000,000, of which $25,000,000 was farm products. In this connection Senator Collomer, speaking in favor of the abrogation of the treaty, said:

The amount received by them (Canada) under the treaty free of duty, since it went into operation, was $73,000,000, and the amount received by us from them $115,000,000—

A balance of trade in favor of Canada of $41,000,000—

and yet we had at that time 30,000,000 people to produce, while Canada had but 3,000,000.

When the treaty began, upon all exports and imports between the two countries, we had a balance of trade of $8,000,000, which, at the expiration of the treaty, had turned into a balance of $30,000,000 against us.

Immediately upon the abrogation of the treaty of 1854 the statesmen of Canada began again to knock at our doors for the admission of her farm products, beseeching us for a resumption of reciprocal relations in the products of the farm, but its disastrous effects were still fresh in our memory, and up to the present time we have steadfastly refused to be drawn into any proposition looking to the free admission of the natural products of the Dominion.

President Grant, in his first administration, declined to consider such a proposition, giving as his reason that the advantages of such a treaty would be wholly in favor of the British producers, excepting in the case of a few engaged in transportation. In his second administration he offered to make a new treaty which should include the free admission into Canada of a large number of manufactured products, but the Dominion officials, adhering then as now to the policy of protection of her manufacturing industries, refused to make a treaty upon that basis.

Again, in the administration of President Harrison, the matter of a reciprocal arrangement contemplating the free admission of natural products was considered, and, in a message to the Congress, President Harrison denounced the proposition in the following language:

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 to 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 of those articles into Canada and against the world.

In another message to Congress referring to reciprocity between the two countries, he said:

The conference developed the fact that the Canadian Government was only prepared to offer to the United States in exchange for the concessions asked the admission of natural products. This admission, which was foreseen, necessarily terminated the conference upon this question. The benefits of an exchange of natural products would be almost wholly with the people of Canada.

The Republican platform of 1904 provided:

We have extended widely our foreign markets, and we believe in the adoption of all practicable methods for their future 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.

It will be noted from the excerpts which I have read that the policy of the American statesmanship of the past has been to decline the overtures of the Canadian Government looking to reciprocity in natural products, in view of the disastrous results to our commerce and the experiences of the treaty of 1854, unless our concessions in the opening of the American market to the natural products of Canada were met with a reciprocal concession on the part of Canada providing for the free or favored admission of our manufactured products into the Dominion. And that, so far as the Republican Party is concerned, it has never contemplated reciprocity with Canada unless it could be effectuated without injury to any American industry, including agriculture.

The present treaty attempts to anticipate the objection that no reciprocal advantages are offered to our manufacturing industries, by injecting into this agreement what is denominated a reciprocal dutiable list and described as Schedule B. An examination of this schedule, however, discloses the fact that the shadow has been substituted for the substance. It discloses further that no attempt was made to so arrange these schedules of the treaty that it would permit the entry into Canada upon equal terms of any of the manufactured products of this country which compete with the industry of the Dominion or with im-

portations from Great Britain. On the contrary, Schedule B is a compromise between the duty upon specified articles provided by the Payne-Aldrich bill and the duties provided by the general tariff laws of Canada.

But in no case is the reduction in duty sufficient to warrant the assumption that any substantial benefit or increased trade will inure to the American manufacturer. The unquestioned statements of the Canadian statesmen upon this proposition are convincing.

As late as 1903 Sir John Charlton, in an address to the Canadian Parliament, said:

> Something must be done to change the trade conditions that exist between the United States and Canada. Free trade in natural products would afford a reasonable adjustment. Nothing short of this will do, and this condition of free trade of natural products must be granted by the United States without a solitary concession from Canada further than she has already made. We can not afford any more.

How close the pending agreement approximates the Canadian ideal I shall make plain later on in an analysis of the trade relations between the two countries.

In addressing the Canadian House of Commons on March 7 of this year, speaking on the reciprocity agreement, Sir Wilfrid Laurier said:

> We (Canada) are above all an agricultural people. Our chief wealth is the growth of these products of the Temperate Zone. * * * I stated a moment ago that the agreement we made is simply to get better prices for the products of the Canadian farmer. * * * Years ago we had a cattle trade with Great Britain. We have some yet, but it is not as large as it ought to be, because everybody knows that it has been constantly retarded by the embargo put upon it some 20 years ago or so, and, therefore, if we are not able to sell all the cattle we can raise in Great Britain there is a ready market in the United States. * * * It is not a great effort of imagination to suppose that the Americans were far more concerned about obtaining reciprocity in manufactured products than in natural products, but our negotiators would not consent to any reciprocity in manufactured products, but insisted on limiting the agreement simply to such manufactured products as agricultural implements.

To my mind this indicates beyond any question that however the treaty may be regarded on this side of the line, on the Canadian side of the line it is regarded as relating only to natural products and as making no concession whatever to our manufacturing interests. To what extent a free exchange of natural products is reciprocal in its advantages to the United States can be gathered from the tables submitted in connection with the message of the President of the United States, January 21, 1911, in transmitting the treaty to Congress, from which I take the figures which follow:

During the fiscal year 1910 the American tariff upon wheat was 25 cents a bushel. Canada's tariff upon wheat was 12½ cents a bushel. In spite of the fact that our tariff as against the Canadian wheat was twice that of the Canadian duty upon American wheat, Canada imported from us only 55,139 bushels in 1910, while we imported from Canada 2,317,191 bushels, which does not take into consideration the 12,000,000 bushels which were brought into the United States and turned into flour and then shipped back into Canada under the drawback and bond provision of the Payne-Aldrich law, without the payment of any duty, and which, of course, under this treaty would come into competition with the wheat produced in this country.

The tariff upon butter in the United States was 6 cents per pound. The Canadian tariff was 4 cents per pound. Notwithstanding the fact that the Canadian tariff was 2 cents less than ours, we exported to Canada but 61,081 pounds, while Canada exported to the United States, paying a tariff of 6 cents per pound, 980,036 pounds.

Our tariff on cheese was 6 cents per pound. Canada's tariff was 3 cents per pound. We exported to Canada 215,681 pounds. Canada exported to us 163,355 pounds. This, however, tells but a small portion of the story. In the same year Canada exported to Great Britain 164,090,903 pounds of cheese and 5,353,770 pounds of butter. What will be the result when this butter and cheese is diverted to the nearer market of the United States, as it will be when these articles are placed on the free list?

Taking the figures submitted by the President in connection with his message transmitting the treaty to Congress, the articles which are now dutiable but which will be free when exported into Canada from the United States under Schedule A amount to $21,957,605, while the articles now dutiable and which it is proposed to make free under the agreement coming from Canada amount to $39,811,560, a balance of trade in Canada's favor of $17,653,955. This, of course, is applying the terms of the treaty to the trade between the two countries as if it had been in force during the year 1910. When you add to this balance of trade the tremendous amount of natural products of Canada's 800,000,000 acres of farm land which will seek the nearer American market under free trade, it becomes at once apparent that the balance of trade in Canada's favor under the free-trade provisions of Schedule A must reach tremendous proportions and will constantly increase.

Having disposed of the advantage which will inure to Canada by the adoption of this agreement, it becomes necessary to determine what reciprocal advantage, if any, will inure to the benefit of the United States.

The determination of this question involves an inquiry into the effect of the treaty upon our manufacturers, our consumers, and our farmers. It will be remembered from what I have said heretofore that Canada's position in the past has been to decline to consider any proposition looking to the admission into Canada of our manufactured products. I think I shall be able to show that she has adhered strictly to that policy in the pending agreement.

Immediately upon the abrogation of the treaty of 1854, and beginning with 1866, our exports to Canada greatly increased. In that year our exports amounted to $28,794,000; in 1903 they had increased to $137,600,000; in 1910 they reached the enormous total of $239,000,000. Of the latter amount, nearly $100,000,000 consisted of manufactured products. Our exports to Canada are 56 per cent of her total imports from all countries. Our balance of trade against Canada in 1910 amounted to $141,000,000, proving conclusively, to my mind, that Canada is now buying in our market nearly 60 per cent of all that she buys from all foreign countries, including Great Britain, and that she prefers to buy of us. There is no reason to assume that she will buy more under the proposed arrangement; but if this treaty had been in force at the beginning of the fiscal year 1910, out of the $133,000,000 worth of goods subject to duty which we shipped into Canada in 1910 only $25,000,000 worth would have received the benefit of reduced duties provided in the law, and these would have received the benefits of an average reduction of duty of only 17 per cent. While our manufacturers of carpets, clothing, collars and cuffs, cotton print, sheets, telephone and telegraph instruments and fixtures, firearms, furniture, window glass, gloves, knit goods, leather goods, leather beltings, sewing machines, boots and shoes, silk goods, typewriters, ribbons, velvets, woolen blankets, flannels, cloths used in the production of men's clothing, granite, marble, slag, mill machinery, scales, organs, pianos, harness, harness hardware, and a hundred and one of our great lines of production in the United States would still have been obliged, and will still be obliged, should this treaty become operative, to pay the duties which they have heretofore had to pay when these goods were exported to Canada. They not only get no reduction of duty upon their products, but must compete with the products of Great Britain imported into Canada under a preferential tariff of 33⅓ per cent. How much the markets of Canada will be opened by this agreement to the manufactured products of the United States may be imagined when we stop to consider that upon the few articles mentioned in the so-called reciprocal dutiable list in the agreement the average reduction of duty made by Canada on products of American manufacture is 17 per cent, while the average reduction made by the United States upon the manufactures of Canada is 39 per cent.

How small a concession has been made to the manufacturers of the United States may be gleaned from the fact that while the total trade between the two countries amounted to $326,963,231 in 1910, the amount of that trade which would have been affected by the reduction in this bill amounts to $33,391,952, or in fact slightly in excess of 10 per cent of the total trade between the two countries. This so-called concession, it seems to me, hardly justifies us in subjecting our farmers to the competition not only to the constantly increasing production of Canada's 800,000,000 acres, but as well to the competition of the $100,000,000 in value of the surplus farm products of Canada which now seek the markets of England, but which under free trade with the United States must inevitably turn to the free-trade market in this country.

We come now to the consideration of the effect of the treaty upon the consumer of this country. President Taft in his message disposes of that feature of the case in the following language:

> I do not wish to hold out the prospect that the unrestricted interchange of food products will greatly and at once reduce their cost to the people of this country.

Mr. Taft might have gone further than that. He would have stated the truth had he said that with the exception of one or two articles, such as butter and eggs, which are consumed in their natural state, there is not the slightest ground to be found in the treaty for the belief that the consumer would get any benefit whatever from its provisions. He might have said that as far as the consumer is concerned it perpetuates all of the inequalities and injustices of the Payne-Aldrich bill.

While the agreement does remove the duty on wheat it retains a duty upon flour. While it removes the duty upon cattle, hogs, and sheep it still retains a duty of 1¼ cents per pound upon fresh and salted meats, bacon, and ham, and it may be confidently asserted that while the duties upon these manufactured food products have been slightly reduced, taking into consideration the fact that the raw products out of which they are manufactured are upon the free list, the duties imposed by this bill are actually higher, from the standpoint of the consumer, than were the duties of the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill, and provide a greater rate of protection to the manufacturers.

It must be remembered that duties upon manufactured products are of two kinds—a compensatory duty which is intended to compensate the manufacturer for the duty which he is obliged to pay for the raw products contained in the manufacture when they are imported from a foreign country and a protective duty upon the manufactured articles themselves. The latter is called the differential duty.

Under the Payne-Aldrich law the duty upon wheat was 25 cents per bushel. It takes 4½ bushels of wheat to make 1 barrel of flour. So that in order to compensate the miller for the duty upon the wheat in the flour it is necessary to impose a tariff upon the barrel of flour of four and one-half times 25 cents, or $1.12. So far the miller has had no protection whatever to cover the difference, if any, of the cost of making the flour. The actual tariff imposed by the Payne bill upon the barrel of flour was 25 per cent ad valorem. The average price of the flour imported from Canada to the United States in 1910 was $5 per barrel, making a specific tariff upon a barrel of flour of $1.25. Taking from this $1.25 of actual duty imposed the $1.12 which represents the compensatory duty on the wheat in the flour leaves an actual protection to the miller of 13 cents per barrel.

Now, then, under the proposed reciprocity agreement wheat is on the free list, so that it is unnecessary to compensate the miller for any duty upon wheat, and it becomes at once apparent that the 50 cents per barrel imposed upon flour by the agreement is a purely protective duty and is nearly four times as great as the protection afforded the miller under the Payne law. Indeed, the tariff of 50 cents a barrel is more than twice the total cost of manufacturing a barrel of flour in this country.

This situation is not confined to flour. The same demonstration could be made in the case of meats, bacon, and ham, and all other manufactured products considered in the agreement, which are manufactured in whole or in part from the products of agriculture. It is a fitting monument to the sagacity of the Canadian commissioners that in this agreement they have so arranged the duties that they (Canadians) can ship the cattle, hogs, and sheep raised upon the cheap and fertile lands of that empire of the Northwest into the United States without the payment of any duty whatever, but that when our packers and our millers have manufactured them into beef, hams, bacon, and mutton, they can not sell these manufactured products in Canada except upon paying a duty of 1¼ cents a pound, but in selling to the American consumer they still get the benefit of the duty as against any competition from Canada.

There is no great amount of comfort for the consumer in the placing of the products of agriculture upon the free list, as it has been ages since the human race has been accustomed to eat the raw product of the farm in its natural state. And it is worth notice that the same duty which prevents the American miller and the American packer from shipping his product into Canada prevents the American consumer from getting one cent of reduction in the price of these products.

I come now to the consideration of the effect of the agreement upon the agricultural sections of this country. I do not consider it last because I consider it less important than the others, for I consider it the most important feature of the entire proposition.

I remember when as a boy I heard the great Republicans of State and Nation telling the farmers of the benefits they had derived and would derive from the policy of protection upon farm products. You have been telling them this for 40 years. Now you propose to tell them that they never needed any protection and do not need it now. You expect them to believe you, because, forsooth, you have been lying to them for 40 years. Whatever others may do in this situation, I do not propose to be a party to the deception. I am convinced that the farmer has derived a benefit from protection upon his product in the past, and I am unwilling that these products should be placed upon the free list now without any reciprocal or compensatory advantages whatever. I am opposed to placing the farmers' products upon the free list without any investigation of the effect of placing them there and without any demonstration of the propriety and justice of doing so.

I have always had a great deal of confidence in that saying of the great emancipator, so often and so unctiously displayed in the Republican campaign textbooks of the past:

> I do not know much about the tariff, but I do know that when we buy our goods in foreign countries we get the goods and the foreigner gets the money, but when we buy our goods in this country we keep both the goods and the money.

And I apply that doctrine alike to the farmer and the manufacturer to the country merchant and the jobber. In fact, the experience, not only of this country, but of all countries of long-established prosperity—such countries as France and Germany—demonstrates beyond the power of any present consideration to abrogate it the proposition that protection to be effectual must commence with protection to the farmer.

The last platform of the Republican Party provided:

> The aim and purpose of the Republican policy being not only to preserve, without excessive duties, the security against foreign competition to which American manufacturers, farmers, and producers are entitled, but also to maintain the high standard of living of the wage-workers of this country—

demonstrating conclusively that up to 1908 we had not abandoned the theory of protecting the products of the farm. That protection to be effectual must so limit the supply and consequently affect the price that the farmer shall be able to maintain a balance of trade in his favor against the world. In other words, it must so regulate the competition of foreign countries that the farmer shall be able to sell his product at such a price and buy what he uses in his business at such a price that he will always have a balance with which he can improve his farm, educate himself and his family, preserve the fertility of his soil, and improve his methods of cultivation. This is the basis of the prosperity of not only the farmer, but the Nation. You may dig deep in the well of memory, you may go back far in the pages of the history of the world, and you will find that the prosperity of nations has been in a large measure the result of the prosperity of the farmer.

You propose to maintain this prosperity by compelling the farmer to sell his product in a free-trade market in competition with one of the greatest agricultural sections in the world and to buy his goods in a highly protected market.

Now, it is claimed by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] that the benefits which the farmer receives from protection is an indirect benefit, arising from the larger employment and higher wages of the laborer and the larger production of the factory under protection, but I do not understand the philosophy that concludes that the farmer's direct protection should be reduced because he has an indirect protection.

The very process which removes the direct protection decreases the indirect benefit by decreasing the purchasing power of the farmers, and consequently reducing the production and wages of the employees of the factory.

It might be pertinent to inquire in this connection where it is that the prosperity expert gets his facts. Does he go to the factory and inquire what men are employed, and at what wages? No. He goes out to the farm and learns that the crops are well put in, that the weather conditions are good, that there is no prospect of drought, that the chinch bugs have not devastated the crop, and he comes back and makes the report, and the factory owner increases his product, raises the wages of his men 5 per cent, and adds 20 per cent to the price of his goods, because he knows that this year the farmer will have the money to buy a new pair of felt boots, a new overcoat, build a new hog house, and buy his wife a new spring bonnet.

He goes out again next year and he finds that in one section there has been too much rain and that the black rust has attacked the crops, that the grasshopper has devastated the fields, and the prospects are for a lean year in agriculture. He comes back and makes his report. The factory owner curtails his production, shortens the hours of his men, because he knows that this year the farmer will have no felt boots, will use his last year's overcoat, that he will make last year's hog house do still another year, and that the farmer's wife will wear last year's styles.

Canada is preeminently a country of protection.

Under that policy 184 factories with a combined American capital of $233,000,000 have been established. The logic of the situation does not lead me to conclude that she is now relinquishing any part of the policy which has enabled her to bring about a situation which must be so gratifying to her. She is not relinquishing under this agreement one iota of protection which she has afforded to her manufacturers in the past. We

must not forget that the protection afforded by this agreement is ample to protect her industries.

Canada to-day is adopting the identical policy which we adopted 50 years ago, and which we now propose to abandon; a policy under which we attracted to our new and fertile lands the farmers and tradesmen of England, France, Germany, Norway, and Sweden; a policy under which we built up our agriculture and at the same time provided the industries which should make a home market for the farmers' products. During the same period we sold our surplus food products in the markets of free-trade England. To-day under that free-trade policy agricultural land within 10 miles of the world's market, London, is selling for $125 per acre.

Under this agreement Canada is providing herself with a free-trade market in the United States for her surplus farm products. At the same time she is protecting the home market made by her manufacturing industries by an amply high tariff against the competition of the United States.

She will attract to her new and fertile lands the farmers and tradesmen of the States and provide for them both a home market in Canada and a free market in the United States under this agreement. For 30 years, from 1860 to 1890, the agriculture of New England stood still. She was feeling the competition of the cheaper lands in the Mississippi Valley. Under this agreement the agriculture of the United States will stand still.

I want briefly now to consider the effect of Canadian competition in farm products upon the price to the farmer.

It is claimed that the incoming tide of foreign farm products will not affect the prices to the farmer by reason of the fact that in foodstuffs and farm products we are an exporting Nation. It requires no figures to demonstrate the fallacy of that conclusion to any man who is familiar with the facts. However, there is abundant evidence, including the report of the Tariff Board recently submitted in response to a resolution of the Senate (S. Doc. No. 849), that the price of land in Canada is much lower than the price of land in agricultural sections of this country; that the price of farm labor is from 17 to 25 per cent lower in Canada than in the United States; and, taking wheat as an example, that the price of wheat in Winnipeg, as compared with Minneapolis, both of which have the same freight rate to Liverpool, is from 11 to 15 cents lower in Winnipeg than in Minneapolis. A proportional difference in the prices of farm products to the producer in Canada and the United States is found practically in all farm products.

It seems to me inevitable that under these conditions, including the difference in the price of land, of labor, and of greater production—the average production of spring wheat in this country being 11.7 bushels and in Canada 15.33 bushels, and winter wheat in this country 15.8 bushels and in Canada 23.49 bushels (report of Tariff Board, p. 94)—these prices must necessarily seek a common level. But assuming that the price of wheat in this country should be decreased only 1 cent a bushel the loss of purchasing power of the American farmer will aggregate nearly $7,000,000 annually, and if the price in Canada should be increased 1 cent a bushel, which is by no means necessarily true, there would be an increase in the purchasing power of the Canadian of a little over a million and a half dollars. This situation will be found all through the entire schedule of agricultural products, and it should illustrate the absurdity of trading the purchasing power of 90,000,000 people for the purchasing power of 9,000,000 people.

Men will tell you that the competition of Canada will not affect the price. I shall not recite any figures of exports to set aside this conclusion, though a careful examination of our exports in farm products leads me to the contrary conclusion, for the experience of every man will tell him that if he has all of a product that will be consumed within the limits of his own market and considerably more, for that matter, which can be exported to other markets, and some competitor should flood his market with a large quantity of the same product, that the inevitable result must be a depression in the price.

No man can tell, or has attempted to tell, how much Canadian produce will break our markets. But the laws which govern this proposition are as immutable as the laws of nature. Gregory King, the noted political economist and mathematician, lays down the following rule: In a commodity a surplus of one-tenth lowers the price below the common rate three-tenths; two-tenths lowers the price below the common rate eight-tenths; three-tenths lowers the price below the common rate sixteen-tenths; four-tenths lowers the price below the common rate twenty-eight tenths; five-tenths lowers the price below the common rate forty-five tenths. It would be difficult to overestimate the importance of the application of this principle to our proposed opening of our markets to the products of Canada.

Many men on this floor have deplored the tendency of centralization of population in the large cities, the movement from the farm to the large city; not one of them but would decrease that tendency if it were possible. To my mind there are two ways by which it can be done. One is by increasing the prosperity of the farmer, enabling him to surround himself in so far as it is possible with the conveniences of the city; the other is to make him so poor that he can not move away. The statesmanship that advocates this bill seems to prefer the latter method.

In my own district, one of the oldest and most thickly settled of the agricultural sections of the great agricultural State of Minnesota, the agricultural population in the last 10 years has decreased nearly 15 per cent as a result of the exodus which has taken place in that time to the cheaper and consequently more profitable lands of North and South Dakota and Montana, where profits may be secured with less labor and with less capital. This exodus will not be discontinued. On the contrary, it will be accelerated, but it will be diverted from the lands of the United States to the virgin prairie of Manitoba and Saskatchewan, and, to my mind, the greatest asset which Canada will secure by this agreement will be the American farmer. My State is spending thousands of dollars annually to repopulate her abandoned farms—thousands of dollars to make fertile her farms—for she realizes that every farmer that settles upon one of her farms brings an added wealth and added buying capacity of $1,000 annually.

I have been unable to secure definite figures showing to what extent immigration from this country to Canada has taken place in the past, but I think it may be confidently asserted that 400,000 Americans have gone to Canada in the last five years. This immigration can not but be accelerated under the provisions of this agreement which enable the Canadian farmer to raise his product upon the cheap lands of Canada and sell it in competition with the product of the American farmer, in the American market upon an equal basis.

In concluding these remarks let me say that from the consideration which I have laid down I can not come to any other conclusion than that the advantages of this agreement inure wholly to the benefit of Canada; that the progress of the industries of this country will be very greatly retarded; that the prosperity and independence of our farmers will be decreased; that there is an entire and absolute lack of any reciprocal advantage to any of our people or our industries in the agreement.

I would be glad, indeed, if we might obtain a wider market either for the production of our farms or our factories. I think I should be willing even to concede a part of our market if we were offered any share in the Canadian market.

But I can come to no other conclusion than that the prosperity and independence of the American farmer is much too high a price to pay for the concessions which Canada offers in the pending agreement.

Mr. DALZELL. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. HELGESEN].

Mr. HELGESEN. Mr. Chairman, coming as I do from one of the greatest agricultural States in this country, a State that up to the present time has been almost wholly dependent upon agriculture for its success and its prosperity, it is but natural that I should be highly interested in the speeches that have been made on both sides of this great question. I have been particularly interested in the speeches that have been made by the gentlemen who favor this proposition; and were it not because the consequences will be so serious, I should be highly amused, because from those speeches we are led to believe that the farmers of this country are a lot of ignoramuses, who do not know either what they want, or what is for their own good, or what makes for their own welfare.

Now, my friends, I want to say to you that the farmers of to-day are not what they were 50 years ago. At that time there were comparatively few educated farmers, few men who read the daily press, few men who studied the agricultural journals that are now spread abroad over this country, and then it was easy to fool the farmer; but, my friends, to-day you can go out over the broad prairies of the West, and you will find a different class of people; men who have been educated in the high schools, academies, and universities of the country, and tens of thousands of whom have been educated in the agricultural colleges that are standing to-day as a perpetual monument to the wisdom and patriotism of the Republican Party. You can not fool those men as you did before, and they know that this bill that is now before the House will, if it passes, give them the worst end of the bargain. I live in a locality that is only 20 miles from the Canadian line, and I do not have to go to statistics; I do not have to go to the daily

press. I know what the farmer is getting on both sides of the line for farm products. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I know, and any man who has had any experience in the matter knows, that for several years the farmers on this side of the line have been getting an average of from 8 to 12 cents per bushel more for wheat and in the neighborhood of 30 cents per bushel more for barley and about 25 cents per bushel more for flax than the farmers on the Canadian side. In all the speeches that have been made on the floor of this House no man has attempted to deny this fact, and what has troubled them has been to find a plausible reason for the existence of such a difference in the price of the products of the farm in primary markets that are only from 1 to 10 miles apart, outside of the duty that is levied on foreign farm products. This does not trouble the people in our State, for they all know that it is caused by the duty, and the duty alone.

In order to show you the relative value of the three principal crops that are raised in both countries—wheat, barley, and flax—I have here a table showing the prices paid on the various dates mentioned in the table. I will have this table inserted in the RECORD, but I will call your attention now to the fact that for the week ending December 31, 1910, wheat was sold on this side of the line for from 10 to 11 cents more than it was on the other side in towns that were only from 2 to 10 miles apart. On January 10, 1911, the difference in the price was 15 cents in favor of the North Dakota farmer. On January 9, 10, and 11, 1911, the difference in the price of barley in favor of our farmers was from 24 to 29 cents. On the same dates, January 9, 10, and 11, 1911, the difference in the price of flax averaged fully as much as the amount of the duty—25 cents per bushel. As a concrete example, take Portal and North Portal, which are really one town, in which the boundary line between North Dakota and Saskatchewan forms one of the principal streets. Here you will find that there was the same difference in the price of wheat, barley, or flax on the two sides of the street that there was in all the other towns mentioned in the table. Is there any man on either side of this House who is foolish enough to believe that the American miller would pay from 10 to 15 cents per bushel more for wheat, about 30 cents per bushel more for barley, and about 25 cents per bushel more for flax on the south side of a certain street in Portal than they could buy it for on the other side of the same street if the duty was removed? This idea is so absurd that it needs no argument before an audience as intelligent as this.

WHEAT.

Prices paid for week ending Dec. 31, 1910.

UNITED STATES.	Cents.	CANADA.	Cents.
Pembina	89–91	Emerson	79–81
Neche	91	Gretna	81
Hannah	90	Snowflake	77
Walhalla	89–91	Haskett	78–79
Sarles	89½	Crystal City	76
Hansboro	90	Cartwright	77–79
St. John	90	Boissevain	80
Antler	91	Lyleton	78
Portal	86	North Portal	75
Kermit	88	Estevan	74
Souris	93	Waskada	77

Prices paid Jan. 10, 1911.

UNITED STATES.	Cents.	CANADA.	Cents.
Pembina	97	Emerson	82
Neche	96	Gretna	81
Walhalla	97	Haskett	82

BARLEY.

Prices paid Jan. 9, 10, and 11, 1911.

UNITED STATES.	Cents.			CANADA.	Cents.		
Pembina	--	--	67	Emerson	--	--	42
Neche	68	66	67	Gretna	37	38	38
Hannah	--	--	64	Crystal City	38	38	38
Sarles	64	64	64	Cartwright	36	36	36
Hansboro	67	65	66	Boissevain	40	40	40
St. John	68	66	67	Lyleton	40	40	40
Portal	63	63	63	North Portal	35	35	35

Difference, 24 to 29 cents.

FLAX.

Prices paid Jan. 9, 10, and 11, 1911.

UNITED STATES.				CANADA.			
Pembina	$2.32	-----	-----	Emerson	$1.93	$1.93	$1.93
Neche	2.32	$2.26	$2.26	Gretna	2.06	2.06	2.06
Walhalla	2.35	2.25	2.32	Haskett	2.03	2.03	2.08
Hannah	2.42	2.42	2.42	Crystal City	2.10	2.10	2.07
Sarles	2.34	2.31	2.31	Cartwright	2.00	2.00	2.00
Hansboro	2.31	2.24	2.31	Boissevain	2.14	2.12	2.17
Portal	2.33	2.33	2.33	North Portal	1.89	1.89	1.89

The burden of all the eloquent speeches that have been made in favor of this measure has been to prove that if this bill becomes a law it will cheapen the products of the farm to the consumer, but will not reduce the price to the farmer. I am astonished that men as intelligent as those who are occupying seats on the floor of this House should make such an absurd statement or think for one moment that this will be believed by even the most ignorant farmers in the country. "It will not hurt the farmer" is a statement that has been made repeatedly the last few days by those who favor this measure. If this is true, how do you account for the fact that every farmers' organization from Maine to California whose members produce the products that are put upon the free list by this so-called pact are bitterly opposed to the measure and are earnestly pleading for its defeat? You say there is no reason why there should be a duty on farm products between countries whose people are operating on an equal basis in every respect. I deny that they are operating on an equal basis. A great deal has already been said about the cheaper Canadian lands and the smaller investment per acre that this necessitates over there and about the virgin soil and the greater yield that it produces, and I will not now burden you with a repetition of these arguments, but there is another matter to which your attention has not yet been called that I wish to refer to for a moment. Canada has three kinds of tariff rates—general tariff, intermediate tariff, and British preferential tariff. As the greater part of the manufactured good imported into Canada comes from Great Britain, and as the goods imported from other countries must be as low in price as those coming from Great Britain, else they would not be purchased, it is only fair to take the rates of duty on British goods as the standard of comparison with our tariff rates. I will therefore insert in the RECORD a table showing the duties paid by the Canadian farmers on the things that he uses in his everyday life and the duties paid by the American farmer on the same articles:

	Canadian tariff.	United States tariff.
Earthenware	15 per cent	60 per cent.
Tin plate	Free	45 per cent.
Tinware	15 per cent	45 per cent.
Wire:		
Some kinds	Free	
None over	10 per cent	75 cents per 100 pounds.
Hats	20 per cent	55 per cent.
Sugar	35 per cent	80 per cent.
Carpets	17½ per cent	60 per cent.
Oilcloth	25 per cent	45 per cent.
Furniture	20 per cent	35 per cent.
Cotton cloth	25 per cent	50 to 60 per cent.
Soap	65 cents per 100 pounds.	50 per cent.
Gloves and mitts	22½ per cent	60 per cent.
Hose	25 per cent	70 cents per dozen pairs, and 15 per cent, to $5 per dozen pairs and 55 per cent.
Dress goods	15 per cent	60 per cent.
Automobile farm trucks	22 per cent	45 per cent.
Pianos	20 per cent	45 per cent.
Celluloid goods:		
Some kinds	Free	
None over	5 per cent	60 per cent.
Cement	5 per cent	10 per cent.
Underclothing	22½ per cent	45 per cent.
Salt	Free	11 cents per 100 pounds.
Axes	15 per cent	45 per cent.
Shovels	20 per cent	45 per cent.
Scythes	15 per cent	45 per cent.
Stoves	15 per cent	45 per cent.
Chains, iron	5 per cent	45 per cent and up.
Knives and forks	20 per cent	50 to 65 per cent.
Agate ware	22½ per cent	40 per cent.
Sewing machines	20 per cent	30 per cent.
Oranges	Free	1 cent per pound and 30 per cent on the package.
Lemons	Free	1½ cents per pound and 30 per cent on the package.
Window glass	7½ per cent	60 per cent to 75 per cent.
Rice	50 cents per 100 pounds.	$2 per 100 pounds.
Figs	40 cents per 100 pounds.	$1 per 100 pounds. and 35 per cent.
Jute bags	15 per cent	45 per cent.
Cotton thread	17½ per cent	45 per cent.
Glassware	15 per cent	60 to 100 per cent.
Lamp chimneys	20 per cent	60 per cent.
Brass goods	20 per cent	45 per cent.
Lamps	20 per cent	45 to 60 per cent.
Baskets	Free	40 to 60 per cent.
Rubber coats	15 per cent	35 per cent.
Rubber boots and shoes	15 per cent	35 per cent.
Books	15 per cent	25 per cent.
Lead	Free	2¾ cents per pound.
Clocks and watches	20 per cent	40 to 60 per cent.
Bicycles	20 per cent	45 per cent.

This table shows that on articles generally used the Canadian farmer pays an average duty of from 20 to 35 per cent less than is paid by our farmer. If this measure becomes a law, it will place our farmers in a position where they will have to sell their products in the open markets of the world, Canada being our only real competitor, and purchase what they need from the highly protected industries of the East. I know you Democrats will say that you are going to remedy this by "revising the tariff downward," but you will find yourselves in a position where you will be unable to furnish much relief along this line. True, there are some important schedules that are entirely too high, and these can be revised and adjusted down to a fair and proper basis, and I promise you that I shall vote with you on every proposition of this kind; but you must not forget that under our present constitutional provisions you will be compelled to raise by duties on imports a vast amount of money for the necessary expenses of this Government, and that during 11 months of 1910, 48.7 per cent of our imports came in under the free list and only 51.3 per cent was dutiable. After "revising the tariff downward" to the best of your ability, you will find that, in order to raise the amount of money that must of necessity be raised by a duty on imports, our manufactured products will still be highly protected. And I venture the prophecy that you will not be able to bring our duties down to anywhere near the Canadian preferential duties with which our Canadian neighbors are now favored. The Democratic slogan of "a tariff for revenue only" is a meaningless and misleading phrase, as every intelligent student ought to know. Senator WILLIAMS, of Mississippi, when he was Democratic floor leader in this House, in speaking of this phrase, said, in substance, that, applied to those things which we can produce in our own country, there is no such thing as "a tariff for revenue only," as every duty on such articles is protective to the extent of the duty, whether it be 1 per cent or 100 per cent, and Senator WILLIAMS was absolutely right. I am therefore satisfied that you will not be able by tariff revision to give the American farmer compensation for one-tenth of the amount that you propose to take away from him by placing his products on the free list.

If, then, the Constitution compels you to give protection to our manufacturers, why do you insist on discriminating against our farmers by placing their products on the free list? Is it because you think they are making their money too fast or too easily? If so, I would advise you to read the bulletin just published by the Agricultural Department, in which they say that after thorough investigation they are satisfied it is no longer an easy task to make our American farms pay. Or is it because you think that our farmers are getting more than their just share of the amounts paid by the ultimate consumer? If so, let me read to you the opinion expressed by Secretary of Agriculture, the Hon. James Wilson, before the administration lash induced him to support this measure. In the Annual Report of the Secretary of Agriculture for 1910, pages 19–26, you will find that after a careful investigation of the increase of prices of farm products in their transfer to the consumer Secretary Wilson shows that the difference between the price paid the farmer and the cost to the consumer is in many cases from 40 to 50 per cent. For instance, it was found that poultry growers received only 55.1 per cent of the price paid by the consumer; that the dairyman receives but a scant 50 per cent of the price paid for milk; the apple grower, 55.6 per cent; that beef cost the consumer 38 per cent more than the price paid the great slaughtering houses; and other farm produce from 41 to 50 per cent over the original cost. The conclusion of this section of Secretary Wilson's report is:

> From the details that have been presented with regard to the increase of the prices of farm products between farmer and consumer, the conclusion is inevitable that the consumer has no well-grounded complaint against the farmer for the prices that he pays.
>
> After consideration of the elements of the matter, it is plain that the farmer is not getting an exorbitant price for his products, and that the cost of distribution from the time of delivery at destination by the railroad to delivery to the consumer is the feature of the problem of high prices which must present itself to the consumer for treatment.

No; it is not the tariff on farm products that is responsible for the high cost of food, but the excessive freight charges of the railways and the exorbitant profits of the commission houses and wholesale dealers through whose hands farm products must pass to reach the consumer.

To show you that Secretary Wilson was right when he expressed what I have just quoted, I will insert another table in the RECORD showing the advance in prices on some of the farmer's necessities, and these are only examples showing the general advance in everything the farmers have to buy.

The following statement was prepared by the Department of Labor in Washington. The average wholesale price in New York and in other primary markets of each article for the years 1890 to 1899, inclusive, is taken as the base price, and is represented by 100. The relative price is the average wholesale price for each year from 1898 to 1909, inclusive, compared with the base price. The relative price in March, 1910, is added:

> Clothing, 96 to 126; cotton prints, 72 to 145; boots and shoes, 96 to 128; cotton sheetings, 86 to 134; cotton shirtings, 83 to 126; cotton tickings, 84 to 132; wool blankets, 107 to 131; wool flannels, 97 to 124; wool dress goods, 88 to 140; cotton flannels, 81 to 128; cotton hosiery, 83 to 93; miscellaneous, 92 to 132; fuel and lighting, 95 to 130; metals and implements, 86 to 128; lumber and building material, 95 to 151; house furnishing goods, 92 to 109; crude petroleum, 100 to 153; refined petroleum, 99 to 127; wool carpets, 100 to 117; wool horse blankets, 99 to 135; cotton thread, 98 to 126; cotton yarns, 90 to 131; cotton ginghams, 83 to 124; cotton 2-bushel bags, 95 to 143.

If, after you have considered all this, you still insist upon handicapping our agricultural industry, the one industry upon which the success and prosperity of the whole country depends, it must be because reason and logic, justice and fairness do not appeal to you, or because the political game you are now playing for high stakes is tempting you beyond your power to resist.

The gentlemen on the other side of this House have tried to justify a revolution in our economic and industrial world by claiming that this measure, if enacted into law, will help the poor by reducing the cost of living. Now, let us see what there is in this. While the farmer loses millions of dollars every year on barley, no one has attempted to claim that the brewers will sell a glass of beer for less than the regulation price of 5 cents per glass. The farmer is to be subjected to a loss of millions of dollars per year on flax, and no one has tried to show how this will in any way benefit the poor. The whole argument here has been made on wheat, while, as a matter of fact, wheat is by no means an overshadowing factor in the opposition to this agreement. But suppose that American wheat should drop to the Canadian level, or about 10 cents per bushel, and the ultimate consumer would get the whole benefit, what would it amount to? Our statistics show that, as a people, we consume from 5 to 6 bushels per capita. Now, if the consumer could buy this at a reduction of 10 cents per bushel he would save from 50 to 60 cents per year, or about 1 cent per week. For this infinitesimal amount per capita—which the consumer would not get, because this agreement amply protects the millers so they will not need to pass it on to the consumer—the farmer is to be subjected to competition with the world, although he always has and probably always will have to pay tribute to the consumers of his products whenever he has to buy anything that is produced by them. As long as the American people pay each year four times as much for liquor as they do for bread, and four times as much for tobacco as they do for potatoes, there is little need of revolutionizing our political and industrial systems and unsettling farm values and farm profits in order to save 1 cent per week on our bread.

If this measure must become a law, I would like to so amend this agreement that all importations from Canada would be admitted free of duty. But the gentlemen on the other side of the House declare they will not permit the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t" for fear Canada might not accept it if we did. Who, let me ask, is legislating for the United States? Is it this House and the Senate at the other end of the Capitol or is it the Canadian Parliament? If Canada will not accept as a free gift the greatest market in the world, she does not have to take it, for we can get along without her better than she can without us. But that is not the reason for refusing to permit amendments.

The real reason is that your Democratic political machine, working in harmony with the interests affected by the admission of manufactured products free of duty—and both have selfish reasons for supporting this measure—are too powerful for the farmers and their friends to overcome.

I know you are trying to cover your tracks by saying you are going to provide for this free list in a separate bill, but the gentleman from New York "let the cat out of the bag" when he said you felt sure your free list would not become a law. If you were sincere you would attach your free list to this agreement as it would then stand ten times the chance of becoming a law that it does as a separate bill.

With the gentlemen on the other side of this House I have no fault to find as they are true to their traditions and consistent in their position, for they have never been friendly to the farmers, but have always looked to the congested cities for their political strength. A striking example of this is New York, where the Democrats nearly always carry the city of New York by about 100,000 majority, and the farmers of the State just as often roll up a Republican majority large enough to more than offset the city vote. The distinguished gentleman from New York, the Hon. FRANCIS BURTON HARRISON, in a

speech on this same subject delivered on the 13th of February last, indicated so plainly where the sympathies of the Democratic Party lie that I shall quote him. He said:

The recent election, bringing about the first overthrow the Republicans have sustained in many years, was freighted with one great demand—the demand by the people of our congested cities to take the taxes off from food and clothing. In response to that mandate we are now taking the first step. From the east side of New York City a million voices are raised in appeal to you that you should make this bill a law. From every city of the East they cry out to you for relief.

If this is not evidence enough of the unfriendliness of the Democratic Party for the farmers of the Northwest, we have but to remember the fact that the Democratic majority, represented by its floor leader, has absolutely refused to grant the farmers a hearing before the final vote is taken. In order to be heard in their own cause, the farmers will have to go to the Republican Senate, where they will be recognized.

Gentlemen, it is a plain case of the cities against the farmers, and with the cities are leagued nearly every trust and monopoly in the country, together with the great financiers that control them. It is a great combination, and it now looks as if it will be a winning one, in this end of the Capitol, at least.

To you, my Republican colleagues who are supporting this measure, I want to sound a note of warning. The Republican platform of 1908 declared for duties equal to the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad and a reasonable profit to the manufacturer. Are you now by your votes going to so interpret this platform that the farmer who invests his all in the farm upon which he lives and where he and his family work, not 8 hours but 16 hours a day, is not to be included in the provision for guaranteed profits that you give to the manufacturer? If so, the Republican Party will never recover from your actions. Applied to the things we can produce in abundance at home, this country can not exist half protection and half free trade; it must be wholly one or the other, and upon your votes on this measure will depend largely what it is to be in the future. You may entertain the fond hope that the farmers, after you have done your utmost to assassinate their industry, will continue to vote for protection for the factories, shops, and mills you represent; but if so, let me disabuse your minds of any such foolish notions. For 50 years it has been the farmer vote that has maintained the principle of protection to American industries, and he has always been promised that he would get the direct benefits that the manufacturers have always had when the consumption of his products would equal the supply. Now, after all these years of loyal support, are you going to break faith with him? If so, can you give me a single reason why the farmers should continue to vote for protection on anything they have to buy?

President Taft has persistently urged the creation of a permanent nonpartisan tariff commission, taking the position that no intelligent action can be taken on any subject involving the tariff without a thorough scientific investigation of the subject by a competent commission. In response to his demand, Congress gave him a Tariff Board composed of five men, who are perhaps as competent and impartial as any men in this country. When President Taft went to work on this Canadian tariff agreement, did he first have the Tariff Board investigate the subject for him and advise him as to the probable effect it would have on the farmers of this country? No! He first initiated a tariff agreement that will not only have a tremendous effect on our agricultural industries, but will entirely revolutionize our tariff laws and in all probability entirely wipe out protection as a principle. He then put the Tariff Board to work on the matter, and when they reported and he discovered their findings were against his reciprocity theories he ignored their report.

Are you, my Republican colleagues, going to put your stamp of approval upon such a measure as this? In order to do so, do not forget that you will have to absolutely ignore the findings of the Tariff Board, whose complete report on this subject has finally been published and whose findings are absolutely against the passage of this measure. The Democrats have loudly proclaimed that this is a Democratic measure, and, smarting under this claim, the gentleman from Connecticut and the gentleman from Massachusetts and others have tried to show that it is not contrary to Republican doctrine. I think you will concede that ex-Speaker Thomas B. Reed was one of the greatest exponents of protection that ever lived in this country and that his definition of Republican protection principles would be accepted by every Republican protectionist. I therefore want to quote a few lines from an article he wrote shortly before he died, in 1902. He said:

Protection rests upon principle or it does not. If it does not, then it is a mere bestowal of bounty and is no part of the business of government. If it rests upon principle, then that principle must be that the American markets belong to the Americans. You can not maintain your system and sacrifice anything to which it is applicable. * * * If we propose to abandon any industries, we had better not let it be the agricultural industries. Between the Atlantic and Pacific stretch vast regions still untilled. The next victory of protection should be there.

Our system of protection is not for the manufacturers alone. It is for farmers also. Whoever deprives our farmers of all the American market they can occupy is false to their principles and must meet with defeat, or the system must be surrendered which proclaims that American markets are, first of all, for American citizens who are engaged in developing the country we already have.

Blaine was the author of reciprocity, and he crystallized it in a letter he wrote to President Harrison in 1891, in which he said:

It is of the highest possible importance that there be no treaty of reciprocity with Canada. They aim at natural products, to get all the products of the farm on us in exchange for heaven knows what. I would cut the whole thing up by the roots. It would be considered a betrayal of the agricultural interests. The fact is, we do not want any intercourse with Canada except through the medium of a tariff. We are tending to have the great majority of the farmers with us. Let us encourage them by every means we can use and not discourage them by anything. We will break that alliance before six months if we maintain this policy.

The present proposed "betrayal of the farmers" was foreseen by Blaine. He pleaded 20 years ago that we should encourage, not discourage, the farmers.

McKinley learned his lessons in reciprocity from Blaine. He also believed in protecting the farmers. There is not a line to be found in his writings that shows to the contrary. His ideas of reciprocity were placed in the Republican national platform of 1900, on which he made a campaign. In that platform reciprocity reads as follows:

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.

In his last inaugural McKinley referred to this matter, using the language of the platform on which he was elected. This is what he said:

The end in view must always 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 to our own people, but tend to increase their employment.

In his Buffalo speech McKinley said:

By sensible trade agreements which will not interrupt home production we shall extend the outlet of our increasing surplus.

And again, in this same speech:

We should take from our customers such of their products as we can use without harm to our industries and labor.

The language and the meaning of the three great advocates of reciprocity in the past is clear and plain. What now passes for reciprocity is not reciprocity. It is not fair exchange. It is simply a sacrificing of our agricultural interests to gain benefits for other interests.

If this is a correct interpretation of the Republican doctrine of protection—and who will dare to say it is not—how can any man claim to be a Republican who works and votes for this measure which violates the principles of protection thus interpreted both in letter and in spirit? I am not pleading for any specific amount of protection on farm products, but I do claim that the great agricultural industry affected by this measure, the greatest and most important industry we have, is entitled to the same consideration and the same benefits under protection that are extended to our manufactured products. No one has denied that the farmers operate our most important industry, and they produce almost wholly raw material, in which the profit is comparatively small.

I agree with John R. Mauff, of the Wisconsin Equity News, who, in speaking of the farmers, says they are the producers of a very large percentage of all the so-called raw material. From these raw materials are developed all of the foodstuffs, including bread, the dairy products, the poultry products, sugars, vegetables, and fruits, all of the grains used in the manufacture of malt and distilled liquors. From these raw materials are also developed the fabrics which the common people use as raiment and for the various household needs, such as cotton, woolen, and linen goods.

These are the people who have cleared the forests, built the highways, erected the schoolhouses, and built the farm residences and splendid barns that dot the landscape. They changed the face of nature and converted the wilderness into a world of peace and plenty, teeming with all the elements of life that enable that other percentage of the Nation's population to live in luxury unknown to the masses in any other country. It is this percentage of farmers that has produced the wealth of the Nation in the main and who feed and clothe the other percentage, including those who consume without producing, as well as other millions who labor in the factories and workshops and in the fields of transportation and commerce. They have filled to overflowing from field and farm and garden, from all over the land, the horn of plenty that pours out so

copiously the richest and sweetest of beef and pork and mutton and bread and butter and fruits into the larder of the housewife in every kitchen in every hamlet and village and city throughout the length and breadth of the land.

I speak of these things to show that a class engaged in an industry of such magnitude and the product of whose toil is so absolutely necessary to producer and nonproducer alike should at least be fairly dealt with in matters of legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I will accuse no man of deliberately trying to ruin the farmers of this country, but I think that you fail to understand the importance of the uninterrupted prosperity of our agricultural industry and to realize that anything that tends to reduce the legitimate profits of our farmers will affect in a still greater degree the success and prosperity of the toilers in our factories, shops, and mills, and, in fact, the welfare and prosperity of every industry in this country.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with deep interest and marked attention to remarks of the various gentlemen upon this very important question and have yet to observe where it would be of benefit to the great people of the United States to adopt it. No one has undertaken to say how it will be of benefit to the American farmer, and that task, I apprehend, will not be demonstrated upon the floor of this Chamber.

NO BENEFIT TO THE FARMER.

It is not satisfactory to them to say they will not be injured. The question is, How will they be benefited? Do you think that by admitting the farm products free into their market you will benefit them? As well might it be claimed that you benefit the great sheep industry of this country by admitting Australian wool free of duty. How will it benefit the American farmer by admitting hundreds of thousands of tons of hay into his market, by admitting millions of bushels of wheat, barley, beans, and farm products; or the great American laborer by admitting the cheap pauper labor of England, Germany, France, Italy, Japan, and Mexico into this country unrestricted?

FARMERS PROTEST.

I hold in my hand more than 40 telegrams, received yesterday and to-day, all protesting against the enactment of this proposed treaty into law. I admit that there are a few of them sent by merchants, manufacturers, and tradesmen, but the majority are sent by farmers and granges; and I want to admit another thing, lest I forget it, and it might escape your attention, and that is that they are all hot ones. You say that the farmers do not know what they want. You claim the right to give them what they want and not even consult them. Do you claim the right to take away any man's property or his market without giving him anything in return? Do you think the great, intelligent American farmer would trade his birthright for a mess of Canadian porridge? He has endured the hardship of frontier life; he has not only done his part, but he has done more than any other class to clear up and improve and beautify this magnificent Republic; he has paid his taxes willingly to build our churches and schools; he has built the crossroads and the people's highways.

CAN NOT FOOL THE FARMERS.

There are four college centers in my district, Kalamazoo, Albion, Hillsdale, and Olivet. The farmers of my district pay liberally and are taxed handsomely to support the great University of Michigan, represented on the floor of this House by a larger number than any other institution of learning in our land. Within 4 miles from my district and in the very heart of the State is the first and greatest agricultural college in the United States. We have the free rural delivery of our mails, and I will not insult the intelligence of the great American farmer by saying that he does not know what he wants.

One-third of the population of this country are engaged in agriculture. Their eyes are to-day upon this body. We may have our way to-day, we may have our way here, but they will have their way to-morrow if you strike this blow at their material welfare. Their profits are below that of any other branch of industry. Fifteen bushels of wheat to the acre; 80 cents a bushel is the price; $12 the reward; $2 profit for your investment, your days' work from sun to sun, and you are lucky to get that.

PURPOSE OF THE PROPOSED TREATY.

It was inspired by a desire to reduce the cost of living, to build up a more friendly relation between the two countries and to extend the market for our manufactured products.

The farmer is now getting low prices for his farm products, barely enough to pay for his toil and leaving very little for his investment. I am not impressed with the low cost of living idea or the low cost propaganda. Labor is more cheerful and better contented when it is well paid; the manufacturer is more prosperous when his prices are fair and he gets a just return for his endeavor. The farmer is no exception and is entitled to a just compensation for his work. It is admitted on all hands that times are better when prices are high and the purpose of the agreement to reduce the cost of living can not be based upon the cost received by the farmer for his products. If so, please put it in on the record. Even the threat of enacting this agreement has cost the farmers already more than a million of dollars. I will place on record the prices of farm products obtained from one of the most reliable sources in this country by a person who has spent 50 years a grain and wool merchant of Charlotte, Mich., and in close touch with the farmers, who writes me under date of April 7, 1911:

	Apr. 7, 1911.	Apr. 7, 1910.
Choice red wheat (60 pounds)	$0.80	$1.10
Oats	.28	.45
Shelled corn	.50	.65
Lambs, live weight (per hundredweight)	5.00- 5.50	8.00- 8.50
Hogs (per hundredweight)	.06	8.00- 8.50
Cattle (per hundredweight)	.04- .05	5.50- 7.00
Potatoes	.30	.60
Eggs	.12	.17
Wool	.17- .18	.23- .25
Butter	.16- .18	.20- .25
Beans (per bushel)	1.60	2.25

And a like reduction for other and similar products.

MORE FRIENDLY RELATIONS WITH CANADA.

If it is claimed that it is necessary to pass this reciprocity agreement in order to establish better relations with Canada, upon what ground are you going to refuse a similar treaty with Great Britain, Germany, France, Spain, Japan, Mexico, and the other great sister nations? You propose to tear down the fortress of protection to the farming industry of this country because there is upon the rampart no guns pointed toward our Canadian neighbors. I am for peace, but I am not for peace at any cost, and when you destroy the market of the agriculturists of this country it is at a great sacrifice, which reflects itself not only as to his market but as to his home, his rights, and his independence by allowing this foreign competition.

AM FOR TAFT.

I do not understand that in framing this proposed Canadian reciprocity agreement that the farmer was anywhere consulted. Who had anything to do with the creation and instigation of this proposed treaty who is directly engaged in or concerned with that particular branch of industry? I am in favor of extending to that great class, which is so directly concerned, the right to be heard upon this great question. I am for the President, and I trust he may be elected in spite of himself, and the farmers of this country will have no better place to cast their lot than with the Republican Party. He is a protectionist and not a free trader, and we should nominate and elect him in spite of himself. [Applause.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH].

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I sat here the other day and listened with great interest to my friend [Mr. KITCHIN] from North Carolina. Mr. KITCHIN is always interesting, even when his logic is wholly bad. He declared that reciprocity is a Democratic doctrine and that the Democratic Party stands for a still wider application of that doctrine than that contemplated in the pending bill. This question I shall not discuss.

I wonder at the logic of my friend, however, when he argues for reciprocity and its advantages, and then argues that the price of American products will not be disturbed by the reciprocal agreement and that the price that the American farmer in Minnesota and the Dakotas will receive for his No. 1 wheat will not be less by reason of the dumping into this country of Canadian wheat of the same quality. If this is true, then we are pretending to be giving to Canada something that, as a matter of fact, we are not giving her. We are pretending to give her people a market which, after all, is no better than the Canadian home market, according to his contention. If this is so, why not end the consideration of this question here and now? Why carry it further, for all that it amounts to after all is that we are handing to Canada that which I gather from his own words amounts to a gold brick and in return therefor receive what I believe is a gold brick?

But I do not agree with my friend. I believe we are actually making concessions to Canada, and are not receiving sufficient concessions in return. I wish I could favor this pending bill. I like the word "reciprocity," and believe that a reciprocal treaty could be drawn between the United States and Canada

that would be of benefit to both lands. That is the only kind of reciprocity bill that is worth while; that is the only kind of bill that should be considered.

The pending reciprocity agreement has the support of different Members of this body for various reasons. Republicans support it who, believing in the policy of protection, believe as well in reciprocity, and that the pending measure will perfect our system of protection. Republicans support it who believe the tariff law contains many imperfections, and that the pending measure, imperfect though it may be, is a wedge that will mark the beginning of tariff modification. It has the support of Democrats who announce that they believe in free trade, and of Democrats who believe in wholesale tariff modification and that the present reciprocal proposition will open the way to such modification, and they even stand for a still wider application of the doctrine than is contemplated in the pending bill. All unite in the desire to scale down the cost of living.

As for myself, I frankly confess that I believe that the present tariff law contains provisions that should be modified at the earliest possible time, but I am afraid that the pending reciprocity bill will be a disappointment to all those who believe in the policy of protection and yet believe in tariff modification. I recognize merit in the proposed reciprocal agreement, and yet, since an agreement of this character is in the nature of a bargain or trade, we must look to our part of the bargain and consider how it will affect every person in our country. Looking at the proposed agreement from the standpoint of the beginning of tariff modification, I fear we are not touching the important schedules that need attention, but are laying the lash upon the poor fellow's back who said that imperfections exist in the tariff law. And, again, our proposed modification, as I see it, is so unbalanced as to fail to scale down the cost of living, as I think I can demonstrate.

The pending bill provides for placing upon the free list of each country for the benefit of the other many articles and commodities that are produced in both countries. I shall insert in my speech at this point a list that I have taken from the bill that is now pending:

Live animals: Cattle, horses and mules, swine, sheep, lambs, and all other live animals.

Poultry, dead or alive.

Wheat, rye, oats, barley, and buckwheat, dried peas and beans, edible.

Corn, sweet corn, or maize.

Hay, straw, and cowpeas.

Fresh vegetables: Potatoes, sweet potatoes, yams, turnips, onions, cabbages, and all other vegetables in their natural state.

Fresh fruits: Apples, pears, peaches, grapes, berries, and all other edible fruits in their natural state, except lemons, oranges, limes, grapefruit, shaddocks, pomelos, and pineapples.

Dried fruits: Apples, peaches, pears, and apricots, dried, desiccated, or evaporated.

Dairy products: Better, cheese, and fresh milk and cream: *Provided*, That cans actually used in the transportation of milk or cream may be passed back and forth between the two countries free of duty, under such regulations as the respective Governments may prescribe.

Eggs of barnyard fowl, in the shell.

Honey.

The bill fails to place on the free list certain other commodities, mention of which I shall make in my printed speech, and which list is closely related to the free list, and yet for some reason is granted the benefit of protection:

Fresh meats: Beef, veal, mutton, lamb, pork, and all other fresh or refrigerated meats excepting game, 1¼ cents per pound.

Bacon and hams, not in tins or jars, 1¼ cents per pound.

Meats of all kinds, dried, smoked, salted, in brine, or prepared or preserved in any manner, not otherwise herein provided for, 1¼ cents per pound.

Canned meats and canned poultry, 20 per cent ad valorem.

Extract of meat, fluid or not, 20 per cent ad valorem.

Lard and compounds thereof, cottolene and cotton stearin, and animal stearin, 1¼ cents per pound.

Tallow, 40 cents per 100 pounds.

Egg yolk, egg albumen, and blood albumen, 7½ per cent ad valorem.

Tomatoes and other vegetables, including corn, in cans or other air-tight packages, and including the weight of the package, 1¼ cents per pound.

Wheat flour and semolina, and rye flour, 50 cents per barrel of 196 pounds.

Oatmeal and rolled oats, including the weight of paper covering, 50 cents per 100 pounds.

Corn meal, 12½ cents per 100 pounds.

Barley malt, 45 cents per 100 pounds. Barley, pot, pearled, or patent, one-half cent per pound.

Buckwheat flour or meal, one-half cent per pound.

Prepared cereal foods, not otherwise provided for herein, 17½ per cent ad valorem.

Bran, middlings, and other offals of grain used for animal food, 12½ cents per 100 pounds.

Pickles, including pickled nuts, sauces of all kinds, and fish paste or sauce, 32½ per cent ad valorem.

Farm wagons and finished parts thereof, 22½ per cent ad valorem.

Plows, tooth and disk harrows, harvesters, reapers, agricultural drills and planters, mowers, horserakes, cultivators; thrashing machines, including windstackers, baggers, weighers, and self-feeders therefor and finished parts thereof imported for repair of the foregoing, 15 per cent ad valorem.

Portable engines with boilers, in combination, horsepowers and traction engines for farm purposes; hay loaders, potato diggers, fodder or feed cutters, grain crushers, fanning mills, hay tedders, farm or field rollers, manure spreaders, weeders, and windmills, and finished parts thereof imported for repair of the foregoing, except shafting, 20 per cent ad valorem.

I have not pretended to give a complete list, but from an examination of the most important items which I have given this fact stands out: That the raw material is not protected, while the manufactured product has practically the same protection that it has when imported from any other country.

Now, let us look this matter over just as we would look over any other business proposition. If it is a good thing, let us avail ourselves of it. If it is bad, let us reject it. There is nothing whatever in the name "reciprocity." It may include everything that is good, or it may include everything that is bad. It may be wholly a giving without a compensation. What of the pending agreement, and how will it affect our country?

Our country has a population of approximately 90,000,000 people. Canada has a population of approximately 8,000,000 people. Our imports from Canada to-day of dutiable goods amount to $47,827,959, and Canada's imports from the United States of dutiable goods amount to $47,333,158. From this Canada's revenue is $7,776,236 annually and our revenue $5,649,826.

The pending bill has to do with commodities that are in very large part produced in both countries, and yet through the demand from year to year and notwithstanding the present duties our country is furnishing a market for many of these products. Last year nearly 1,000,000 bushels of oats were shipped into the United States from Canada and found sale in our markets after paying a duty of 15 cents per bushel. Nearly 100,000 tons of Canadian hay were shipped and sold in our markets after meeting a duty of $4 per ton. Last year nearly 1,000,000 pounds of butter were imported and upon the same a duty of 6 cents per pound was collected, and upon all the commodities that were shipped over the line we collected last year in duties, that we are now asked to surrender, $4,849,933. With the removal of the duties the same commodities would be able to bear down the prices of like commodities in the United States to at least the amount of the duty, and the farmer would lose accordingly. As against this we can not hope for compensating markets in Canada. Nine-tenths of the population of both countries is on the side of the United States, and it takes people to make a market.

But what I have suggested with respect to our imports from Canada upon the theory that if we import the same amount annually in the future our markets would be depressed to that extent is only the small part of this problem. At this time Canada is shipping to us a comparatively small amount of her products of which I am speaking, while she is shipping to England many times this amount, and here lies the difficulty. Between England and Canada there is no tariff, and does anyone doubt that with 3,000 miles cut off from the distance of transportation that Canada would immediately consign the goods that she has to sell to American markets instead of sending them to markets on the other side of the Atlantic? If anyone doubts this he certainly has a wrong conception of business principles.

On this head we need not feel so much disturbed for the present year or for next year. Nor need we feel disturbed on account of the $5,000,000 in revenues that we are surrendering. The imports within the next year or two would necessarily mean something of a loss to our farmers, but it would be scattered over a large population, and thereby would not be so keenly felt. More than this consideration, a consideration appeals to me that has to do with a condition that, as I see it, is just a few years ahead, should this treaty become effective, and the effect that the condition that will exist then will have in preventing the rightful increase in land values within our own country. Our farmers have with care and patience built up their lands, and it is not right that they should now be denied the legitimate value that belongs to such lands by reason of the opening up in competition lands that are now of little value upon the Canadian side of the line.

Within the United States the public lands have been very largely acquired by private individuals through the generous public-land laws of our country. Lands that have a value for agricultural purposes have passed to private ownership. Our great grazing plains are gone. Extensive farming upon the part of the individual must more and more give place to intensive farming in order that values may be produced upon the investment. No one can deny that the extensive areas of unappropriated public lands that the Government has offered free under the homestead laws have played an important part during the last half century in discouraging intensive farming and as well in keeping down the price of lands in the older sections of the United States. Intensive farming means more of cost to

the farmer, just as stall-fed stock mean a greater expense to the stockgrower than the range-fed cattle of 20 years ago.

I am opposed to this bill, because I believe it will spell disaster to the American farmer, for the reason that large areas will be opened to settlement in Canada within the immediate future, and the cost of production in Canada for the next 20 or 30 years will be found to be cheaper than the cost of production within our own country. Canadian land is new, it is virgin, it will produce such an acreage with the minimum amount of labor as will enable the farmers there to flood our markets with their hay, their oats and other grains, their butter and eggs and other farm produce, and the price that will be received will be remunerative to the Canadian, but meager to the farmer of our own land. This is a proposition that is easy of demonstration. Canadian land that is avilable for farm purposes is worth on an average less than one-half what it is worth on this side of the line. A farmer who has $6,000 to invest in land and can buy 100 acres of $60 land in the United States can buy 200 acres of the same quality of land across the Canadian border. A schoolboy can figure out that the producer on the cheap land can sell his products at a remunerative price, and that the same price would net a small margin of gain to the farmer raising the crop on a more expensive land.

But this is not all. The supplies which the Canadian buys he buys at a less cost. In the United States there is a uniform tariff upon the products imported from foreign countries, while in Canada, in addition to the tariffs between Canada and foreign countries, there is a British preferential tariff. This preferential tariff being less than the tariff between Canada and other countries, must necessarily set the price. The tariff on the goods that the American farmer must buy is from 25 per cent to nearly 50 per cent more than this preferential tariff that is available to the Canadian, and the farmer of the United States is compelled to pay that much more for the commodities which he would buy.

On rubber boots and shoes and on rubber coats the Canadian pays 15 per cent duty, the consumer in our country 35 per cent; on jute bags, in which the farmer in my State sells his grain, he pays a duty of 45 per cent, while his Canadian competitor across the line pays 15 per cent; on a sewing machine for his wife our farmer pays a duty of 30 per cent, the Canadian 20 per cent; on a stove for the kitchen our farmer pays 45 per cent, the Canadian 15 per cent; on shovels and axes it is the same; on dress goods our farmer pays 60 per cent, the Canadian 15 per cent; on wire our farmer pays 75 cents per 100 pounds, while the Canadian buys his wire at not to exceed 10 per cent, and much of it is free of duty. Our farmer pays 55 per cent duty on his hat, the Canadian only 20 per cent; our farmer 45 per cent duty on his underwear, the Canadian 22½ per cent, or just one-half that amount; and so I could continue if I had time, and I could show that the farmer on this side of the line is placed at a distinct disadvantage when compared with his Canadian brother because of the preferential duty between Canada and the great manufacturing country of Great Britain. Yet if this treaty shall go into effect, you will expect the American farmer, the farmer of your State and mine, to compete in our own markets in the sale of his hay and his oats, his eggs and his butter, his fruits and his vegetables.

And when it comes to labor it is almost the same. It is true that the wages paid in the part of Canada immediately north of my own State and the State of Washington is about the same as the wages paid to the Canadian laborers across the line, but, taking all the other parts of Canada and comparing them with the United States, the wages paid are nearly 25 per cent higher, on an average, in the United States than the wages paid for similar labor in the parts of Canada of which I speak. Certainly, wages on the farms of the United States must come down to meet the Canadian wage scale or else the American farmer must incur a loss.

I am opposed to this treaty for, as I see it, it is reciprocal in name alone. No one can deny that in revenues we are surrendering approximately twice as much as is Canada. On this point I shall not speak, because I think it is a small consideration. The treaty is reciprocal in name only, because its benefits are not reciprocal. On the one side the Canadian is benefited by being offered a market at home for his products. He is benefited because this will build up his lands, stimulate railroad development, and give him other business enterprises from Halifax to Vancouver. But what is given to the citizens of the United States in return for all this? It is useless to say that the markets of Canada are thrown open to his products. The Canadian markets are already overstocked; there are no extensive markets there for American goods. What other compensation is offered? Why, that the cost of living will be lowered. Now, on this head let us make a little inquiry. It is proposed to place wheat, oats, and other grains upon the free list. But it is also proposed to leave a duty upon flour, prepared cereal foods, and other products of grain. The housekeeper does not buy wheat for her family; she buys flour or bread. She does not buy oats or corn; she buys prepared cereals. If a duty is retained upon the flour and the cereal foods, even though grains are admitted free, do you suppose the consumer will buy his flour or his bread or his cereal food cheaper? Not a bit of it. The consumer will pay just as much, but some one else besides the farmer will receive the benefit. The middle man, the broker, the manufacturer will receive the difference. Let us inquire further. It is proposed to place cattle, hogs, and sheep upon the free list; but the duty is still maintained with slight modification on fresh and cured meats and on the other products of live stock. Can anyone seriously argue that the consumer would pay less for his ham, or his bacon, or his beefsteak, or chops, because the live stock is admitted free? I think not. What would compel the great packing plant to sell its products cheaper? It has no additional competition. On the other hand, it will be able to make a larger profit because, while buying the cattle, hogs, and sheep in a cheaper market, it will sell its manufactured products in the same old market and at the same old price.

Again, I say the housekeeper does not buy beeves, she buys meat; she does not buy hogs, she buys ham or bacon; she does not buy sheep, she buys mutton. And so I conclude that that which the friends of the treaty call a benefit will prove elusive. Elusive to the farmer, because while it offers markets to him, there are small markets in Canada that he wants; and elusive to the consumer, because while the duty is removed from the raw material it is retained in almost its original form upon the manufactured product.

The desire upon the part of the administration to do something that will lower the cost of living is most commendable, yet I believe that whatever may have been the idea when the reciprocity question was first considered, that the working out of the agreement will not attain this end. More than this, even if it should attain this end, it is at the expense of the farmer. Of all those in our country who have stood by the policy of protection, the farmer up to the present has received the smallest returns. Within the last few years the wisdom of the policy is justifying itself to the farmer, and at this time, with the farmer coming into his own as never before, we propose to take from him the benefit that in all justice to him rightfully belongs.

The farmer is not selfish in this fight. More than one of them have said to me that they would be willing to make the sacrifice necessary to bring down the cost of living providing a similar sacrifice be made by our other producers and by the manufacturers. More than this, more than one have said to me that they would stand for the Canadian treaty with all the loss that it means to them providing in that treaty may be incorporated reciprocal agreements touching not the raw products alone, but manufactured products as well. If you are going to throw down the bars on his products, let us throw them all down and let business intercourse and freedom be complete between our own country and the great nation to the north of us.

Yes; but some one says the Democratic Congress proposes to pass a bill placing upon the free list some of the articles mentioned on the protection list with Canada. I am asked if that might make some difference with my vote. In answer I would say that it might, providing the items were included in the present bill. This, however, is impossible. More than this, there is no certainty of the passage of the bill that has been proposed. What is less certain than the outcome of a Congress one branch of which is Democratic and the other Republican? Who is here to promise that the bill will be followed by another that will correct injustices in this one? Who can give assurances that it can pass? Here is a bill that, as I see it, works an injustice upon the farmers of my State and upon our country, and I can not sacrifice their interests upon a promise that no one here is able to fulfill. I must consider the pending bill providing for reciprocity with Canada upon its own merits, and, considering it upon its own merits, I am compelled to be opposed to its passage. [Applause.]

Mr. DALZELL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOCHT.]

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Chairman, during the debate on this question of reciprocity there has been every opportunity to make observations concerning the sentiment prevailing throughout the country as reflected in the expression of Members residing in all parts of the Republic. In the face of the President's desire, as expressed in his several messages, there were recorded against this bill when last before us 87 Republican votes, and so uncertain were the managers of the treaty as to its probable fate as a party measure, that a caucus was not called to con-

sider its merits. In fact, I have not learned of a single Senator or Member with whom the Chief Executive counseled before presenting this treaty or trade agreement to Congress. It is evident from the wide divergence of opinion and utter lack of unanimity on the part of the Republican representation here that the objections to this measure are founded on logical and rational reasons, this conclusion being reached, if in no other way, by the fact that 87 Members, or a majority of 9 Republicans, cast their votes against it. Coming directly from the people, as did the Members of the House which convened in December, the vote of that body in February on this measure carries with it the weight of extraordinary significance.

We believe the President to be thoroughly honest and sincere and surely hopeful of the result of the enactment of this legislation; but it is not to be expected that even a President of this great Republic is either infallible, immortal, or immaculate, and error with him is within the range of possibility.

From a political standpoint it may after all result in much good to the Republican Party, for it has been demonstrated during the discussion of this measure that when fundamentals of the Republican Party are assaulted insurgent and stalwart can and do stand together. The kind of insurgents we have in this House I can now regard from a different angle and a different measure of respect than I did when I first came here and witnessed the petty and inconsequential rows over minor and collateral matters. Now, in the time of real trial, when the party has been outvoted and is without power to take the initiative or achieve direct results, they stand like oak and rock, side by side with the stalwarts of the faith of our party's immortal leaders; and in the face of the rising, triumphant shouts of Democracy take their ground when loyalty is best demonstrated and true party pride and patriotism are most needed.

I come from the Republican State of Pennsylvania, a State that is true and certain in her Republican majorities, never wavers, is always stalwart, yields to no State in freedom of suffrage, universal primary law, and triumphs under the unbeaten leadership of the Senate's new head. Notwithstanding my own affiliation during more than a quarter of a century and tendencies toward centralized strength within party council, I am ever ready and willing to recognize what is just and right, and from what I have seen in recent days of the attitude of the so-called insurgents I am impelled to make these passing observations.

The Democratic Speaker long ago claimed this reciprocity treaty to be a real Democratic baby, and I have heard his successor lay like claim, while Mr. KITCHIN on last Saturday made a similar modest challenge.

From a political standpoint, what is the Republican Party to get out of this measure by way of political advantage in case it should be enacted into law?

Observing this Republican minority and recalling last fall's election reverses, it is evident that we not only need to hold the farmer vote, but we must first get him back into the fold if we are to win the presidential election in 1912. I submit that if it is agreed we must have him back, will we accomplish that purpose by removing the tariff from the products of his farm and retaining a tax on what he buys?

We already have 60 per cent of Canada's import trade, while 30 per cent is made up of teas, coffees, spices, champagne, diamonds, and other luxuries which we do not produce, leaving a beggarly 10 per cent of business to compete for. For the mere chance, which we already have, to get part of this remaining 10 per cent we propose removing the tariff from 76 per cent of Canada's exports, with only approximately 17 per cent of our export articles to be admitted free into Canada!

This is truly a one-sided pancake, although the working out of such a policy might be of unusual interest to the Beef Trust, the Harvester Trust, and the Milling Trust. Therefore, if there is only ruin ahead for the Republican Party in abandoning the tenets of the past, of turning from the principles which made the country great and rich and strong, what is there if viewed from the position taken by the President in his message? It is declared, on the one hand, that reciprocity is to give the poor man a better breakfast at lower cost than at present, while, on the other hand, the farmer is told—and we were told right here even yesterday—that reciprocity would not reduce the cost of food products to the ultimate consumer.

There seems to be a contradiction here that thoroughly explodes any theory that will definitely fix the outcome of this trade agreement, excepting that it is certain to give away the world's greatest market with nothing in return, and yet the bill is labeled reciprocity, which is a misnomer and a misconception.

As illustrating the fallacy of this whole breakfast theory and that the farmer is not the man to be pursued because of high prices for food, I bring before you an object lesson which must carry conviction. I hold in my hand a small catalogue issued from the Pennsylvania State College, which contains the names of the students and a few advertisements. State College is located in the heart of Pennsylvania, in a rich agricultural district and farms virtually abutting the campus, and not a cold-storage plant is within 50 miles of the place. There is a free, normal market for agricultural products; in fact, prices should be necessarily a little higher than normal, with 1,800 consuming students creating the demand, and yet I find in this little book an advertisement asking to take boarders at $3 per week. Three dollars per week, or 21 meals at less than 15 cents each, and these meals must necessarily be substantial, as they are served for hungry professors, hungry, growing schoolboys, and football players. In this locality the consumer deals directly with the farmer; in Washington and other cities the consumer deals with the cold-storage baron, and pays 45 cents per pound for calf's liver and 10 cents each for apples.

If you break down this tariff which protects the farmer; if you break down the tariff which protects the manufacturer, then we instantly face in field and in factory competition with Europe's cheapest labor and Asia's worse than slavery. But do not break it down. Keep up protection, not so high that it will be a menace to anybody, but, in any event, if the plan works, keept it up so that it may show the difference of cost of production at home and abroad. But, while protective tariff laws are making the country as a whole mighty with wealth, and it can not be so without protection, let us see to it that the rewards are better divided. Let us see that the great combinations of wealth which have sprung into existence are properly regulated. You can quickly break these mighty combinations of capital called trusts by the ruinous remedy of free trade, but by the application of this method you will at the same time break the country. There must be Federal power great and strong enough, and a power exercised, to meet this trust situation, to bring up with a turn this invisible, insidious power which has been getting most of the reward and the toiling masses so little.

Yes; protection to the farmer, protection to the capitalist, protection to the manufacturer, all in fair and equitable measure; but the place protection is now most needed is around the bending back of labor. The sequel to this suggestion is written against the horizon each day as the great ocean liners emerge from the mists off of Sandy Hook, and from the deck of each great racer of the seas there may be seen from 1,000 to 2,000 hopeful faces peering into the promised land.

Immigrants, immigrants, millions of them, coming to our shores to do what—develop America? No; not the kind who are coming now, for, according to the President's message, the country is overdeveloped already. What then? To help the steamship companies? Yes; that is it; the steamship companies, to make them rich that they may build more ships abroad, fly them under a foreign flag and receive a foreign subsidy, while the millions they bring turn countless thousands of Americans into the streets. Had our great and good President suggested the enactment of some measure that would divert this stream of foreign immigration now coming to this country into Canada, instead of proposing that a stream of Canadian products shall swamp our markets and thereby drive hundreds of thousands of American farmers and their families from under the protecting folds of the American flag to find new homes under the banner of the British Empire, the uplifted hands of not only the agriculturist, but of the American laborer, would have called down from on high a divine blessing.

With the spectacle witnessed on this floor last week of the Democratic majority rejecting real election reform which might have effected the peculiar election system prevailing in the South; with a northern college professor teaching his students to respect the red flag of anarchy instead of the Stars and Stripes; and a Democratic Cabinet member belittling and demeaning the old veterans of the North who hurled back treason and saved the Nation from dissolution, it is indeed high time that Republicans took seriously the issues of the hour and declined to follow misguided leadership.

So far as my constituents are concerned, Pennsylvania, where independence was born, the State which furnished first defenders for all the wars and money without limit, and on whose sacred soil, by the valor of her sons, was determined the fate of independence in Revolutionary days as well as the fate of the Nation from 1861 to 1865, shall not be misunderstood.

My constituents believe in the old nationalism, the old patriotism, the old progressive republicanism. They people the valleys

where Lee's mighty army marched forth to expected triumph and retreated in defeat, where McCausland's marauders applied the torch and exacted tribute, but did not conquer the national spirit of that brave, true people whose humble spokesman I am proud to be to-day.

The Republican Party, if it will stand bravely united against this un-Republican and un-American policy, which is but the forerunner of free trade, and are determined to fuse for that final and ultimate battle for the firesides of the farmer and the workingman, the party will again be triumphant, its messages will be heard to-day and in the long future, and posterity will ever sing its praises.

FARMERS OPPOSE TAFT RECIPROCITY.

To the EDITOR OF THE PRESS:

SIR: Why oppress the American farmer, who has been between the devil and the deep sea for, lo, these many years, prior to the last one or two, and now that consumption of wheat has about overtaken production in the United States, and therefore a glimmer of hope for better times in the future appears to give him heart to struggle on, why, I ask, should his hopes be dashed to the ground by this reciprocity bill? Why should his, of all the industries of the country, be deprived of all protection? Do you think the country can prosper with the basic industry in ruin? Do you think the newspapers will prosper then even with free pulp wood?

My dear sir, mark you, if the farmer is deprived of all protection, will he vote protection to other industries? Or does the Press no longer believe in protection?

The negotiation of this astounding so-called reciprocity by a Republican administration, and supported by Republican newspapers is the most astonishing occurrence within the span of my 70 years of life. Public opinion here—and, I believe, throughout all rural regions—is practically unanimous against the measure, and fiercely against it.

This bill provides for the free dumping of 500,000,000 bushels of wheat into our land in the very near future, besides oats, barley, flax, potatoes, etc. In 1909, the Canadian northwest raised 125,000,000 bushels of wheat. That region is filling up rapidly with settlers, many of them Americans, and it is not a wild prophecy that in five years their wheat yield will be quadrupled. This reciprocity, being enacted into law, means 50-cent wheat for 50 years and correspondingly low prices for the other agricultural products admitted free.

CALVIN M. HAYES.

HARTLETON, PA., *April 15, 1911.*

DENOUNCED BY KNIGHTS OF LABOR—AN APPEAL TO THE PRESIDENT AND MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AGAINST FREE TRADE WITH CANADA—DO NOT DESTROY A GREAT INDUSTRY.

THE CONGRESS OF THE KNIGHTS OF LABOR,
New York, April 2, 1911.

To the President and Members of Congress:

The paper industry is one of the greatest single industries in the United States of America. The capital invested exceeds $300,000,000. With an annual business of over $200,000,000, with something like 4,000,000 tons of annual production, the paper industry furnishes to the railroads in the way of freight and raw materials upward of 20,000,000 tons of freight annually. They consume 3,000,000 tons of coal, all from our domestic mines. They sustain a large number of establishments which supply them with machinery and supplies used only in paper mills. They furnish employment directly to over 100,000 men in their plants and probably 40,000 in getting out raw material in the woods and mines, besides indirectly supporting an army of men engaged in supplying them with material which they use in their manufacturing departments.

For every dollar which the consumer pays for paper it is estimated that nearly 70 cents goes to the wage fund of the country.

The whole agitation for Canadian reciprocity is due to a small syndicate of unscrupulous and selfish newspaper and magazine publishers who are desirous of increasing their already enormous profits by $5,000,000 annually through reciprocity at the expense of American labor and industry.

If finished paper is to be imported into this country free of duty, the great paper industry will be crippled, and the man who is a paper maker by trade has got to go to Canada to follow his trade, and take his wife and family into the wilderness to live, where there is no compulsory education law and not one of the comforts of civilization. It means the death blow to many communities clustered about the paper mills and the breaking up of American homes and migration of our skilled labor to Canada, and we are going to have a lot of mills on our hands that won't sell for money enough to pay the bondholders, and the Canadians are going to have our business and our profits.

Any downward revision of the tariff such as the McCall bill proposes would be unjust to both the manufacturer and the farmer of the United States, and would ultimately mean one of two things—the closing of American factories, mills, and workshops, or the American workmen will have to accept a reduction in wages to correspond with the cheaper elements of cost in foreign countries. We would therefore urge that you use your influence to defeat this iniquitous and un-American agreement.

Very respectfully, yours.

THE CONGRESS OF THE KNIGHTS OF LABOR,
J. R. MANBION, *Secretary and Treasurer.*

NATIONAL GRANGE APPEALS.

NATIONAL GRANGE, PATRONS OF HUSBANDRY,
Concord, N. H., March 28, 1911.

To the PRESIDENT:

I would submit that the facts show conclusively that the cost of producing the staple farm crops put on the free list by the Canadian reciprocity arrangement is lower in Canada than in this country. Among these facts, which can not be disputed, are the following:

1. The price of farm lands, as shown by official reports, is much lower in Canada, thus subjecting the Canadian farmer to much smaller fixed charges on his investment.

2. The wages of Canadian farm labor, as shown in an official statement prepared by the Department of Commerce and Labor, are on an average much lower than in this country. This statement gives figures showing that in the Northern and Eastern States the wages paid farm workers are from 20 to 25 per cent higher than in all sections of Canada, with the exception of the Canadian Northwestern Provinces, where wages are practically the same as in our Northwestern States. As against this equality of wages, the value of farm lands in those Provinces is not one-third the value of lands in Iowa, Nebraska, Minnesota, and other neighboring States.

3. The cost of the manufactured articles which the Canadian farmer buys is much lower than that of similar articles used by our farmers, because of the lower tariff taxes imposed by Canada on foreign goods. An examination of the Canadian tariff laws and preferential trade arrangements shows a difference of at least 20 per cent in favor of the Canadian farmer.

4. Owing to the fact that the farm lands of Canada are chiefly virgin soil the Canadian farmer does not find it necessary to use fertilizers to any extent, while our farmers are forced to use hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of fertilizer each year.

Respectfully,

N. J. BACHELDER,
Chairman Legislative Committee National Grange.

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield seven minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR].

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I do not like to disagree with my colleague and good friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOCHT] on this question, but there has been in evidence in the last few days in this House the fact that every man is thinking for himself, regardless of party, and for the best interests of the people of this great country as he conceives them.

We have farmers in Lackawanna and Luzerne Counties, as good farmers as there are in any part of this country. [Applause.] Their fields may not be so fertile or extensive as in some other portions of the country, but they make up largely for this by their industry, energy, and the careful study and intelligent use of soil conditions. And we have a great market there for them. As a result of protection to American industries that market has become so great that the farmers of those two counties, and of all northeastern Pennsylvania, can furnish but a small part of the food necessary for them. [Applause.] Carloads of produce come daily from New York, the West, and South to make up the deficiency.

Now, I want to say to the farmers of this country that where the wheels turn and the furnaces are burning is your market. Originally, as I understand protection, the thought was not so much to protect the farmer against some competitor; it was to give him a market, and the Republican Party has done that. So long as the Republican Party is in power so long will the farmers of this country have a market.

Now, I am an ardent protectionist. No State in the Union has been more steadfast to this principle than the grand old Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. But reciprocity with Canada will in no way violate that principle. Wages and the standard of living in that country are practically the same as in this country. This opening of the markets between us and Canada is not going to hurt the American farmer. It is going to increase our opportunities to manufacture, as our lists of exportations there show conclusively, increase our employment, and enlarge our market both at home and in Canada. The farmer in Canada has not any advantage on account of the great area in land up there. He is paying fancy prices for good farm land to-day, and if you go through that wonderful country, as I had the privilege of doing some five years ago, you will see that real estate values are booming. In the little town of Edmonton, with 12,000 people, the most northerly point reached by a railroad, business property sold there five years ago for $1,000 a foot front, and all around that place, for 2 or 3 miles, town lots were staked out; and the secretary of the board of trade told me that they had to go into British Columbia to get the products with which to feed their people.

We are not going to be harmed by this reciprocal arrangement with Canada, but will be greatly benefited. We are selling from the hard-coal lands of Pennsylvania upward of $14,000,000 worth of hard coal and $19,000,000 worth of bituminous coal and coke. We are going to make that country grow. You will see Canada grow faster than it ever grew in any period of its history—so fast that it will astound the world; and the faster it grows, the greater Canada becomes, the greater will be our market. [Applause.]

First, we ought to make this arrangement with them on account of our neighborly relations. It practically means the addition of a new State. Then there is one question that has not been sufficiently dwelt upon, and that is that we will be at peace with that nation; that not one gun or one cannon will be necessary on the boundary line between us, and making unnecessary the expenditure of vast millions in the future for that purpose. It will be a step forward to peace with the nations of the world. I want to commend President Taft for showing that he has the courage of his convictions in presenting this matter to the House with a majority against him, so far as partisan lines are concerned.

I want to commend him on account of his valor, and it will be a ten-strike in the platform on which he will be nominated and elected in 1912. [Applause on the Republican side.] And I want also to commend him for his attitude on the question

of a commission of tariff experts, showing that he is high-minded, farsighted, and nonpartisan, and that he has some faith, at least, in the good judgment of the Democratic Party on that question. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

And I want to say to Democrats from the Southland, be careful how you move on the tariff question, because if you do what your party did a few years ago, the South, on account of its great recent industrial development, will be hurt more than the North. [Applause on the Republican side.]

From my county millions of dollars have gone into West Virginia, into Texas, Alabama, and other Southern States. I believe, however, much of this money would have been more successfully and usefully invested in Scranton and Lackawanna County, but it is now yours, and if you tinker with the tariff you are going to hurt these and other investors; you are going to deter other millions of northern money from going to your land, and without northern money and northern energy and some northern brains you can not develop the magnificent resources and utilize the splendid opportunities in your great section of country. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

One man in my county, my friends, has $600,000 invested in West Virginia coal lands. If the wheels do not turn and the furnaces do not burn, that coal does not come out of the ground. Another constituent of mine has upward of a million dollars invested in a stretch of railroad in Texas. You must have the mills and furnaces and factories going in order to give employment to the people to make railroads pay, in order to get dividends on anything, and in order to make business worth the while. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NYE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. NYE. Mr. Chairman, I can not hope, perhaps, to add anything that is substantial to this very remarkable debate, a debate which has been interesting and able. But I may offer a suggestion or two in the 10 minutes that I have.

The barbarians of old looked upon a stranger as an enemy. I think the old Romans had but one word to indicate both "stranger" and "enemy." But as civilization advances and men come nearer together and know each other better the tendency is in spirit always reciprocal. And if we were to trace the march of civilization from the primitive days until to-day we should find that humanity has marched toward reciprocity, at least in spirit.

This is not a perfect bill. I am frank to say that in some respects I consider it far from perfect. But I believe it is in keeping with the spirit of our age and a move in the right direction. I do not believe the subject can be disposed of by splitting hairs or even by a careful analysis of trade balances. I believe the question is ethical as well as economic, and I believe the solution of great economic questions should always be in the light of ethical or moral principles. Sound economic policies must be consistent with sound morals and with just and generous dealings between man and man.

I have been reminded a good deal, while thinking on this subject, of a story I used to tell about a fellow who went West from Maine. I can with propriety locate the story in Maine because I was born there, and I know something of the characteristics and peculiarities of some of the people. This was a case where a man went west and was very fortunate and made lots of money, and 40 years later went back to visit an old neighbor of his, and to visit generally those neighbors whom he knew and with whom he went to school. On one occasion he dropped into a little store and saw an old friend whom he had not seen for 40 years. The home-staying merchant was anxious to know how much his friend was worth and how many millions he had accumulated, and as the two sat and talked together the western man helped himself to an apple that was in a barrel by his side and ate it. Finally, when he had finished his visit, which they both had enjoyed, the western man started to go. "By the way," he said, "I took an apple here. How much are they?" The merchant stopped and hesitated a minute, and then said, "Oh, they are two for a nickel. Take another one." [Laughter.] They had not seen each other for 40 years. They had gone to school together and been boys together.

Now, in the philosophy of the thing there was a genuine sentiment of gladness in the breast of each to meet the other. There was the old-time sentiment of friendship at the bottom, but it finally had to be measured on the basis of "two for a nickel." [Laughter and applause.]

It is no new commentary on human nature. Strive as we may to give freer breath to the social and generous sentiments of our being, we fall back at last to a financial basis of action.

According to the philosophy of many, sentiment is fancy. Only selfishness is fact. With our growth will come a clearer and wider vision of life. Future generations who read the record of this debate will wonder at the fear and alarm of those who to-day picture disaster and ruin because of this well-meant effort of neighboring nations to come into closer and more friendly relations, relations mutually beneficial and healthful to both Nations.

I remember when I was a boy on the farm a couple of neighbors could not agree on a line fence. There was a variance of about 2½ inches between them as to where the line was, and they finally built a narrow lane that people used to call the Devil's Lane. I remember it well. I believe in future years we will look back at this devil's lane that stretches 3,000 miles across this great continent, a continent bearing the impress of an Infinite Father's hand, and wonder that neighbors of one blood and kindred, with one hope, one ambition, and one destiny, could not come to terms of real reciprocity. [Applause.]

But it is the same old story. I guess they are just the same over in Canada as we are here. New Brunswick is afraid of her market for potatoes and Maine is afraid, and both legislatures have passed hostile resolutions concerning this treaty. So it is all along the line, here and there, in spots; some fellow whose experience leads him to believe that he will lose a little stands against this measure. I had just as soon my boy, if he thought his future required it, would go to Alberta or Saskatchewan as to go to the Dakotas or Montana, much as I love my own country and my own flag. But there is a life, a future development of mankind on this continent that human legislation can not control. [Applause.] These great, magnificent countries are going to develop side by side one common people, and they do not need to be under one flag. A neighbor can be a neighbor under his own flag. And I believe that in spirit and principle this is right. It is even worth a sacrifice on both sides. It is a farsighted policy. It is a goal of high statesmanship.

I was born on a farm. I lived and worked on a farm until I was 22 years of age. I would not knowingly or consciously enter upon a new economic policy that would be burdensome to the great agricultural class of this country. I would not do so intentionally. I do not believe this measure will operate to the detriment of any class or any industry. Local and temporary disadvantages may result, but the general welfare will be promoted, and the permanent good of both countries will be advanced.

The social tendency of mankind is toward the cities, and it is destined to be so, for aught I see, for generations to come. There is some attraction about the city. I often wonder what it is. I often wish I could go back onto the farm, and I guess I will when I get through Congress; but the mouths to consume are increasing in proportion to our power of production of agricultural commodities. The farmer is not going to suffer in the future. The best opening and the best destiny, industrially, of any man or of any industry in this country is the future of the sound, honest, thrifty farmer, in my judgment. [Applause.] His prosperity will, I believe, be permanent. Nothing short of famine or pestilence seems likely to impede it, and even these will bring him less suffering than will come to the millions who throng the cities and who depend upon him.

I know that some strictures have been laid upon this measure as un-Republican. My good friend who sits here [Mr. DALZELL], who has led the battle for many years for protection, whose ability and courtesy I have always respected, and whom I admire as a man, seems to fear that this is not good Republican doctrine. I tell him that the Republicanism that has given life to the party is not altogether its industrial policies. It is the party of freedom and progress. The Republicanism that lives, the Republicanism of freedom, does not rest on any mere domestic policy.

I believe that with all our strength of production, with our vigor of diversified industry, we can reduce tariffs substantially and in some industries to the point of a revenue basis, and I do not believe that the future of our country or of our neighbor to the north will be advanced by longer impeding the flow of natural commerce and natural trade between these two great peoples. [Applause.]

Others have presented figures and analyzed tables and dwelt upon statistics. These may be ingeniously employed to the advantage of either side and to some extent have been during this debate. I have neither time nor inclination to dwell upon them. From as fair and impartial a summing up as I am able to make one thing appears. That is, the cost of production in Canada and the United States of the commodities affected by this bill is so nearly identical as to bring the measure within the doctrine of the Republican platform of 1908.

Imperfect though it may be, it is in the main in line with modern thought and with modern and progressive Republicanism. I shall support it in the firm faith that the future will justify it, and that vast and general benefits will flow to all our people and to the generations yet to be.

Mr. DALZELL. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VOLSTEAD].

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, in the time allotted to me I wish to talk on one or two points. I did not intend to take any part in this discussion, because I have stated my views quite freely on other occasions. As preliminary I might say that my friend who just spoke [Mr. NYE] appealed to sentiment, and in his inimitable style ridiculed as sordid those who oppose this treaty. It is true generally that in this discussion there has been an appeal to sentiment rather than sense, ridicule rather than reason. But, gentlemen, it seems to me the question for us to settle can not be solved by such means. Sentiment will not satisfy the man that is robbed nor ridicule deter him from retaliating against unfair treatment. Reciprocity between our people should be our first consideration. This is an act to help special interests at the expense of our farmers and to help the cities at the expense of the country. Yes, but they tell us that the farmers can not be hurt, because it is insisted that the price of farm products are fixed in foreign markets. This assertion, though absolutely ridiculous as to most of the products with which this treaty will place us in competition with Canada, has been repeated over and over again in this discussion.

If the domestic price of wheat is fixed by the export price, then the price at Minneapolis should be the foreign price less the cost of placing it on the foreign market. The Interstate Commerce Commission a day or two ago gave me the export freight rate from Minneapolis to New York at 13.8 cents per bushel by the all-rail route and 11.8 cents by the lake-and-rail route; and the Department of Commerce and Labor says the ocean rate from New York to Liverpool has been from 4 to 5 cents per bushel during 1910. This makes a total freight rate of 18 cents per bushel, rail and ocean, and 16 cents by lake, rail, and ocean routes. This is just about what it has been in the years past. I will print in connection with these remarks tables which I obtained from the Department of Commerce and Labor. These tables give the prices of wheat at Minneapolis, Winnipeg, and Liverpool since September 1, 1909. They show that during 18 out of the 20 months wheat at Minneapolis was too high priced to permit of the export of a single bushel. For three months it was higher than the Liverpool prices. In the face of this fact, can anyone contend that Liverpool fixed the price of our wheat during that time? Like tables can be had for a number of years in the past. Everybody who has lived in my section of the country and paid any attention knows that this is true, as newspapers in their market reports have constantly called attention to it.

In the Minneapolis Journal, one of the leading newspapers of that section, which I received this morning, is a statement that wheat is still too high for foreign export.

Canada exports nearly all the time, and their prices are consequently much lower than the United States.

The President in two different speeches has stated that prices of wheat and other cereals are from 10 to 15 cents higher in Minneapolis than Winnipeg. He might have called attention to the fact that in 1905 the difference in price of wheat was 22 cents and that Minneapolis then imported from Canada more than 3,200,000 bushels, upon which a duty of 25 cents per bushel was paid. Only about half a million bushels of this was afterwards exported. The recent report of the Tariff Board, made upon careful investigation of prices, sustains the statement of the President as to this difference, not only as to wheat but also barley, flax, and other farm products, and no one has seriously attempted to dispute the fact. Some cheap attempts have been made to deceive the farmers by comparing prices of some products in eastern Canada with prices on this side in the Middle West, but such comparisons deceive no one, not even those who engage in that pastime. Some have claimed that the difference in prices only applies to small localities, but this is clearly disproved by the President's statement and by the report of the Tariff Board.

That report shows higher prices than Winnipeg, not only at Minneapolis but also at Kansas City, St. Louis, Chicago, and other large grain markets of this country. To talk about Minneapolis and Winnipeg, the two greatest primary wheat markets of the world, as local in character, is about as absurd as anything can be. Anyone that knows anything about the wheat trade knows that Minneapolis fixes the price of nearly all our spring wheat and buys large quantities of winter wheat from Kansas and Nebraska. Winnipeg is the gateway for all of western Canada, and dominates that market. Equally ridiculous is the suggestion made by some that the difference between Minneapolis and Winnipeg is due to lack of elevator or transportation facilities. This suggestion is a mere insinuation. The Tariff Board found nothing upon which such a claim could be based. The wheat prices of Winnipeg are for wheat in store at elevators in Fort William or Port Arthur, and not for wheat located at Winnipeg. These great terminal elevators are as able to handle grain as Minneapolis, and they have the same freight rate for foreign export as Minneapolis and Duluth.

But the argument mainly relied upon to show that prices are not affected by the tariff is that we export large quantities. This fallacy has done duty for many years, and I presume we ought to approach it with the reverence due to its age. The vice of the argument is that it entirely ignores actual conditions.

If all the wheat was of one quality, located at the same spot, and had to be sold on the same day the contention would be very persuasive, but that is not the situation. You may overload and depress the market for a month or two until it gets low enough for export and a few bushels may be exported, still during the rest of the year, while more than four-fifths of the crop is being marketed, our prices may be too high for export. This surplus may be in Kansas or Nebraska without affecting the prices at Minneapolis or other large markets. This is the usual situation. Then again you may have a wheat that can not be sold to advantage in this country, because of its character. This is true of the durum wheat; as a consequence it does not compete to any great extent with our other wheat in the domestic market. It is about the only export that has come from the spring-wheat section in years. The Agricultural Department says that for the year ending June 30, 1911, more than 20,000,000 bushels of this wheat either as wheat or flour was exported.

The total export of wheat and wheat flour during the calendar year of 1910 was equal to about 62,000,000 bushels, of this about 24,000,000 bushels was exported as wheat, the balance as flour. The Pacific coast exported last year wheat and wheat flour amounting to approximately 17,000,000 bushels. This wheat does not come in competition with wheat raised east of the Rocky Mountains where you propose to dump Canadian wheat, as the freight rates are too high to make such competition possible.

Now, let us deduct from the 62,000,000 bushels this 17,000,000 bushels. This leaves 45,000,000 bushels. Deduct from this the durum wheat, 20,000,000, and you have left some 25,000,000 bushels. Nearly all of this 25,000,000 bushels goes out as a low-grade flour, for which there is a very poor market in the United States. The reason why the higher grades do not go to foreign countries is well known. Nearly all the wheat that enters the foreign trade, except that from Canada and the durum from the United States, is a soft winter wheat of poor quality. To make a good flour from this it is necessary to mix it with a higher grade. For some years Europe imported high-grade flour for this purpose, but soon found it more profitable to mix the high grades of wheat with the low grades of wheat. This not only gives better results, but is otherwise more advantageous.

When you come to consider that this export comes in small lots, at different times of the year, and is of the character that I have suggested, there is no difficulty in understanding why the tariff affects the price of wheat. The difference in prices between Canada, the United States, and Liverpool is an absolute demonstration of this effect. But let me call your attention to other farm products. Wheat is but one and to many sections not the most important.

No one has contended that any foreign market fixes the price of our barley, flaxseed, rye, buckwheat, oats, hay, potatoes, butter, cheese, eggs, and the like. Barley is in many sections more important than wheat. The United States produced some 162,000,000 bushels last year. Of this an amount no greater than that produced in a single township in my section was exported from the east half of the United States. A small amount was exported from the Pacific coast, but that barley can not come in competition with barley raised in the great agricultural section of our country, as the freight is 50 cents a hundred pounds from the Pacific coast to Minneapolis. The brewers are about the only ones that will profit by Canadian barley. We produced 33,000,000 bushels of rye last year. Of this less than 20,000 bushels went beyond our borders during that time. The distillers of rye whisky smile over the prospects that cheaper Canadian rye will add to their profits. Flaxseed is another important crop. Until last year we produced enough for home consumption, but as prices had not been sufficient to pay for production, the acreage decreased; this in connection with a small crop in North Dakota left the home market short. We exported last year less than $7,000 worth and imported more than $18,000,000 worth. Canada has the soil and situation to put our farmers out of the business of raising flaxseed. Barley and flax usually sell in Winnipeg for about 20 cents per bushel less than in Minneapolis.

Our production of buckwheat, oats, potatoes, hay, butter, cheese, eggs, and the like is just about equal to our home con-

sumption. There is no export of any consequence of any of these. Those who are in favor of this treaty have studiously tried to force wheat to the front as the only article affected. Is not this a trick to divert attention from the real issue? It will not only affect every article that I have enumerated, but every farm product, both North and South. The opening of the Mississippi Valley took from eastern farmers hundreds of millions of dollars. It gave you ruined farms, deserted homes. You propose to open another empire of rich soil, in which plant food has been stored for untold centuries, and let our farmers, who are compelled to fertilize their soil and expend on it very much more labor than is required on new land to produce a crop, compete, and at the same time you expect them to support a system of protection for the factory. You have promised him different treatment. You may have the power to make him submit, but are you sure that it will profit you? If he was getting an undue advantage he might not find fault; but there is no class of our citizens that receive as little reward for toil or privations as does the farmer. The Agricultural Department, in Farmers' Bulletin No. 437, just issued, says that—

> In actual practice and for many reasons not foreseen at the outset the average profits in farming, aside from the rise in the value of the land itself, are not large, but on the other hand extremely modest.

This was also the judgment of the Senate committee that recently investigated this subject.

This proposition is not fair and should not pass. [Applause on the Republican side.]

APPENDIX.

Minneapolis cash wheat quotations of Nos. 1 and 2 northern (track) compared with Winnipeg quotations of No. 1 northern "in store," Fort William or Port Arthur terminal elevators, and Liverpool quotations of No. 2 northern Manitoba.

	Wednesday quotations.			Tuesday quotations. Liverpool—No. 2 northern Manitoba.
	Minneapolis.		Winnipeg.	
	No. 1 northern.	No. 2 northern.	No. 1 northern.	
1909.	*Cents per bush.*	*Cents per bush.*	*Cts. per bu.*	*Cts. per bu.*
Sept. 1	98⅛	96 - 96⅛	97⅛	125⅛
8	97¼- 97¾	95¼- 95¾	97½	129
15	99⅜-100⅛	97⅜- 98⅛	98½	130⅛
22	100⅛-100⅜	98⅛- 98⅜	98	129⅛
29	101⅜	99⅜	94¾	130
Oct. 6	101	99	96⅛	130¾
13	103¾	101¼	98⅛	131½
20	104¼-104¾	102⅛-102½	97	131
27	105⅛-105¾	103⅛-103⅝	97⅝	131
Nov. 3	102 -102⅛	100 -100⅛	95⅝	115⅞
10	104⅛-104⅜	102⅛-102¾	97⅛	115⅝
17	105⅞-106⅛	103⅞-104⅛	98⅜	.....
24	106¾-107	104¾-105	99⅛	117⅝
Dec. 1	105⅛-106	103⅞-104	94⅛	118⅜
8	109⅛-110	107⅛-108	96⅛	118⅛
15	112 -112⅛	110 -110⅛	99⅜	119⅜
22	111⅜-112⅛	109⅞-110⅛	100⅛	120⅜
29	111⅛-112⅛	109⅛-110⅛	100⅜	119⅛
1910.				
Jan. 5	114 -115	112 -113	103⅞	122⅛
12	114⅜-115⅜	112⅜-113⅜	103⅞	122⅛
19	110⅝-111⅜	108⅝-109⅜	101⅞	120⅞
26	114 -114¼	112 -112⅛	103¼	120⅞
Feb. 2	111¾	109¾	103	121⅜
9	112	109	102¼	119⅞
16	115⅜	113⅜	103⅛	120⅛
23	113⅜	111⅞	102⅛	119⅛
Mar. 2	114⅛	112⅛	103⅛	119⅜
9	114¼	112¼	104	118⅜
16	114¼	112¼	104¼	120⅞
23	116¼	114¼	105⅛	120⅜
30	115⅜	113⅜	105¼	121⅞
Apr. 6	110⅜	108¼	104	121⅜
13	111	109	103⅛	119⅜
20	107⅛	105⅛	100⅜	117⅞
27	109⅛	107⅛	99⅜	117⅛
May 4	111	109	99⅛	112⅜
11	112¼	110¼	98¼	112⅛
18	110	108	96¼	109⅛
25	109⅜	107⅜	92⅜	104⅛
June 1	106¼	104¼	88¾	97⅜
8	107⅜	105⅜	90	102⅜
15	106⅛	104⅛	89¾	99⅛
22	111⅛	109⅛	93⅛	102⅜
29	115¾	113¾	100¼	107¼
July 6	118	116	106	107⅛
13	118	116	109⅛	110⅛
20	120¾	124¾	115⅜	119⅜
27	124⅜	122⅜	110¼	121⅜
Aug. 3	117⅛	114⅜	106	117⅜
10	115⅛	110	108⅛	117⅜
17	113	109⅛	110	121⅜
24	110⅜	107⅜	107⅛	121⅛
31	112⅜	110⅜	108⅛	120⅜

Liverpool quotations are for the day preceding the date specified in the statement.

Weekly (Tuesday) quotations of wheat in the Minneapolis, Winnipeg, and Liverpool markets, Sept. 6, 1910, to Apr. 18, 1911.

[Data taken from Commercial West, published at Minneapolis, Minn., and Broomhall's Corn Trade News, published at Liverpool.]

	Minneapolis.		Winnipeg.		Liverpool.
	No. 1 northern.	No. 2 northern.	No. 1 northern.	No. 2 northern.	No. 2 northern Manitoba.
1910.					
Sept. 6	$1.12⅜	$1.10⅞	$1.05	$1.03⅜	$1.20⅜
13	1.11⅜	1.09⅛	1.02½	1.01	1.18⅜
20	1.11½	1.09	1.01	99	1.18⅜
27	1.10½	1.08	99	94¾	1.16⅜
Oct. 4	1.10⅜	1.08⅜	98¼	94¼	1.15⅜
11	1.09½	1.07⅜	97	93½	1.16⅜
18	1.05	1.03	95½	92¼	1.16⅜
25	1.04½	1.02½	94¼	91½	1.15⅞ 1.08⅜
Nov. 1	1.02	1.00	89½	86½	[1] 1.05½
8	[2] 1.02	[2] 1.00	90	87	1.03⅞
15	1.07	1.05½	94	91	1.03⅜
22	1.05⅜	1.04⅜	94¾	91¾	1.08
29	1.03	1.01⅜	90	87	1.05½
Dec. 6	1.04½	1.02¾	91¼	88¼	1.06¾
13	1.02⅜	1.01⅜	89½	86½	1.05½
20	1.02½	1.01	90	87¼	1.04⅜
27	1.02⅜	1.00⅜	89¾	86¼	1.05½
1911.					
Jan. 3	1.06⅞	1.04⅞	92½	89½	1.09¼
10	1.08½	1.06¾	95	92	1.09¾
17	1.08¾	1.06¾	95½	92½	1.10¼
24	1.05¼	1.02¾	94	91	1.11½
31	1.04⅛	1.02⅛	92	89	1.11¼
Feb. 7	1.01	99	92	89	1.11
14	97½	95½	90¾	88¼	1.11
21	98¼	96¼	90¼	87¼	1.09¾
28	96⅜	94⅞	88	83½	1.08½
Mar. 7	99¼	97¼	88¾	86	1.08
14	99¼	97¼	90	87½	1.07¼
21	98¼	96¼	90¼	87¾	1.07¼
28	95⅛	93⅛	89¾	87	1.07¼
Apr. 4	93	91	88	85	1.05¾
11	98⅜	96⅞	89¾	87	1.07
18	98	96	90½	88	.....

[1] Quotation for new crop.
[2] Quotation is for November 9, November 8 being a holiday in the United States.

Quotations of flaxseed at the Minneapolis, Duluth, and Winnipeg markets from Sept. 26, 1910, to Jan. 23, 1911, as reported by Commercial West.

[Price per bushel.]

Dates.	Minneapolis.	Duluth.	Winnipeg.
1910.			
Sept. 26	$2.70	$2.78	$2.48
Oct. 3	2.54	2.53	2.15
10	2.66½	2.65½	[1] 2.44
17	2.64	2.64	2.40
24	2.57½	2.61	2.39
31	2.60½	2.61½	[2] 2.43
Nov. 7	2.63	2.64	2.45
14	2.70	2.74	2.52
21	2.59½	2.64½	[3] 2.45 / [4] 2.37
28	2.54	2.53	2.26
Dec. 5	2.55	2.54	2.25
12	.....	.....	.....
19	.....	.....	.....
27	2.42	2.37	2.07
1911.			
Jan. 3	2.48⅞	2.47⅞	2.22
9	2.53	2.53	2.26
16	[5] 2.61	[5] 2.61	2.42
23	2.63½	2.63½	2.25

[1] October 11 quotation. [2] November 1 quotation. [3] November bid. [4] December bid. [5] January delivery.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LA FOLLETTE].

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, this debate on Canadian reciprocity has had a wide range; it is well that it has, and proper that it should. This is a momentous question, and one affecting for benefit or injury all of our people.

I protest against the attempt to close this debate or the fixing of a date to close until each and every Member on both sides of this Chamber who so desires has had ample time to express his views on this great measure. Neither the Democratic nor the Republican Party can afford to suppress full and free discussion in debating a question of such importance as this. I have no apology to offer for having asked for an hour on this question, even though a new Member. I am as much concerned, and my constituents as much interested, as if I had served here for 30 years. I can not help feeling, as I hear men

asking for time and unable to secure time enough fully to express themselves, that they have the right to demand it.

What is the pressing need for a hurried vote on this question? Will it not stand investigation? Do you think you are currying any favor from the farmer or anybody else by shutting off debate on a question of such vital importance to him as is this?

SOMEWHAT OF A "RUBE" MYSELF.

One of the gentlemen on that side of the Chamber referred to the farmer yesterday as a "Reuben." Well, I am a "Rube" myself.

When this report reaches the Farmers' Cooperative Union and the great grange organization of this country, they will have something to say about the short time given to debating a question of such importance that a special session of Congress was called to consider it. The distinguished gentleman from Connecticut, and others here, have given a great array of figures to justify the passage of this measure, covering the relative conditions in the two countries, scale of wages paid, and so forth, attempting to show that there is no discrimination against the farmer, but there was one item they failed to take into consideration. Otherwise I would pay no attention to their glittering array of figures.

They failed to count in the cost of the fertilizer that thousands and thousands of our farmers have to use. The North, East, and the South are full of fertilizer factories. The great packing houses of our country put it out by thousands of tons. The newspaper farmer, the banking farmer, the factory farmer, and, very often, the statistical farmer do not always take this item into account, but the bona fide farmer does.

I venture to say that thousands of our farmers pay out more per acre for fertilizers than it costs thousands of Canadian farmers to put in and harvest their crops per acre. Do you think in cases like that they can compete on a free-trade basis with him?

WHAT PRICES DOES LIVERPOOL FIX?

We have heard much about Liverpool fixing prices. Liverpool does not fix the price on apples in the United States, does it? It does not fix the price of barley, does it? It does not fix the price of hay, does it? Or of potatoes? No; nor of wheat, except to a limited extent, and every intelligent farmer knows it. There are many factors affecting prices all the time, but the farmer does know that 25 cents tariff on the bushel protects him against the competition of Canadian wheat.

I am only a plain farmer, one of that class whom the gentlemen on that side of the Chamber and some of those on this side are trying so hard to convince will not be hurt by the passage of a measure of this kind.

I wish to say to those on this side of the Chamber, who are mostly high protectionists for the manufactured products of their States and communities, and who are now arguing this heresy of the farmer's product going on the free list against the only country he has any need to fear as a competitor in nearly all that he produces, that they are either inconsistent now or else must admit they have for many long years been attempting to flimflam the farmer by word, act, and acquiescence in this protection to his industries.

CAN FARMERS BE BLAMED FOR SUSPICIONS?

Can you blame the farmers of this country for doubting your sincerity? Who constituted you the arbiters of his fortune and the judge of what would be his benefit? And I will say to the gentlemen on that side of the Chamber, who are arguing along the same lines, that as a party they are as inconsistent.

Under your great Wilson bill, when you had the opportunity to carry out these free-trade heresies, did your party improve it? No.

That law carried protection to all farm products, as did the McKinley law. It is true it reduced the rates on those products, as it did in common with other schedules. Did those reductions help anybody or the Government? No.

The effect was exactly the opposite. Why did not your party, when it had the opportunity, put all farm products on the free list, including hemp, cane, cotton, peanuts, with all the products of the South and North? You are very solicitous for the welfare of the farmer, and you also desire to tickle the consumer. It is politics you are playing, and you no more desire free trade as a party than do these proselytes, now your colleagues on this side of the Chamber, and you are attempting to bunco the farmer as well as they are.

Mr. Chairman, some of the gentlemen on that side of the Chamber and the Democratic press of the country have criticized the insurgent Republicans for working hand in hand with the Hon. JOSEPH G. CANNON and other so-called standpat Republicans on this great question.

I have no doubt it gives them a pain to find that most of those insurgents who rebelled against so-called usurpation of power by not only Mr. CANNON, but by other Speakers who preceded him, who took different views on methods of procedure and revising the rules of the House that he and other gentlemen did, to find that when it came to great questions like the present one, a proposition that carries with it a vital principle involving not only the financial but the moral interests of the country that these insurgents were still Republicans.

INSURGENTS WOULD CORRECT ABUSES.

The so-called insurgent Republicans are progressive. They want to see the Republican Party correct any abuses that have grown up within the party and the Nation during its long and I will say glorious life. No other political party on earth can point with pride to the achievements along all lines of human endeavor as those that have been written on history's pages during the life of this great party. If the Democrats of this country thought a difference of opinion on some questions was going to cause a split in the Republican Party, that progressives would forsake the party of Lincoln, Garfield, and McKinley, those three great martyrs, the party of Grant and Sumner, of James G. Blaine, Oliver P. Morton, and other noted statesmen, they must have been grievously disappointed.

Mr. Chairman, I think the Republican Party is to be congratulated that it contains an element of progressiveness, just as I think the Democratic Party should thank God that they have insurgents and progressives in their party, for they are the balance wheels that prevent parties from going to destruction, and it is necessary that we have great political parties.

Mr. Chairman, the South has thousands of farmers, broad-minded, well-informed men, who have within the last few years awakened to the necessity of cooperation. I have met many of them and have the good fortune to belong to the same fraternal and economic unions that many of them do. I have learned to appreciate their sterling qualities, their sense of honor, and their liberality in reciprocal relations between our order in different parts of our common country.

I have traveled to some extent in the Southland, through the Virginias, Carolinas, and through Georgia, Tennessee, and Kentucky. It is a wonderful land. But much of it shows the effects of one to two hundred years of use. The farmers who are so bravely trying to meet the responsibilities of life, rear their families, and maintain their high moral and social standards under the conditions incident to a depleted soil are worthy of all honor and consideration and the highest respect of their countrymen.

SENTIMENT HOLDS SOUTHERN FARMERS.

As I traveled through parts of the South and contrasted their farms and farm land with that of the boundless West I was prone to say: "God pity them; their condition in life is hard indeed. Why do they stay here when they can do so much better in the West or in Canada?" And then the words of Scott's poem, in his Lay of the Last Minstrel, came into my mind:

> Breathes there the man with soul so dead
> Who never to himself hath said,
> This is my own, my native land!

And the question was answered, this was home—the magic word "home." To-day, as ever, every rightly constituted man and woman, wherever they are and whatever their station, long for home, sweet home. Thousands have left the Southland to make their homes in the North and West, and while they have prospered and grown rich there, they still exclaim of the States of their birth: That "is my own, my native land!"

I have talked with many of them and heard their stories, contrasting the ofttimes struggle for existence on many of the farms of the East and South with their condition of peace and plenty in the West.

Mr. Chairman, being a farmer myself and, I think, understanding farming conditions fairly well in all sections of this Union, I will never knowingly support a measure that discriminates against the farmer or strikes at his welfare as a class, even though I know some of them would be benefited thereby.

NO WHEAT, BUT POLITICIANS.

The gentleman from North Carolina said they did not raise wheat down in his State; and his own lack of knowledge of the industry proves that he at least never raised it, or is in any way informed on the subject. But they do raise wheat, cotton, corn, hemp, sweet potatoes, tobacco, fruit, and many other products, and some of their politicians do raise "h" with a dash and an "l."

I desire to warn the Members from West Virginia, Virginia, and all of those States that are putting out thousands of acres of apples that Canada raises apples, and has hundreds of thou-

sands of acres of as good apple land as there is in the world, and their apples are better keepers than those raised in southern climes. I will give you apple statistics a little later.

I think your southern apple and tobacco raisers, your growers of cane, cotton, and rice, of cattle, sheep, and wool, and all other products are deserving of protection against the products of any foreign country that might come in competition with them. Your country raises some of the products that Canada does. In tobacco and apples she would become a great competitor with Canada under free trade. As far back as the year 1901 Canada produced 11,266,732 pounds of tobacco, as shown by the Canadian Year Book of 1909, and the same authority shows that in 1906 she had 155 tobacco manufactories capitalized at $15,274,923.

WHY NOT FREE-LIST SUGAR?

In this famous compensation bill which you have introduced as a sop to the farmer are you putting tobacco and tobacco products on the free list? Thousands of them use it, as well as do other thousands of our citizens. Canada also has sugar factories and can raise sugar beets in any quantity. You could probably benefit Canada and the American consumer if you would put sugar on the free list. Do you intend to do it in this compensation bill of yours?

Our farmers all use sugar when they have the money to buy it; so does the great mass of the people you call the consumer, though the farmer is the heaviest consumer of any one class because there is more of him. If you want to help those poor consumers in the tenements and factories, do you not think they would get as much benefit from free sugar as from free potatoes?

The farmer is not altogether a hog, although he raises a few. He does not ask for special reductions in his favor. All he asks is a square deal for all the people. You can not fool him with this compensation bill of yours that does not compensate. Quit playing politics and play ball.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina points with pride to this as a Democratic measure. I am very willing they shall father it, and I very much regret that a Republican President has seen fit to champion so unjust and nonmeritorious a measure as this so-called reciprocity fiasco. He is a great lawyer, an eminent jurist, and an authority on government, but doubtless has had but little time to give to economic questions.

His environment and occupation have been such that, evidently, he has given little thought to agricultural questions, and in this case we consider he has been very unfortunate in his advisers.

If we refer to the table of articles on which Canada would have to remit to us on 1910 business under this agreement, we find that United States coal shippers would be benefited to the extent of $455,246, a little more than one-sixth of the money that Canada would have to remit under this act.

GOOD THING FOR MINE OWNERS.

And while this would be a good thing, no doubt, for some of the American mine owners, and so forth, it is no help in the world to that large coalless region lying contiguous to Canada's immense coal fields. Canada has a rate of 53 cents the ton against the United States rate of 45 cents the ton, and Canada did make a rate reciprocal with ours, or 45 cents the ton, but no consumers of coal in the United States are benefited thereby. Still, one-sixth of the business on which Canada remits is coal.

I have heard much said about this measure, but as yet I have never heard one word that shows any crying need for it or any valid reason why it should not be amended and made a just reciprocity measure, or else defeated.

The cry is made that the exactions of the Paper Trust are grievous. Are they more grievous than a great many others whose products are really benefited by this measure? I have not heard any reason assigned for the fisherman's products being placed on the free list. The framers of this measure have tried to justify themselves with the farmer, but not the fisherman. I presume the difference is caused by the farmer's much larger voting number. They need to fool him, but the fisherman politically can not figure very heavily, so it is not necessary even to apologize for placing his products on the free list.

When this measure passed the House last winter, 2,100 Gloucester fishermen placed their flags at half-mast, and well they might. Canada, with its relatively smaller population, has the same fishing possibilities as this country, and our fishermen already feel its competition. According to the statistics we have here, Canada exported of dutiable fish of all kinds to the United States in 1910 more than 73,000,000 pounds, while the United States sent into Canada less than 4,000,000 dutiable product.

SACRIFICES FISHERMEN FOR MANUFACTURER?

Does the sponsor of this bill in the House [Mr. McCALL] feel that the fishermen of his State are not as worthy of consideration and protection as are its manufacturers?

Mr. Chairman, I feel that the principle of protection to American manufacturers on the basis we have conducted it has been shamefully abused, but as against that abuse and absolute free trade for our country, I think the latter would work to our people far greater calamity than have the abuses under the former.

I believe in tariff revision. I believe in an effective tariff commission that will check the abuses that have long years existed under the system. But while I think absolute free trade would be a calamity, yet from the viewpoint of justice and right, is much more defensible than this attempt to single out three or four of our industries and arbitrarily place them on the free list.

Mr. Chairman, I do not consider it justifiable to try and correct something we regard as a commercial mistake by committing an act of injustice or a moral wrong. I raise my voice here against the attempted rank injustice done to each and every interest being discriminated against under this treaty. As I have said, I am a farmer. I am a member of the Grange and the Farmers' Union, and have been a member of every farmers' organization of any scope we have had in the United States for the last 30 years. I know how they as a class feel about this measure. I am in receipt of petitions that represent the desires of thousands of farmers on this question, and those in favor of this measure are in the proportion of about 1 to 1,000. These petitioners are farmers who represent all political parties.

The Farmers' Union and Grange of the North, East, West, and a part of the South are against this discriminating treaty. Even though in some cases it might benefit some of them, they object to the unjust features of the measure.

Mr. Chairman, the cry of the Members on that side of the House that this is a blow at protection is not borne out by the effect of the Democratic reciprocity measure which was on the statute books of this country from 1854 to 1865.

It had the same free trade provisions, and the only thing it demonstrated to this country was that Canada had vastly the better of the deal, and that at a time when its agricultural production was not a drop in the bucket to what it is now, and when its chance for the better of the treaty was nothing to what it is at the present time, nor is it now a drop in the bucket to what it will be in the future.

On most of the articles Canadians can not raise Canada refused to reciprocate. It puts some fruits and vegetables on the free list, for it, in a greater or less degree, raises most of them, but oranges, lemons, pineapples, and fruits of that kind it refused to let in free. They were entirely too good revenue getters, and it would likewise offend some other nations with which Canada does business if it discriminated in favor of the United States.

CANADA WINS BY TEMPTING SOUTH.

The only wonder is that Canada put cottonseed oil on the free list. Those long-headed Canadian statesmen must have realized that they would have to concede something to our Southland or fail of its support for this measure. Accordingly they put cottonseed oil on the free list and made a very substantial reduction on peanuts. Thus on the basis of 1910 business Canada would remit on those two products $219,223.85, which is between 11½ and 12 per cent of the entire amount Canada would have to remit.

Now, while I have referred to this I do not for one minute think this is influencing the vote of any Member on that side of this Chamber, whatever I may think of other motives, probably not so worthy, influencing some of them.

I am sure of one thing, and that is that it did not influence Senator JOSEPH W. BAILEY, of Texas, when he said on the floor of the Senate last winter that he would never support a measure so unjust to the American farmer as this one.

Mr. Chairman, in looking up the meaning of the word reciprocate, in order to be sure that I was giving to the word its true meaning and not simply what I myself thought it should mean, I found that Webster gives as the logic of reciprocating, "A proposition which asserts subject and predicate to be equal and identical in extent."

Taking Webster as an authority for the meaning of the word, I want to say that the title of this bill is a misnomer; that in few particulars are there any truly reciprocating features in it.

In my judgment it should be entitled "An act of discrimination against certain classes of our people in favor of Canada."

There are several propositions involved in this question, and the one that naturally appeals to us is the financial side, but

in passing laws the Congress of the United States is never justified in passing them purely for financial reasons when there is a moral consideration at stake of vastly more importance to the Nation than is the mere question of dollars and cents.

By what ethics can we justify the singling out of three or four of our industries and putting their products or output on an absolutely free-trade basis, leaving other industries as fully protected as before? Is there any justice in such action?

FEW CLASSES SACRIFICED.

Yet this is what the proposed measure does. By what right do we, as Representatives, take a measure of this kind, negotiated by men, but few if any of us ever heard of until this measure came up—I mean those who represented the Department of State—Mr. Pepper and Mr. Davis, who went up to Ottawa and there framed this measure that would depreciate in value the property of part of our people for the benefit of another part of our people and the Canadians and their Government?

Mr. Chairman, a measure of this kind, of such vital importance to our governmental welfare and the welfare of vast numbers of our people, is a thing which should not be entered into hastily, its essential features trusted to untried and uninformed men. Neither should it be passed through Congress by any such hurry-up methods and urging against the amending and correcting of the unjust features of the measure as was practiced and urged at the last session of Congress. I also question the moral right of any political party to go into caucus and agree to pass a drastic and unreasonable measure like this for political expediency, or to make such an attempt.

Mr. Chairman, I found on my desk a few days ago a pamphlet from the Government Printing Office, headed "Canadian reciprocity; extracts from the Daily Congressional Record from January 26, 1911, to March 4, 1911." Among these extracts I find one from the speech of the Hon. OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD, of Alabama, in the House of Representatives, February 14. I desire to read an excerpt from that speech. The gentleman from Alabama says:

> Now as to agricultural machinery and meat. Of course I recognize that this bill is not properly balanced when you put cattle on the free list and leave a prohibitive tax on meat, as you do in this bill. But I want to call your attention to this fact: Suppose you put meat coming from Canada on the free list, would you get any meat to the consumers in this country? Not at all. The Canadians do not produce enough meat for their own people. A little might come over the border here and there, but it would not affect the price of meat in this country.

Mr. Chairman, I have not the pleasure of Mr. UNDERWOOD'S acquaintance. I have no doubt but that he is an honorable, upright gentleman, and I would not for one minute impugn his motives in making this declaration; but I am inclined to think he made that statement from some preconceived ideas in the matter and not from any statistical facts. While, no doubt, he thought he was right, I think, Mr. Chairman, that I hold in my hand a document which will prove to the satisfaction of the gentleman from Alabama that he was wrong. I have here a copy of the Canadian Yearbook for 1909. On page 124 of this book I find, under the heading of "Trade and Commerce, Table XXIX," information regarding the total amount of meat Canada exported to all countries during the years 1905 to 1909, inclusive.

CANADA LARGE MEAT EXPORTER.

According to this table put out by the Canadian Government, the minimum amount of all classes of meat Canada has exported in any one of the years from 1905 to 1909 is 83,909,745 pounds, and the maximum amount exported in any one year 163,481,589 pounds, and a total for five years of 574,427,970 pounds.

We find in the list of meats shipped by the United States to Canada last year that all kinds of meats—fresh, dressed, dried, salted, barreled, and canned, including chicken—only a total of 18,119,642 pounds, less than one-fourth of the amount Canada exported in any year from 1905 to 1909, both years inclusive.

The gentleman from Alabama was under the impression that Canada could not raise enough meat for its own consumption. You can not judge of the possibilities of a country altogether by its exports and imports, and the fact that Canada imported some meat from the United States was no proof that it could not produce enough meat for its own use. Some of the speeches made in the Sixty-first Congress, as well as in the present Congress, in favor of this measure show an amazing lack of information as regards Canada, or else a willful desire to fool the American people, and this is another reason I am against this principle of attempting to decide the fate of a measure like this or any other by a caucus.

A few men generally control these caucuses, fix their policy, and largely destroy the incentive of their members to investigate conditions for themselves. In other words, the caucus destroys their initiative, and they become automatons or pawns on the chessboard. This for the defenders of that system on both sides of this Chamber.

Mr. Chairman, in this same pamphlet of extracts, already referred to, I find a speech of Senator Carter, of Montana, delivered in the United States Senate, in which he presented some excerpts from the statements made by Mr. Pepper and Mr. Davis as to where the Canadian reciprocity measure benefits the farmer; they tell how many more vegetables the United States ships to Canada than Canada to us, and how this is going to help the farmer. He also refers to shipments of fruits.

WHAT PERSONAL EXPERIENCE SHOWS.

Mr. Chairman, I have been a fruit and vegetable grower for some 14 years, and I have exported by the carload into Canada, and presume I understand Canadian conditions and possibilities as well as Mr. Pepper and Mr. Davis do. I will not attempt to say that there will not be some cases where American shippers would benefit under a reciprocal agreement that puts fruits and vegetables on the free list, but on the whole, with my knowledge of Canada's possibilities as to production of those fruits and vegetables that can be raised in that climate, in my judgment the United States producer will lose infinitely more than he will gain by this arrangement.

There is a widespread opinion that Canada can not raise fruit to any extent, and while part of the data I have on this subject is somewhat old, much of it is up to date. This is what Canada produced in fruit from 1871 to 1901, according to the Canadian Yearbook of 1909:

	1871	1881	1891	1901
Apples.....bushels..	6,365,315	13,377,655	7,519,913	18,626,186
Peaches.....do....	.....	.....	43,637	545,415
Pears.....do....	.....	.....	229,240	531,837
Cherries.....do....	.....	.....	192,369	336,751
Plums.....do....	.....	.....	266,350	557,875
Other fruits.....do....	358,963	841,219	320,641	70,396
Grapes.....pounds..	1,126,402	3,896,508	12,252,331	24,302,634
Small fruits.....quarts..	.....	.....	.....	21,701,791

In 1910 Canada shipped 8,126,984 pounds of dried apples, 1,604,477 barrels of apples, which is nearly 5,000,000 bushels.

If Canada has increased in the same proportion in the last 10 years that it did in the other decades referred to, it produces now something more than 30,000,000 bushels of apples, and we suppose other fruits in proportion. While this is not much fruit the possibilities of enormous accessions to this supply are staring the United States producer in the face, and even now the throwing of 10,000,000 or 15,000,000 bushels on the American market would materially decrease the price of apples to the United States producer in the fall of the year when the majority of these fruits are marketed.

He refers to cottonseed oil, and there, Mr. Chairman, I admit there will be a distinct gain to our people. Already Canada is using large quantities, and putting this on the free list should help the cottonseed oil mills, and Canada can not produce it under natural or advantageous conditions, and if the United States could allow some product of Canada that would not interfere with the living or welfare of some of our own people to come in free as an offset, it would be fair and just reciprocity, and carrying out the ideas of reciprocity as advocated by James G. Blaine and William McKinley. Neither of them ever hinted at such reciprocity with Canada as is contemplated by this measure.

Mr. Pepper and Mr. Davis refer to sheep as follows:

> The sheep raisers of the United States would 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 $50,000.

INTERESTING FACTS OVERLOOKED.

These gentlemen failed to tell in this connection that the United States, on sheep imported into this country from Canada, collected duties amounting to $103,519, and that Canada exported to this country about three times as many sheep as we sent there. If this becomes a law the United States sheep man is certainly worsted, as under this act vast herds can be driven down from Canada in the early spring into the United States, for there is no restriction. After shearing time they can be driven back into Canada, thus putting large quantities of Canadian wool on the free list as well as sheep, and becoming equal competitors in wool sales with our American growers.

The statement has been made on the floor of this House that the American negotiators of this measure desired to put meats and meat products, as well as flour, on the free list, but that Canada would not agree to it. The idea that Canada, which is trying to build up its industries and manufactures, would

reject a proposition that would give employment to labor and open up a 92,000,000-people market against their 7,000,000 who have immense quantities of grain in excess of their own needs and have only made a start on their possible production, would refuse to put flour on the free list is too incredible for belief. The same might be said of meat products. If Canada can furnish the United States with the animals, they surely need not fear for their home market, but should jump at the twelve-fold greater one.

If Canada did so refuse, our representatives at the drafting of this measure would have been perfectly justified in refusing to indorse the agreement. I maintain, without any fear of successful contradiction, that the admission of their raw products above mentioned into the market of the United States gives the great milling industries of our country, the Meat Trust, and other protected industries a chance to use the Canadian product to hammer down the price of the United States product without any necessity whatever for their giving to the consumer an equal reduction.

ADVOCATES OF MEASURE INCONSISTENT.

These reciprocity disciples say in one breath that our people need all the flour and breadstuffs they can get, and in the next, "We are the largest exporters of wheat in the world."

If this is right, why this crying need? One assertion refutes the other. If it is true, there is only one need we could possibly have for Canada's products, and that is to use as a club to hammer down American prices, which it would naturally do.

Let us be honest with each other and the country. No individual or party can afford to carry a measure by misstatement of facts or by attempting to mislead the class which has all to lose by this arrangement.

Mr. Chairman, the two subordinates of the State Department who negotiated this treaty for our country, these gentlemen to fortune and fame unknown, give us "Wheat values and reciprocity" as follows:

The wheat crop of the United States in recent years has varied from 550,000,000 to 750,000,000 bushels per annum. The present production of Canada is from 100,000,000 to 160,000,000 per annum. Optimists as to Canada's possibilities in wheat raising go so far as to estimate her wheat crop, when the Northwestern Provinces have been more thoroughly settled, at twice and even three times her present production. It is safe to assume that the Canadian surplus of wheat for the immediate future will amount to from 40,000,000 bushels to 100,000,000 bushels per annum. The price of wheat in the United States generally averages as to the northwestern crops fully 10 cents per bushel, and sometimes so much as 15 cents per bushel, higher than in the corresponding sections of Canada. The effect of the removal of the duty on wheat will be advantageous to Canada in that her wheat will be placed substantially on a parity with values in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I have given these figures of the negotiators of this treaty as to wheat values in the United States and Canada especially for the benefit of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN], who so persistently, and I might say so insolently, branded all those asserting this difference in price as falsifiers.

Now, as to their claim regarding Canada's possibilities in wheat raising, I wish to read an excerpt from the report of a Canadian senate committee to their Parliament after scientific examination into Canada's lands and other resources:

Within the scope of the committee's inquiry there is a possible area of 656,000 square miles fitted for the growth of potatoes, 407,000 square miles suitable for barley, and 816,000 square miles suitable for wheat. * * * There is a pastoral area of 860,000 square miles, 26,000 of which is open prairie with occasional groves, the remainder being more or less wooded. Throughout this arable and pastoral land latitude bears no direct relation to summer isotherms, the spring flowers and the buds of deciduous trees appearing as early north of Great Slave Lake as at Winnipeg, St. Paul, and Minneapolis, or Ottawa, and earlier along the Peace River and some minor western affluents of the Great Mackenzie River, where the climate resembles that of western Ontario.

CANADA HAS BOUNDLESS FARMS.

And again:

Three years ago Mr. Conroy, of the department of Indian affairs, reported to a Canadian parliamentary committee that he had found excellent farms in the latitude 62 degrees 3 minutes, which is almost as far north as Iceland, farther north than the southern end of Greenland and some 800 miles north of the upper boundary of Minnesota, where he saw heavy crops of wheat, oats, barley, and peas. Before he started south, on July 28, barley cutting was already under way. He reported all kinds of wild fruits in the country, with the exception of apples, which can not be grown north of Edmonton. But even as far north as Fort Providence he picked with his own hand fine strawberries, raspberries, blueberries, and cranberries. And this is the territory even beyond that territory which Gen. Sherman once contemptuously designated as "the frozen belt."

We find that this 656,000 square miles fitted for the growth of potatoes amounts to 419,840,000 acres, and at 100 bushels to the acre—a low estimate for potatoes—gives a possible 41,984,000,000 bushels of potatoes. Yet there are people already beginning to bemoan the starvation of future generations for the lack of food. We find that the 407,000 square miles suitable to barley production is equivalent to 245,828,000 acres, which at the very low estimate of 10 bushels to the acre gives a production of 2,458,280,000 bushels of barley. Need anybody fear that future generations will run out of that very essential article from which to make beer?

We find that the 816,000 square miles suitable for raising wheat equals 522,240,000 acres, which, at the very low estimate of 12 bushels to the acre, amounts to 6,266,880,000 bushels of wheat; and yet some of our pessimistic economists are already lying awake nights pondering where future generations are going to obtain their white loaf. If but one-half of this territory were used for purposes enumerated, still at Canada's average production per acre, it would not reduce these figures.

We find that their 860,000 square miles pastoral area equals 550,400,000 acres, which, allowing 10 acres to the head, would pasture 55,040,000 head of stock. And it is quite evident that Canada will always be able to furnish its own meat supplies.

The timber, the mineral, including coal, the fisheries, and other natural resources of Canada are probably unequalled by any like-sized territory on the face of the globe, and we want to remember that it has 750,000 square miles more territory than is contained within the boundaries of the United States.

WHEAT RESOURCES OF CANADA ENDLESS.

There is one valley up in Canada that is capable of raising more wheat, or as much wheat, as Mr. Pepper claims optimists estimate for all Canada. This is known as the Peace River Valley, and is made up of 65,000,000 acres of first-class agricultural land. Of the nature of its soil Prof. Tanner, the great English laboratory agriculturist, has reported as follows:

We have hitherto considered the black earth of central Russia the richest soil in the world. That land, however, has now to yield its distinguished position to the rich, deep, black soil of western Canada. The earth here is a rich vegetable humus of from 1 to 4 feet in depth, with a surface deposit rich in nitrogen, phosphoric acid, and potash.

This one valley, which, as compared to the whole of Canada, is as the State of Missouri to the United States, is capable of producing nearly as much wheat as is now produced by the United States. It is this wonderful country, filled with such marvelous future possibilities, that our distinguished friends here who are favoring this bill desire to place in competiton with our farmers and their too-often depleted soil.

In return for the privilege of shipping their raw products into the United States free, among other things, Canada has graciously made a reduction of some 14 per cent in her tariff rate on automobiles. The poor manufacturers and the consumers of that luxury will receive the benefit, and this alone should console the fishermen of Gloucester, potato raisers of Maine, dairymen of New York, and apple raisers of Michigan.

The reciprocity treaty which existed between the United States and Canada from 1854 to 1865 has been both lauded and criticized, but whether or not this was a wise or beneficent measure or a weak and discriminating one there is one fact of mathematical accuracy, and that is that the Government of Canada was the financial beneficiary and the Government of the United States the heavy loser.

SUMNER'S VIEW OF OLD TREATY.

Charles Sumner, of Massachusetts, in a speech in the United States Senate, January 11, 1864, said:

I come, in the last place, to the influence of the treaty on the revenue of our country; and here the customhouse is our principal witness. The means of determining this question will be found in the authentic tables which have been published from time to time in reports of the Treasury, and especially in the report made to Congress at this session, which I have in my hand.

Looking at these tables we find certain unanswerable points. I begin with an estimate founded on the trade before the treaty. From this it appears that if no treaty had been made, and the trade had increased in the same ratio as before the treaty, Canada would have paid to the United States in the 10 years of the treaty at least $16,373,880, from which she has been relieved. This sum is actually lost to the United States. In return Canada has given up $2,650,890, being the amount it would have collected if no treaty had been made. Here is a vast disproportion, to the detriment of the United States.

Here is another illustration, derived from the tables: During the 10 years of the treaty the United States have actually paid in duties to Canada alone $16,802,962, while during this same period Canada has paid in duties to the United States the very moderate sum of $930,447. Here again is a vast disproportion, to the detriment of the United States.

The same inequality may be seen in another way. During the 10 years of the treaty dutiable products of the United States have entered Canada and the other Provinces to the amount of $83,347,019, while during this same period dutiable products of Canada and the other Provinces have entered the United States only to the amount of $7,750,482. During this same period free products of the United States have entered Canada and the other Provinces to the amount of $118,853,972, while free products of Canada and the other Provinces have entered the United States to the amount of $178,500,184. Here again is a vast disproportion, to the detriment of the United States.

Add to these various results the statement in the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, which has just been laid on our tables, in the following words:

"The treaty has released from duty a total sum of $42,333,257 in value of goods of Canada more than of goods the produce of the United States." (Foreign and Domestic Commerce, 1864, p. 93.)

This conclusion is in substantial harmony with that which I had reached from an independent examination of the tables.

From these various illustrations it is clear that the revenue of the United States has suffered by the treaty in question, and that in this important particular its advantages have not been shared equally by the two countries. Here, at least, it loses all title to its name.

There is an old saying that we can only judge the future by the past, and if such was the result to our Government under that treaty it would be only reasonable to suppose that the same conditions will occur again.

In this case we have only to take the tables prepared by our Government for our guidance in considering this bill to see that a like condition would exist under this treaty. We have statistical data covering all articles exported and imported from and by the two countries from each other for the year 1910 that would be in any way affected by this treaty, together with the present duty rate charged by each country; also giving the proposed reciprocal rate and the amount of money levied by the two countries on articles imported and the amount that would have to be remitted on 1910 business by each country under this agreement.

CANADA DRIVES GOOD BARGAIN.

We find that Canada imported from the United States in 1910 reciprocal products to the amount of $47,827,959, on which she collected tariff duties of $7,776,236. Of this amount Canada would have to remit under this reciprocal agreement $2,560,579. Take this from the duties collected and it leaves Canada a balance of $5,215,657 tariff revenue. We find that the United States imported from Canada during the same year products to the value of $47,333,158, on which we collected customs duties of $5,649,826. Of this amount we would have to remit under this proposed agreement $4,849,933, leaving a balance in favor of the United States of $779,893 tariff duties collected on more than $47,000,000 of business done with Canada, as against Canada's $5,215,657 on practically the same amount of business it did with this Government.

Where is our Government's reciprocal benefit from a measure like this?

We have indisputable proof here that the United States on practically the same amount of business done in Canada that Canada did with us only receives a little more than one-sixth the revenue Canada receives from us under this proposed treaty. Is it wise for our Government to go into any such treaty with these indisputable figures staring us in the face?

This is, in my judgment, not only a great moral wrong we are attempting to do a certain class of our citizens, but from the standpoint of sound business policy it looks to me to be indefensible. Canada puts on the free list all commodities on which it knows it will be able to compete with us, but with few exceptions on those articles which Canada considers are not competitive it retains duties that bring in as much revenue under this treaty as the United States collected from Canada under the old system.

I maintain that from a financial viewpoint this is not fair to our Government as an executor, and from a moral viewpoint it is not fair to our people. This measure is only reciprocity in name. It is a travesty on justice, executed for the benefit of special interests under the guise of a benefit for the masses.

Mr. Chairman, the President of the United States has been quoted as having said that it would check and reduce the cost of living—

that it will not hurt the American farmer, will help the Canadian farmer, and reduce the cost of living to the consumer.

He may be able to fool some American producers with a paradoxical declaration of that kind, but he can not fool all of them.

BOUND TO HURT PRODUCER.

The law of supply and demand, the commercial training of a lifetime, teaches that by no natural conditions can such a thing be possible. How is it going to lower the price of food products to the consumer, yet not hurt the United States producer? There is nothing the producer can buy from Canada that would reduce his cost of living commensurate with his sacrifices. The entire line of commodities that he buys bears the same old tariff rate, with the single possible exception of rough lumber, so he can not help but suffer, the President's assertion to the contrary notwithstanding.

Is it not possible that it is largely other things our people have to buy that are responsible for their burden of high cost of living and not the food supply?

In Secretary Wilson's report for the present year he brings his discussion on the high cost of living to a close as follows:

From the details that have been presented with regard to the increase of the prices of farm products between farmer and consumer, the conclusion is inevitable that the consumer has no well-grounded complaint against the farmer for the prices that he pays.

After the consideration of the elements of the matter it is plain that the farmer is not getting an exorbitant price for his products, and that the cost of distribution from the time of delivery at destination by the railroads to delivery to the consumer is the feature of the problem of high prices which must present itself to the consumer for treatment.

Note again that this statement is from the annual report of the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Wilson.

Some great statesmen in their wisdom, in order to get an increased business for certain manufactured articles, have seen fit to put farm products on the free list, thereby depriving the United States producer of protection against the only country he had any reason to fear—this without consulting him or giving him any representation on the supposed commission that framed this agreement.

Now they add insult to injury and belittle his intelligence by telling him that it will not hurt him, but will benefit the consumer.

WHEN FARMER IS HURT COUNTRY IS HURT.

Let us reason together and figure out whether we show good statesmanship and wise policy to treat one class of our citizens in such a high-handed and arbitrary manner. Will it pay even from a financial point of view? Suppose this agreement was entered into, and there is a consequent reduction in the cost of living. There is also bound to be a consequent reduction in the purchasing power of the United States farmer. The United States is dotted over with smiling towns and villages, the prosperity of which is directly influenced by the purchasing power of the farmer.

If this purchasing power is reduced you have immediately struck at the greatest single factor in our American prosperity. The consumer may live cheaper, but he will immediately find that his wage has decreased and his certainty of employment diminished. The trade of the retail stores of all kinds will begin to fall off, consequently it will be felt by the wholesaler in the city. The sales in agricultural machinery and other manufactured products will decrease along with diminished trade in all other lines, and the reduced purchases of home products will greatly offset the increased sale of products in Canada under this reciprocity agreement.

There will be an immediate shrinkage in farm values to keep pace with the decrease in the price of farm products. There will be an increased value of Canadian lands to correspond with the relative value of a 92,000,000-people market opened at their door. We will immediately suffer a great decrease in our circulating medium caused by the influx of American capital into Canada, as well as the loss of a great many of our good citizens who will go over there to reside and partake of their greater prosperity.

The moral effect upon our country will immediately be felt. The farm, becoming unprofitable, will cause an immediate exodus of farmers' sons and daughters to other avenues of life, thus accelerating a condition that has long been causing anxiety and commiseration among our thoughtful scholars and economists. If, in order to benefit a few manufacturers and special interests in the United States, we force this condition on the American producer, what assurances have that class that in a year or two the same interests, desiring to increase their trade with Argentina, will not enter into a similar agreement with that country, with a promised decrease in the cost of living to our consumers and assurance to the American farmer that it will not hurt him?

The American farmer has as much to gain by reciprocity with South America as with Canada, and is bound to lose in either case. The American manufacturer and special interests of all kinds would probably be willing to trade the exchange of the United States agricultural products in return for the admission of their own wares on the same principle that a man is willing to sacrifice all his wife's relatives for the good of his country.

PRIVILEGED CLASSES CRUSH AGRICULTURISTS.

It has been the history of all nations that the wealthy and privileged class controlled the Government and worked their own sweet will on the agricultural classes. This policy was usually carried out until that class became a debased peasantry. When they arrived at that point those countries speedily had their fall. This has been the history of all nationalities, and unless the governments of the present day can profit by the experience of the ages they will follow to the same end.

Some of our European countries are realizing this, and have made vast strides in amending economic laws and changing conditions among their agricultural classes. The most noted of these is Germany.

Great stress has been placed on the benefits that would accrue to the American farmer from the cattle that would be

sent down from Canada to be corn fed in the United States. It is true there might some cattle be brought into this country for that purpose, but, in my judgment, they would be few and far between.

Canada may not be able to raise much corn, although in Ontario they can raise corn equally as well as in New York and Michigan, and better than in Wisconsin or Minnesota. Canada can raise oats, wheat, and barley galore, and can fatten cattle on those grains the beef quality of which is hard to surpass. When the reciprocity bill passed the House last winter cattle immediately took a tumble in price, on account of the increased supply that was going to be obtainable, and an Iowa representative, who was an extensive feeder of cattle, told me that he had ordered his sold at once, at a loss of $1,000. He was of the opinion that he would lose more if he held his cattle and the measure passed the Senate.

Wheat immediately declined some 5 or 6 cents the bushel and never rallied, but the price of flour and beef made no corresponding decline. The consumers of those two commodities received no benefits.

If gentlemen think that the Canadians would allow their cattle to go into the United States as feeders when they have unlimited feed of a splendid quality, they underestimate the shrewdness of our Canadian brother. Some gentlemen arguing on this reciprocity measure allude to the tariff between the United States and Canada as a wall, an unnatural barrier. Why any more unnatural than that between this and other nations with which we have commercial relations?

WHY ONE LINE BARRIER MORE THAN ANOTHER?

There is no more excuse for calling the line between an English colony and us an unnatural barrier than one between us and England herself, though an ocean rolls between. We can do business more expeditiously with England than we can with a large part of Canada. Even though there is only an imaginary line between us, that line is as broad as the Atlantic Ocean when it comes to a question of nationality.

There is nothing in this imaginary line bearing on the justice, injustice, or wisdom of this measure.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, if we are going to hammer down the price of our own products with Canadian products, give the woolen industry, the cotton manufacturer, the Sugar and Tobacco Trusts, the United States Steel Trust, and all other protected industries free trade. They are as able to stand it as the American farmer, and there is more justice in this demand than there is in forcing this so-called reciprocity measure on the United States producer. I again reiterate there can be no gain for any part of our people that would compensate for the rank injustice done to another class.

The greatest mistake the United States can make is to start in to trade even the partial prosperity of her agricultural classes for the benefit of any other industry. If justly handled, they will be for all time to come the bulwark of this Nation, her leaders in honor and virtue. They who hold communion with nature and nature's god are apt to be good citizens, and we need the help of that leaven to keep the entire loaf wholesome.

Mr. Chairman, there are sure to be some who would benefit from a measure of this kind, for all could not lose from a financial viewpoint. Reciprocity in most any form is sure to help somebody. The question is whether or not we, as a Nation, can afford to pass a measure like this simply for a financial consideration. The principle of the thing is more to be considered than anything else. The taking away from the United States farmer all protection as against his most dangerous competitor in the manner contemplated by this act is as unjust to him as was King George's acts against the American colonies.

It is natural for all of us to be selfish in our viewpoints on questions like this. If it benefits us financially, it is easy for us to think the other fellow's view is wrong and his loss largely imaginary, while our loss or gain is very real, indeed.

WESTERN FRUIT MAN DECEIVED.

In the far West the fruit man thinks he will gain by an increased demand for his products in the Canadian treeless region. In the fruitless sections of our country it is a matter of indifference. In the East, where United States fruit products have to come into direct competition with Ontario, they are bitterly opposed to it. Anyone who is benefited by this measure considers the contention of the producers of other kinds of products as hardly worthy of consideration. All of our people who own Canadian mines or Canadian lands naturally favor this measure, and it is hard for them to see wherein it could do harm.

The people who buy paper products hope for a benefit from free pulp wood and free paper, and while they think there is concrete argument for their being benefited, it is easy for them to think the other fellow's contentions of damages are weak and unreasonable. There are some who care nothing for the losses of others if they are only sure of benefiting themselves, and there are those who say they expect to suffer a personal loss, but are willing to stand it for the sake of striking a blow at the principle of protection. They admit that this reciprocity agreement is very unjust in its provisions, but are willing to see this wrong committed in order to destroy what they regard as an unwise commercial policy.

This class is little, if any, better than those who look at it solely from the viewpoint of self-interest, for they utterly fail to take the moral effect into consideration. This is not a local question, but a national one, even though it is a question which affects every local community, and its effects should not be considered from the viewpoint of its benefit to the individual, community, or district.

What the effect is going to be upon our entire Nation, not only financially but morally, is more important, and the least thing worthy of consideration is the question of political expediency as affecting political parties or preferment. The actual welfare of the Nation is more worthy of consideration. [Loud applause.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I may be pardoned for engaging the attention of this body so early in my legislative experience in this Chamber when I say that, in my judgment, there has not been in the last generation brought before the American Congress so far-reaching and enormously vital a proposition, that so universally affects the whole interests of every class of people I have the honor to represent here as this so-called reciprocity compact.

Not only is it true of my people locally, but to a greater or less degree the whole of the American people elsewhere, and especially is it true of the 30,000,000 of them who are engaged in our agricultural industry and who are producing annually food products to the fabulous value of nearly $9,000,000,000.

Kansas being chiefly and almost exclusively an agricultural region and not lagging in the good work proudly carries the banner above all other States in the production and annual value of her wheat crops, and stands near the head of the column of States in the production of corn, beef, pork, and other foodstuffs. It is not, therefore, strange that her farmers are very deeply and vitally interested in what is going to happen to their great business of stock raising and farm productions, amounting annually in value to $640,000,000, and to their bank deposits, now aggregating $150,000,000 more, when the last anchor of protection they have on their industry shall be swept away by the passage of this bill, bringing them face to face with an unknown and unascertainable competition that will come to them from the incalculable possibilities of a rapidly developing agricultural empire across our northern border, where labor is paid far less, lands one-half or less cheaper, with a fertility much greater than their own. And all this without a reciprocal morsel in return.

It may be wise to remember that we have been delegated and are here solely to legislate for the benefit of our citizens, and not foreigners, which thought should be paramount in every conscience before trying this extremely doubtful experiment that, in the light of the past, will become an additional burdensome yoke upon him who daily goes forth before the rising of the sun and is at this hour tilling the soil, and until the close of the day, for the very necessities of life which all must have—the merchant, the mechanic, the doctor, the lawyer, the preacher, the teacher, and the banker, all wait until in the sweat of his brow he has plowed, sowed, and reaped. He feeds them all.

The farmer's trade is one of worth;
He's partner with the sky and earth,
He's partner with the sun and rain,
And no man loses for his gain.
Men may rise and men may fall,
Yet, the farmer, he feeds them all.

It is of the rights of this great army of American toilers, who are contending with the very elements day by day, in sunshine and rain, in heat and cold, that should be defended from assaults from every source. They are in their fields and are not here. In this they are greatly handicapped for legislative consideration in competition with the well-organized manufacturers, wage earners, and the corporate interests of the country, for the farmers are almost wholly without organization, heretofore depending upon the inexorable law of compensation, which has always met with favor in their sight—receiving an equivalent for what they confer—and content to work out an industrial destiny without special governmental favors.

They are willing at all times to do the square thing, even to conceding some things not to their advantage if in the interests of the city toilers, but if protection is taken off of all their products, as this bill does, they want and are demanding to see it come off of the packers' products and all trust-made goods which they are compelled to buy. If it is protection, they want their share of it; if it is free trade, they want their share of that; and if it is to be reciprocity, they want it to be reciprocity.

The farmers of this country, and especially the western farmers, believe that in trade if you increase the purchasing power of a customer you thereby increase your own prosperity; and therefore they well understand that the more laborers employed and better wages paid in the mills and factories of the East and South the more consumers there will be and better prices will they obtain for their wheat, corn, beef, pork, and other food materials, the finished product of their industry.

Believing thus, they have stood firmly in the past for every measure that would throw a wall of protection around the mills, factories, and workshops in the East and South and the laborers and wage earners employed therein as against all foreign competitors; and they are now willing, if fairly treated by them, that all such industries shall be protected by that reasonable Republican doctrine, namely, the imposition of such tariff duties as will equal the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad with a fair profit to the investor.

Protectionists have always claimed that home competition prevented prices from becoming excessive. In recent years this natural law has been curtailed in its operation, so far as many manufactured articles are concerned, by the action of the trusts in preventing real competition in trust-made articles, and progressive Republicans have demanded not a destruction of the protective principle, but a lowering of the duty until it measured but slightly more than the difference in the cost of production here and abroad. But no one has claimed that there was not real competition in the home market as to agricultural products. The farmers have not combined. The prices of their products are still regulated by the law of supply and demand.

If this be true—and it is true, and no one will deny it—pray tell me then why the protection on the farmers' products should be the first to be destroyed? Pray tell me why it is inconsistent in those who have demanded a reduction of the tariff on trust-made articles to oppose a measure for reduction which carefully—I may say studiously—excepts them from its provisions?

The farmers are not demanding class legislation; they are asking no special favors; they are only contending that the same standard should be applied to the measure of their protection that is applied to others. They contend that the true measure of protection is the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad, and demand that a no more favorable method be applied to those interests which have stifled competition than to theirs, where home competition is free and unobstructed.

"Equal rights and special privileges to none." Afford the farmers this and they will ask no more.

But, let me warn the gentlemen on this floor representing the manufacturing districts of our country, who are pressing so ardently the passage of this so-called reciprocity measure, which robs the farmers of every line of protection they now enjoy. That they may cease to be liberal to your interests, become impatient under the burden you have laid upon them, forgetting the golden rule, and say unto you, "An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth," and with some Elijah to lead them on, strike back by encompassing your walls of protection, assaulting them so fiercely that there will not be one stone left upon another, and you too will face the avarice and greed of every nation of the earth and then feel the sting of the like burden you have placed upon them.

Gentlemen of the South on this floor, who are so numerously favoring this bill, I ask you where is your fairness or consistency in hugging to your bosoms an ample protection on your sugar, rice, tobacco, and peanuts, of which last year you produced but $150,000,000 worth, and demanding and pressing the passage of this measure that will sweep away the last vestige of protection the farmers elsewhere have, who for the same period produced cereal crops alone of more than $3,000,000,000 in value. With child-like fondness you cling to a tariff on one-twentieth of this great production, and insist that the farmers elsewhere shall lose all on the remaining nineteen-twentieths, and then declare here and upon the stump with vehemence that protection is a robbery, thereby convicting you, not as accessories to the alleged crime, but as principals. Wherein can there be any justice to force the farmer to sell his cereals in a free-trade market and retain an amply protected market in which to sell your cotton, sugar, tobacco, and peanuts?

Pass this bill and you legislate in favor of the corporations, trusts, and combines everywhere by compelling the American farmer to sell his wheat in a free-trade market, so far as Canada is concerned, and when converted into flour, save to the Flour Trust a protected market of 50 cents per barrel in which to sell its products; it will force him to raise and sell his steers, the finished product of his labor, in the same free-trade market, while you give to the packer and the Beef Trust a protected market of $1.25 per hundred pounds in which to sell its meats at exorbitant prices to every family in the land; and it will force the farmer to sell all his other food products in a like free-trade market, and at the same time you carefully give an amply protected market to all manufactured food products now so completely controlled by the numerous other trusts of the country that are daily exploiting the poor of the city, the family on the farm, and everyone, by demanding an unjust tribute from them all.

Charles Sumner once said that reciprocity was a beautiful word and very pleasing to the ear, and then showed how difficult it was to put into practice generally, and condemned the Canadian reciprocity agreement of 1854, which was very similar to the proposed measure, covering like products from each country, as this one does, and which proved so disastrous to and was by the United States abrogated in 1865. Canada has been knocking at our doors ever since for a renewal of the old agreement. She has pressed her claims upon every administration from Lincoln to the present time, without avail until now. If our experiences with a like Canadian reciprocal agreement in the past is of any value, then we should not hesitate, if for no other reason, to set our disapproval upon it. Enact this measure into law and we again reverse the policy of this Government since its foundation, and especially is it true that it will overturn the policy pursued by it in the last 50 years, which has brought to it unbounded prosperity by increasing the property of the Nation from $16,000,000,000 to more than $116,000,000,000, or more than one-fourth of the wealth of the entire world. It will reverse the policy of a great majority of the leading statesmen of our country from the beginning of our Government, as advocated by Washington, Hamilton, Sumner, Morrill, Grant, Sherman, Harrison, Garfield, Blaine, McKinley, and many others who stood for a complete protective policy for the American farmer and reciprocity in such commodities only as were not and could not be produced in this country. In the light, then, of our past teachings, history, and policies, how does the proposed reciprocal agreement square itself, for it requires us to freely open up the greatest market on earth of 92,000,000 of people for an unimportant market of less than 9,000,000 of people, which is unequal, unreciprocal, and unfair?

It puts upon the free list every product of the farmer of the North and West, composing one-third of our great population, to the direct competition of an empire of farm lands as large as our own, with greater fertility, more than one-half cheaper in price per acre than American farms, with labor far lower than our own, and destined at no distant day to be producing an equal amount of farm products to that of the American farmer, if not much more.

George Harcourt, deputy minister of agriculture for Alberta, one of the several Provinces of Canada, in 1909 made this report:

> Of the country which is known the area of producing grain is 220,000,000 acres. The total area in crops last year was 11,257,870 acres, producing a total crop of 240,000,000 bushels. This is not the end. There is a great northern country, the McKenzie Basin, which is capable of producing grain. (Canadian Yearbook.)

It has been estimated that within a comparatively short time, with the encouragement this measure gives, this vast territory will produce bread enough to feed the people of the whole North American Continent. In this connection I invite attention to an address delivered in the House of Commons by Sir Wilfrid Laurier, for 16 years prime minister of Canada, on March 7, 1911:

> We [referring to Canada] are above all an agricultural people. Our chief wealth is the growth of these products of the Temperate Zone. What are they? Fruits, cereals, and vegetables; and it is our boast—not an idle boast, but a boast founded upon actual experience—that in cereals, vegetables, and fruit we can, without exaggeration, beat the world.

This, too, is manifestly unfair to the American farmer, to now bring him up against such conditions, who for many weary years struggled against depression and adversity in building up the vast wealth of the Nation, and after the long-looked-for day of prosperity to him had dawned, when he was just coming into his own and reaping fair and remunerative prices for his patience, labor, and toil, to be thus sorely smitten by him whom he has in the years that are agone defended with his

strong arm, to now be forced to stand with helpless hands while his lands decline in price, see the fruits of his toil sell for less, compelling him to work more and to produce more and sell more for the same amount, in order to keep the home and the farm running. This is not only unjust and unfair to him, but is gross ingratitude. The farm home is an institution and not a factory, and must go on from year to year; the same expenses must be paid from day to day. He therefore can not shut down his farm and close his home, like the mills and factories, when hard times and low prices prevail, and wait for better times as they can do.

The American farmer knows he can not close down and wait, that his industry must go on, and with courage he faces the future and with a loyal devotion to his home, country, and flag, excelled by none, every emotion of his heart pulsating with—

My country, 'tis of thee,
Sweet land of liberty—

and realizes he owes a patriotic duty to preserve the home and farm, the hope of the land, without which this country will weaken, fail, and finally perish as nations have done in the past and be known only as they on the historical pages of time.

The American farmer is the chief factor that has created our great American market, built on her soil, in trade and commerce over her rivers and lakes and railroads of which we proudly boast, which exceeds $25,000,000,000 per year, with a production in agricultural and manufactured products four and one-half times greater than all Europe and spending more for education than all the rest of the world combined, the foreigners contributing not one cent in taxes for the maintenance of our schools, churches, roads, bridges, and all other internal improvements that go to make this great market for the use of which he heretofore has had to pay a tariff in order to enjoy the benefits thereof; but this bill, in effect, proposes to compel the American farmer to tax himself to build roads and bridges and highways, so that the Canadian may conveniently travel over them to every American farmer's door as his competitor without money or price. How reciprocal(?).

It has been admitted in debate by friends of this measure that the price of wheat in recent years in the United States has averaged somewhat over 10 cents per bushel more than in Canada, and that this proposed measure, if put into force, would either lower the price of American wheat or raise the price of Canadian wheat. If the former should happen, as intended in the bill, it would have produced a direct loss to the American wheat raiser of $74,000,000, applied to that crop of 1909, and a loss to the Kansas wheat grower last year of the vast sum of $8,500,000. And applying this to the middle and western portion of Kansas, where by skillful farming, the production of wheat, oats, and barley has been developed second to no other portion of our country, driving the arid boundary westward beyond the Colorado line, will work an irreparable injury and perhaps destruction to that industry there.

What loss would come to the American farmer on other products of his can not now be ascertained, but, as affecting one interest alone, again I want your attention to the words of Mr. Laurier when he said, in the aforesaid address:

Then there is the cattle trade. Years ago we had a cattle trade with Great Britain. We have some yet, but it is not as large as it ought to be, because everybody knows that it has been constantly retarded by the exchange embargo put upon it some 20 years ago or so, and therefore, if we are not able to sell all the cattle we can raise, in Great Britain, there is a ready market in the United States.

Great Britain, to whom Canada owes her allegiance, places an embargo on the cattle trade from Canada, and we are here now removing all embargoes as a gracious gift to her Canadian daughter. How generous(?). How reciprocal(?). How fair(?).

A few comparisons will be sufficient to establish the fact that this so-called reciprocal measure is not reciprocal in any respect, but wholly unilateral in spirit and effect:

(1) It gives to Canada a market of 92,000,000 of people, valued annually at $25,000,000,000, for a market of less than 9,000,000 of people, which is far less in proportion to her people than that of our own.

(2) It gives free trade in our great market for all Canadian farm products and refuses free lumber, coal, iron ore, and the like to the American farmer.

(3) It opens our markets freely, but does not require Canada to remove the export duty on her wood and wood pulp that we buy from her.

(4) As to the reciprocal nature of this agreement, the opinion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier is worth considering. In the same address above referred to he compliments the Canadian minister of finance, Mr. Fielding, and the Canadian minister of customs, Mr. Patterson, who negotiated the agreement with our Secretary of State, and thanks these two men for having obtained from the United States such an advantageous arrangement and "having obtained it without the sacrifice of any Canadian interest." In other words, he means to say the United States gave all and Canada gave nothing in return.

(5) Pass this bill and we take a step backward among the nations of the earth, for Germany, France, Belgium, and the rest of the world have long since discarded the old reactionary policy of giving free trade in farm products, that even free-trade England is anxious to discard, which will bring dearth and depression to our agricultural industry; our rural population will surely decrease and the slogan "Back to the farm" will become obsolete, and "Go West, young man," will not take him to Kansas, Nebraska, Oklahoma, or the great Middle West, but will be unheeded by him, and he will turn his back on the old home and country and either face toward Manitoba, Saskatchewan, or Alberta, to there swear allegiance to a king and live under another flag, or toward the overcrowded cities, to abide where slums and saloons abound, as breeding places of ignorance, lawlessness, crime, and anarchy. Such is not conducive to, but dangerous to the country's welfare.

It has been urged that this measure will lessen the price of food products and cheapen the cost of living to all; that it will lessen the value of food products of the producer, yes; but to the consumer, no. The consumer does not eat wheat, but the product of the Flour Trust; he does not eat fat cattle, but the products of the Beef Trust. Neither does he eat other raw materials of the producer, but the manufactured food products so completely controlled by the other trusts of our country. It is apparent, therefore, that this measure is not in the interest of the producers nor the consumers of manufactured food products, but in the interest of the conspiracy of organized avarice and greed; and the trusts, combines, and corporations will absorb, as additional profits, all reductions it will force from the producer of farm products long before it reaches the consumer of food products.

The greatest beneficiaries under this measure will undoubtedly be the trusts, combines, and corporatons who buy and sell the food products, both of the producer and consumer, together with the railroads who will transport these products from the Canadian fields to our midst in competition with our own home products. It is perfectly natural, therefore, that the Hills, Rockefellers, Morgans, Vanderbilts, and other captains of high finance are reported as favoring the passage of this measure, which is not only unreciprocal, but class legislation against a large body of our American citizens in favor of a foreign people, and is obnoxiously discriminative in character as against one class of our own people in favor of another, for it gives to the American farmer a free-trade market in which to sell his products and amply protects the trusts and combines of the country in their methods in the handling of the food products of our people. It forces the farmer to compete with free wheat and protects the Flour Trust on its flour at 50 cents per barrel. It gives free competition in barley for the farmer and 45 cents per hundred pounds protection to the brewer on malt barley; free competition in live stock for the farmer and $1.25 per hundred protection to the Beef Trust for its meats; free competition in free flaxseed and other oil seed for the farmer and ample protection on linseed oil and such products for the Oil Trust; free competition in horses and cattle for the farmer and protection at $1.25 per thousand on lumber for the Lumber Trust to house them; free competition in dairy products for the farmer and protection on coal at 45 cents per ton for the Coal Trust. Besides the Sugar Trust, the Steel Trust, and all the other products of the numerous other trusts seemed to be favored as against the American farmer, which is unfair, ununjust, un-Republican, and un-American.

In placing myself in opposition to this measure, along with many others of like belief, I am not unmindful of the sensation that awaits our experiences beneath the most powerful machine of the times—the steam roller of the opposition—which is operated so skillfully by the gentlemen on the other side of this Chamber. Unpleasant for a time it may be, but the conscientiousness of having stood for and defended the rights of the people we represent will be satisfaction everlasting. [Loud applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CURLEY].

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Chairman, in the consideration of the Canadian reciprocity bill one would be justified in the assumption that the paper manufacturers and lumbermen of the country would be forced into bankruptcy in the event of the passage of this measure. I am in favor of the Canadian reciprocity bill because the Lumber Trust and all its allied interests are opposing it and because it typifies the most advanced character of pro-

gressive legislation in behalf of the great masses of our people. [Applause.] The activity of the special interests in their endeavor to defeat this measure is a sign of the times.

We find the best thought of the Democratic Party of the Nation favoring this Canadian reciprocity bill, and there seems no question in my mind that its passage will eventually lower the cost of living to our people.

I do not think that God in His wisdom ever intended that an unnatural barrier should rise as a monument to greed, avarice, and the lust of wealth between the people of this country and their neighbors across the Canadian border. [Applause.]

What matters it if the earnings of the Lumber and Paper Trusts and their satellites are reduced if a market for the exportation of our products and the interchange of Canadian goods makes lighter the burden borne by the great masses of our toilers. [Applause.]

But above and beyond all else there is absolutely no question in my mind but what the present high and intolerant cost of living to our people can be lowered materially if we remove the present tariff walls existing between the United States and Canada and allow the wage earners of the land to enjoy the benefits to be derived from Canadian staple products.

To say that there can be no advantage in opening to the widest extent the great market upon our borders is the sheerest folly. Let me present for a moment as a fair and well-drawn illustration the actual conditions in the city of New York that have come about under the present high cost of living.

New York City has a population in round numbers of 4,700,000. It is estimated that these 4,700,000 persons spend about $2,350,000 a day for food. According to the tables of the United States Bureau of Labor the price of beef in 1909 showed an increase of 32 per cent over the average price for the 10 years between 1890 and 1900.

Bread showed an increase of 24 per cent.
Butter showed an increase of 35 per cent.
Eggs showed an increase of 42 per cent.
Flour showed an increase of 54 per cent.
Milk showed an increase of 41 per cent.
Mutton showed an increase of 35 per cent.
Fresh pork showed an increase of 68 per cent.
Salt pork and bacon showed an increase of 80 per cent.
Ham showed an increase of 45 per cent.
Potatoes showed an increase of 20 per cent.
Veal showed an increase of 30 per cent.

This means that the people of the city of New York are paying $180,000 a day more for meat, or $66,000,000 a year, than they would pay under the prices of the previous decade.

They are paying $34,000 a day more for eggs, or $12,000,000 a year.

They are paying $20,000 a day more for milk, or $7,000,000 a year.

They are paying $34,000 a day more for butter, or $12,000,000 a year.

They are paying $7,000 a day more for potatoes, or $2,600,000 a year.

They are paying $267,000 a day more for other articles of food, or $101,000,000 a year.

Thus the people of New York are paying $542,000 more a day for food, or $200,000,000 more a year for food, under the present prices than they would pay under the average prices of 1890–1900.

My friends, let us soberly realize the great problem that confronts us with the people of one American city paying an increase of $200,000,000 on foodstuffs in a single year.

The passage of the Canadian reciprocity bill will realize a double gain for the American people. For we will put raw materials upon the free list which will save our small manufacturers a substantial part of what it now costs them to run their factories, and also let in the food products from the great harvest fields of Canada which will ameliorate the conditions in our cities, such as I have just illustrated, by reducing the cost of living.

I believe also that there is a great and important side of this question that has not as yet been considered in the debate upon this tremendously vital economic issue, and that is the opportunity that lies for moving a new and vastly important commerce of another land through the ports of the United States.

And I beg in connection with this proposed gain in American commerce that you will note how almost entirely dependent Canada is upon her eastern and western terminals for the movement of such commerce, while the United States has so many outlets necessary for this new trade.

No adequate defense can be presented for the trade barriers we have erected against the Canadian Dominion. The trade of our country with Canada should flow as freely as between the States of the Union, for we need the raw materials, the food supply, and the taking advantage of the wonderful natural resources of the Dominion.

To-day all over the land may be noted the demand of hundreds of small manufacturers that they may have the free raw materials of Canada in view of the rapidly increasing competition which they are feeling more and more each year. For the full measure of prosperity will only come to the small manufacturers when they realize an ability to secure the necessary free raw materials for their factories on the fairest and most equitable terms.

The most grievous fact that appears in the trade relations between the United States and Canada is that in the main we have taxed the people of the Dominion on the majority of goods a duty nearly twice as large as that which Canada places upon American goods.

We are establishing a system of continental freedom of trade in the passage of this measure. We are realizing for the first time, as we should have realized years ago, how important—yes, how vitally necessary to us—are the products of the Canadian forests, the earth, the sea, and the mines, and we will allow the American workingman to freely exchange his products with the Canadian lumberman, farmer, fisherman, and miner and pay for them, in reality, with products of our own, for you must bear in mind that the people of Canada are as yet little engaged in manufacturing pursuits and form an ideal people for us to trade with.

The people of Canada, by reason of our greater development in manufacturing, are to-day vitally in need of the things we are most engaged in making, and which we must sell more and more to foreign buyers if we are to continue to grow in prosperity.

With trade flowing as freely between the United States and Canada as between the States of our Union, we shall realize again that great prosperity which followed the trade centers of the East and the great agricultural centers of the West, and find history inevitably repeating itself between the manufacturing centers of the United States and the great and rapidly developing agricultural districts of the Dominion.

Never in the history of this Republic have the conditions of great affluence upon the one hand and extreme poverty upon the other been so strongly paralleled, and the only protest that now rises in the country against the passage of this measure is the voice in behalf of special interest.

The marvelous economic awakening of our people that caused the recent upheaval in politics and gave so wonderful a Democratic victory was the voice of the people crying out for relief from the exactions of a high and intolerant cost of living, and the very presence of many new faces upon the other side of this historic Chamber and a few new ones also at the extreme end of this Chamber, can be considered in no sense as the result of a personal victory, but rather the righteous demand of the people for a new order of things in the economic life of our country.

The result of the recent elections was as pleasing to those Democrats chosen to carry the message of the people as it proved displeasing and disastrous to many men who heard the voice of the people during the days of the Sixty-first Congress and heeded it not.

The tremendous increase in population in this country during the past 20 years and the gradual decrease in the purchasing power of the American dollar has been such that every thinking man realizes that a stronger and better economic policy is vitally necessary to our people.

It is a very narrow line that marks the difference between the purchasing power and the income of the American laborer, and this reciprocity measure, in giving a wider market to our exports, will aid the well-being of those who produce with their brains and hands the wealth of the land.

The American workingman should rejoice to find in the Republican ranks men of the type of McCall, of Massachusetts, Hill, of Connecticut, Crumpacker, of Indiana, and others who are to-day placing loyalty to the people above all else.

When the present governor of Massachusetts voiced the needs of the people in a Republican convention he was advised by the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts to leave the party, and in turning his back upon his party and becoming a Democrat and leading the people's cause he was elected by a tremendous majority last year and will be reelected by the largest majority this year ever received by a Democrat in Massachusetts.

There is no turning back from the signs of the times. [Loud 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 and had come to no resolution thereon.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, Mr. FAISON was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of A. M. Williams, Sixty-first Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HENRY of Texas, indefinitely, on account of sickness in family.

Also to Mr. DRAPER, indefinitely.

CONCLUSION OF GENERAL DEBATE.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent that after three hours' debate in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to-morrow on the bill H. R. 4412, general debate shall close, and that one hour of that time shall be controlled by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCALL], one hour by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], and one hour by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that general debate on this bill shall run for three hours to-morrow—one hour to be controlled by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], one hour by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCALL], and the other hour by himself. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 44 minutes), the House adjourned to meet to-morrow, Friday, April 21, 1911, 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 Commerce and Labor, transmitting a draft of a bill for improvements at Edgemore Lighthouse Depot, Del. (H. Doc. No. 21); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a recommendation as to disbursements of appropriations for certain exigency work in connection with the care of public buildings (H. Doc. No. 22); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

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

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 6293) to divest intoxicating liquors of their interstate-commerce character in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 6294) providing for the allotment of the Camp McDowell Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BARNHART: A bill (H. R. 6295) to amend sections 2304 and 2305 of the Revised Statutes of 1878 of an act providing for soldiers and sailors acquiring homesteads in public lands of the United States, and deductions of military and naval service from the time required generally to perfect title; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 6296) to diminish the expense of proceedings on appeal and writ of error or of certiorari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 6297) increasing pensions of Indian War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 6298) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes," approved August 5, 1909; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 6299) to provide for the erection of a public building at Naugatuck, Conn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6300) to provide for the erection of a public building at Seymour, in the State of Connecticut; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 6301) to establish a fish-hatching and fish-cultural station within Cherokee County, in the third congressional district, State of Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RAUCH: A bill (H. R. 6302) to remedy in the line of the Army the inequalities in rank due to the past system of regimental promotion; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 6303) to repeal section 40 of the act approved August 5, 1909, which authorizes the issuance of certificates of indebtedness; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOSTER of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 6304) to apply a portion of the proceeds of the sales of public lands to the endowment of schools or departments of mines and mining, and to regulate the expenditures thereof; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6305) to establish a biological and fish-cultural station in the twenty-third congressional district of Illinois; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6306) granting pensions to all enlisted men, soldiers and officers, who served in the Civil War or the War with Mexico; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROUSE: A bill (H. R. 6307) for the relief of the Kentucky drafted men; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COX of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 6308) to establish in the Department of Agriculture a bureau to be known as the Bureau of Public Highways, and to provide for national aid in the improvement of the public roads; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: A bill (H. R. 6309) to amend section 647, chapter 18, Code of Law for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas (by request): A bill (H. R. 6310) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claims of Choctaw and Chickasaw Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LITTLEPAGE: A bill (H. R. 6311) for the establishment of a parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ROBINSON: A bill (H. R. 6312) to repeal an act entitled "An act granting the use of certain lands in the Hot Springs Reservation, in the State of Arkansas, to the Barry Hospital," and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 6313) to provide an eight-hour workday for United States penitentiary guards; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6314) to provide payment for overtime to United States penitentiary guards; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6315) providing for a military highway between Forts Leavenworth and Riley, Kans.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 6316) authorizing the designation and employment of a medical officer of the Army as director of sanitation of the government of Porto Rico, and prescribing compensation therefor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 6317) to prevent the sale or transportation in interstate or foreign commerce of articles of food held in cold storage for more than the time herein specified, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 6318) to provide for the assignment of certain water rights acquired by the United States under the laws of the different States and Territories; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6319) to amend section 2139 of the Revised Statutes of the United States of 1878; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6320) providing for the allowance of compensation to the members of the United States Land Commission to the Territory of New Mexico, created under the act of Congress of June 21, 1898; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6321) to amend section 3 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the allotment of land in severalty," etc., approved February 28, 1901; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FINLEY: A bill (H. R. 6322) for the relief of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6323) to regulate and fix the fees of United States commissioners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6324) for the erection of a public building at Winnsboro, S. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6325) for the erection of a public building at Cheraw, S. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6326) for the erection of a public building at Yorkville, S. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6327) for the erection of a public building at Lancaster, S. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6328) to provide for a substitute list of storekeeper-gaugers in the Internal-Revenue Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6329) providing for the erection of a monument at Cowpens battle ground, Cherokee County, S. C., commemorative of Gen. Daniel Morgan and those who participated in the Battle of Cowpens on the 17th day of January, 1781; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6330) relating to the removal of civil cases from the State courts to United States courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 6331) to set aside a portion of certain lands in the new State of Arizona now known as the Grand Canyon National Monument and Coconino National Forest as a public park, to be known as the Carnegie National Park, in commemoration of the name of the founder of some of America's greatest institutions and the benefactor of mankind by the promotion of everlasting peace among all nations of the earth without the use of arms; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 6332) to further increase the efficiency of the Organized Militia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 6333) to cooperate with the States in encouraging instruction in agriculture, the trades and industries, and home economics in secondary schools; in preparing teachers for those vocational subjects in State normal schools, and to appropriate money therefor and to regulate its expenditure; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Resolution (H. Res. 113) calling upon the Secretary of the Treasury for information relative to expenses of the Monetary Commission; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

By Mr. FOSTER of Illinois: Resolution (H. Res. 114) amending Rules X and XI; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SABATH: Resolution (H. Res. 115) providing for an investigation of the undervaluations, frauds, and other malpractices of the persons controlling the American Sugar Co.; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SIMS: Resolution (H. Res. 116) providing for a stenographer to the Committee on War Claims; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. LLOYD: Resolution (H. Res. 117) providing for a clerk and messenger to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers; to the Committee on Accounts.

Also, a resolution (H. Res. 118) providing for clerical and messenger service to the several committees on expenditures in the executive departments; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 72) for the appointment of a committee to investigate commerce on the high seas; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

By Mr. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 6334) granting an increase of pension to David Whitehead; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 6335) granting an increase of pension to William J. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 6336) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Arntz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6337) granting an increase of pension to Martin H. Black; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6338) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Blackford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6339) granting an increase of pension to William H. Chaney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6340) granting an increase of pension to Joshua Covell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6341) granting an increase of pension to James Carper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6342) granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Chance; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6343) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Collins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6344) granting an increase of pension to John Dyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6345) granting an increase of pension to Peter Dennis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6346) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Dale; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6347) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Fry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6348) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Gish; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6349) granting an increase of pension to John Gruver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6350) granting an increase of pension to Mary Hurst; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6351) granting an increase of pension to Frederick K. Hewitt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6352) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin H. Hull; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6353) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Henry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6354) granting an increase of pension to Erwin M. Harley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6355) granting an increase of pension to Richard M. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6356) granting an increase of pension to Lafayette Johnston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6357) granting an increase of pension to John P. Lonsway; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6358) granting an increase of pension to Helen Longley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6359) granting an increase of pension to John Lutz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6360) granting an increase of pension to Ruben V. Lott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6361) granting an increase of pension to Alfred C. McClead; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6362) granting an increase of pension to Vinel E. McCreary; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6363) granting an increase of pension to John H. Mohler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6364) granting an increase of pension to William A. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6365) granting an increase of pension to John Myers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6366) granting an increase of pension to William H. McLaughlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6367) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Morgan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6368) granting an increase of pension to William Newson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6369) granting an increase of pension to George P. Ogg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6370) granting an increase of pension to William B. Olds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6371) granting an increase of pension to Erwin A. Ogden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6372) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Rohla; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6373) granting an increase of pension to John W. Robinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6374) granting an increase of pension to Edwin F. Spink; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6375) granting an increase of pension to John Shellhouse; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6376) granting an increase of pension to George Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6377) granting an increase of pension to Eli Snyder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6378) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Shindorff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6379) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6380) granting an increase of pension to William Swaney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6381) granting an increase of pension to Henry Strouss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6382) granting an increase of pension to Giles J. Titus; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6383) granting an increase of pension to William Updegraff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6384) granting an increase of pension to Wilson S. Van Horn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6385) granting an increase of pension to David Warner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6386) granting an increase of pension to Frederick H. Winiker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6387) granting an increase of pension to Celius W. Worman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6388) granting an increase of pension to David Wertz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6389) granting an increase of pension to James T. Waltemire; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6390) granting a pension to Elizabeth Youngblood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6391) granting an increase of pension to George Zabriskie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6392) granting an increase of pension to William O. Bulger; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6393) granting an increase of pension to Robert S. Blaine; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6394) granting an increase of pension to Everett E. Garner; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6395) granting a pension to Mary A. Harrison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6396) granting a pension to Alice J. Phillips; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6397) granting a pension to Desdamona T. Perin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6398) granting a pension to Margaret Patterson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 6399) granting an increase of pension to Margarita B. Ryan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6400) for the relief of Emiliano Martinez; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6401) for the relief of Jesus Gallegos y Vigil; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6402) for the relief of Pedro Rafael Trujillo; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6403) for the relief of Nicolas Apodaca; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6404) for the relief of Jose Salazar y Ortiz; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6405) for the relief of the estate of Martin Vigil, deceased, and the administrator of said estate, Eslavio Vigil; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: A bill (H. R. 6406) granting a pension to Catharine Crockett; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 6407) to pay to the city of Leavenworth, Kans., taxes with interest assessed against the lots on which is located the Federal building for street improvements adjacent thereto; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6408) to pay the city of Topeka, Kans., taxes, with interest, assessed against the lots on which is located the Federal building for street improvements adjacent thereto; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6409) for the relief of James Stanton; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6410) for the relief of John T. Glynn; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 6411) granting an increase of pension to William S. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BORLAND: A bill (H. R. 6412) granting a pension to Edward Waldo; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRADLEY: A bill (H. R. 6413) granting an increase of pension to John Hornbeck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6414) granting an increase of pension to Edward H. Garrison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6415) granting an increase of pension to George W. Soules; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6416) granting an increase of pension to Samuel C. Myers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6417) granting an increase of pension to Sarah C. Sherman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6418) granting an increase of pension to Pethuel Dorcas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6419) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Gelston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6420) granting an increase of pension to Jesse W. Whitmore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6421) granting a pension to Susan Babcock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN: A bill (H. R. 6422) granting an increase of pension to David H. Cox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANDLER: A bill (H. R. 6423) for the relief of B. H. Davis, administrator of the estate of Enos Davis, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6424) for the relief of the heirs of Gladney, Gardner & Co.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6425) for the relief of the estate of R. C. Bumpass, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 6426) granting an increase of pension to George W. Holdson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6427) granting an increase of pension to Albert M. Patrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 6428) granting an increase of pension to Eric Oleson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DENVER: A bill (H. R. 6429) granting an increase of pension to Richard A. Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6430) granting an increase of pension to Josiah Gough; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6431) granting an increase of pension to Phillip P. Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6432) granting an increase of pension to James W. McDaniel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6433) granting an increase of pension to William H. Everhart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6434) granting an increase of pension to Thomas L. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6435) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Luce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6436) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Gustin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6437) granting an increase of pension to David Gough; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6438) granting an increase of pension to Samuel N. Weeks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6439) granting an increase of pension to Frank L. Dunlap; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6440) granting an increase of pension to Henry N. Bushnell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6441) granting an increase of pension to William Frye; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6442) granting an increase of pension to George A. Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6443) granting an increase of pension to John I. Barrows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6444) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6445) granting an increase of pension to William Barrow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6446) granting an increase of pension to Edward M. Curtis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6447) granting an increase of pension to Samuel F. Welshimer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6448) granting an increase of pension to David Montgomery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6449) granting a pension to Ellen Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6450) for the relief of C. C. Shearer; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DONOHOE: A bill (H. R. 6451) for the relief of Annie McColgan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FINLEY: A bill (H. R. 6452) granting a pension to Henry Langley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6453) granting a pension to William L. Hicklin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6454) granting a pension to Theresa J. Sowell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6455) for the relief of St. John's Episcopal Church, at Winnsboro, S. C.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6456) for the relief of U. G. Des Portes, administrator of the estate of S. S. Wolfe, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6457) for the relief of J. M. Moore; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6458) for the relief of the estate of A. E. Hutchison; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FOSTER of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 6459) granting an increase of pension to William H. Benthall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6460) granting an increase of pension to J. C. Judy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 6461) granting an increase of pension to Recorder M. Mudgett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6462) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Bigham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6463) granting an increase of pension to Spencer C. Weaver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6464) granting an increase of pension to Blockmon E. Lawrence; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GALLAGHER: A bill (H. R. 6465) granting a pension to Albert Truffner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6466) granting a pension to John Zilkie; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GREGG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 6467) granting an increase of pension to Jacob R. Zuck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GUERNSEY: A bill (H. R. 6468) granting a pension to Laura J. Grant; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 6469) granting a pension to William Alexander; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HINDS: A bill (H. R. 6470) granting an increase of pension to Frank Cleaves; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 6471) granting an increase of pension to William F. Simpson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6472) granting a pension to Albert G. Jenkins; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6473) for the relief of the legal representatives of the estate of Benjamin Lillard, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6474) for the relief of the legal representatives of the estate of Lewis M. Maney; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6475) for the relief of the heirs of Joseph H. Thompson; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6476) for the relief of F. S. McRady; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6477) for the relief of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, of Tullahoma, Tenn.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6478) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of Henry Pepper and Elizabeth H. Cleveland, heirs of William Pepper, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 6479) granting an increase of pension to Ferree Pirtle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: A bill (H. R. 6480) granting an increase of pension to William H. Merritt; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6481) granting an increase of pension to Simeon Lockwood Coen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6482) granting a pension to Jenkins Morgan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JACOWAY: A bill (H. R. 6483) granting a pension to Frank Doering; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KIPP: A bill (H. R. 6484) granting an increase of pension to Charles Rutty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6485) granting an increase of pension to Orlando English; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6486) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Lucas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6487) granting an increase of pension to J. H. Fox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6488) granting an increase of pension to Randolph M. Manley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6489) granting an increase of pension to Minor Hoover; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6490) granting an increase of pension to T. Fleming Lent; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6491) granting an increase of pension to William F. Merrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6492) granting an increase of pension to Josephine Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6493) granting an increase of pension to L. W. Kelly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6494) granting an increase of pension to Charles R. Green; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6495) granting an increase of pension to Wilson Murphy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6496) granting an increase of pension to Eldridge G. Van Dyke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6497) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah E. Vansice; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6498) granting an increase of pension to Dallas J. Sweet; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6499) granting an increase of pension to James W. Hurst; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6500) granting an increase of pension to Berlin F. Myer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6501) granting an increase of pension to William Kintner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6502) granting an increase of pension to J. D. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6503) granting a pension to James H. Sawyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6504) granting a pension to Harvey G. Van Horn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6505) granting a pension to Mary Ann Hembury; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LATTA: A bill (H. R. 6506) granting an increase of pension to Robert Reynolds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6507) granting an increase of pension to James R. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLEPAGE: A bill (H. R. 6508) granting a pension to Martin M. Rice; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6509) granting an increase of pension to Henry D. Lively; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McGILLICUDDY: A bill (H. R. 6510) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Frank Cooper; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6511) granting a pension to Clarence M. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6512) granting an increase of pension to Francis G. French, alias Frank Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 6513) granting a pension to Amelia Wells; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also a bill (H. R. 6514) granting an increase of pension to George W. Frazee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAHER: A bill (H. R. 6515) granting an increase of pension to L. Alonzo Dennett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6516) granting an increase of pension to John McMahon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 6517) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Fulks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6518) granting an increase of pension to William H. Van Horn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MITCHELL: A bill (H. R. 6519) granting an increase of pension to McArthur W. Brittingham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6520) granting an increase of pension to Julius E. Henderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6521) granting an increase of pension to Albert Bauswell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6522) granting an increase of pension to William McClure; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6523) granting a pension to Margaret Dickson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6524) granting a pension to Hugh J. McKane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6525) for the relief of the University of Kansas; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 6526) granting an increase of pension to Elipha M. Field; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6527) granting an increase of pension to Jane McLaughlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6528) granting an increase of pension to Lydia A. Randall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6529) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Lyghton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6530) granting an increase of pension to Margaret T. Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6531) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAUCH: A bill (H. R. 6532) granting an increase of pension to Christopher U. Rumpf; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6533) granting an increase of pension to George Henson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6534) granting an increase of pension to John F. Staley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6535) granting an increase of pension to James T. Riordan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6536) granting an increase of pension to John O'Harrow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6537) granting a pension to William H. Lowry; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6538) granting an increase of pension to Robert A. Love; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6539) granting an increase of pension to Robert Cameron, jr.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6540) granting a pension to McCullough Tally; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6541) granting a pension to William Fosler; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6542) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Samuel E. Calvert; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROUSE: A bill (H. R. 6543) granting a pension to Gertie Lee Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUCKER of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 6544) for the relief of the heirs of John W. West, deceased; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 6545) granting an increase of pension to Jennie Higgins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6546) granting a pension to Ophelia McKay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6547) granting an increase of pension to Benton Braden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: A bill (H. R. 6548) for the relief of the heirs of George S. Thebo; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SIMMONS: A bill (H. R. 6549) granting an increase of pension to Edwin L. Hoopes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 6550) for the relief of J. M. Gurley; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6551) for the relief of the heirs of J. D. Bellah, sr.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6552) 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.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6553) granting a pension to Louis H. Dowd; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STONE: A bill (H. R. 6554) for the relief of Nicholas C. Buswell; to the Committee on War Calims.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 6555) for the relief of the Winchester Repeating Arms Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6556) granting a pension to William C. Manning; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6557) granting an increase of pension to John Speers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHITACRE: A bill (H. R. 6558) granting an increase of pension to Eugene Davenport; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6559) granting an increase of pension to George H. Wirebaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6560) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Johnston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6561) granting an increase of pension to John Bash; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6562) granting an increase of pension to Henry Clay Corbett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6563) granting an increase of pension to Josiah Ketchum; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 6564) granting an increase of pension to Thomas B. Heiser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6565) granting an increase of pension to Francis Lombard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6566) granting an increase of pension to Johnathan Erdman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6567) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Sheets; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6568) granting an increase of pension to Nelson Freer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6569) granting an increase of pension to Job Wetmore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6570) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Lane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6571) granting an increase of pension to John S. McGinness; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6572) granting an increase of pension to Eugene B. Guild; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6573) granting an increase of pension to Josiah Gurr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, A bill (H. R. 6574) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Robb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6575) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Hurst; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6576) granting an increase of pension to William F. Stamets; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6577) granting an increase of pension to William Cook Caldwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6578) granting an increase of pension to John A. Brimmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6579) granting an increase of pension to Dennis McGinnis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6580) granting an increase of pension to William L. Poust; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6581) granting an increase of pension to William Willoughby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6582) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Metzgar; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6583) granting an increase of pension to James Steen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6584) granting an increase of pension to George W. Kelley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6585) granting an increase of pension to Horatio P. Keyte; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6586) granting an increase of pension to Percey H. White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6587) granting an increase of pension to Peter Dayton, alias William Ross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6588) granting an increase of pension to Leonard H. Brady; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6589) granting an increase of pension to Peter Schaddle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6590) granting an increase of pension to William Bessinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6591) granting an increase of pension to Harriet M. Ritter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6592) granting an increase of pension to James E. Beach; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6593) granting an increase of pension to David O'Brien; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6594) granting an increase of pension to Eli Webb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6595) granting an increase of pension to George W. Musto; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6596) granting an increase of pension to Frederick R. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6597) granting an increase of pension to William H. H. McCowan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6598) granting an increase of pension to Harry T. Peet; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6599) granting an increase of pension to John Maneval; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6600) granting an increase of pension to Jennie K. Noll; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6601) granting an increase of pension to William W. Bird; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6602) granting a pension to Marie de Planque; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6603) granting an increase of pension to Susan C. Long; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6604) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Hoof; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6605) granting an increase of pension to Israel Osman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6606) granting an increase of pension to John Sweeds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6607) granting an increase of pension to Robert Karstetter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6608) granting an increase of pension to Ebenezer Mott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6609) granting an increase of pension to Isaac A. Brosius; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6610) granting an increase of pension to Ashbell C. Wheeler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6611) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Shaffer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6612) granting an increase of pension to Elias Merrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6613) granting an increase of pension to John Koch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6614) granting an increase of pension to Abram Robbins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6615) granting an increase of pension to John Brinser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6616) granting an increase of pension to Philip Kohler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6617) granting an increase of pension to Eli K. Peasley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6618) granting an increase of pension to Zachariah T. Woodward; to the Committee on Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6619) granting an increase of pension to Ernest G. Treat; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6620) granting an increase of pension to Solomon W. Shadle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6621) granting an increase of pension to Dennis Hancen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6622) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Livingston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6623) granting an increase of pension to Silas E. Cummings; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6624) granting an increase of pension to James E. Howard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6625) granting an increase of pension to Oren M. Card; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6626) granting an increase of pension to Peter F. Reeser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6627) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Shank; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6628) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Sanders; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6629) granting an increase of pension to George Couch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6630) granting an increase of pension to William B. Reece; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6631) granting an increase of pension to Squire L. Gage; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6632) granting an increase of pension to John Lyman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also a bill (H. R. 6633) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Shemery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6634) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Fessenden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also a bill (H. R. 6635) granting an increase of pension to John Ludwig; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6636) granting an increase of pension to Alpheus Johnstonbaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6637) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Ball; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6638) granting an increase of pension to Christopher C. Pfoutz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6639) granting an increase of pension to William H. Strunk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6640) granting an increase of pension to Charles Chilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6641) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Brimegin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6642) granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Bennett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6643) granting an increase of pension to David Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6644) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Zeller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6645) granting an increase of pension to Howard D. Avery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6646) granting an increase of pension to Johnston R. Lambright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6647) granting an increase of pension to John Croak; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6648) granting an increase of pension to Joseph S. Morris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6649) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Hillman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6650) granting an increase of pension to Henry Harer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6651) granting an increase of pension to Cecile O. Hamill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6652) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Douglass; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6653) granting an increase of pension to Norman M. Ostrander; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6654) granting an increase of pension to John Kennedy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6655) granting an increase of pension to Emer E. Irons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6656) granting an increase of pension to John F. Burkhart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6657) granting an increase of pension to John Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6658) granting an increase of pension to Jacob S. Kimball; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6659) granting an increase of pension to M. J. Holmes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6660) granting an increase of pension to William C. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6661) granting an increase of pension to John W. Corle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6662) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Holter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6663) granting an increase of pension to William Coder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6664) granting an increase of pension to Jacob H. Moon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6665) granting an increase of pension to Jackson Tibbens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6666) granting an increase of pension to Charles Bruner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6667) granting an increase of pension to G. W. Rogers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6668) granting an increase of pension to George J. Horton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6669) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Butler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6670) granting an increase of pension to Hurlbutt L. Farnsworth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6671) granting an increase of pension to Ebenezer A. Whitney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6672) granting an increase of pension to William Hancock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6673) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Eddy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6674) granting an increase of pension to William M. Everhart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6675) granting an increase of pension to Harvey Fravel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6676) granting an increase of pension to John S. Schuyler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6677) granting an increase of pension to James A. Roche; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6678) granting an increase of pension to Hiram L. Yoder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6679) granting an increase of pension to George S. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6680) granting an increase of pension to John Shroat; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6681) granting an increase of pension to John L. G. Robbins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6682) granting an increase of pension to David McClintock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6683) granting an increase of pension to John Bossinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6684) granting an increase of pension to Henry D. Smead; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6685) granting an increase of pension to William Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6686) granting an increase of pension to Wesley Doyle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6687) granting an increase of pension to Daniel W. Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6688) granting an increase of pension to Josiah W. Harding; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6689) granting an increase of pension to James L. Bonnell; to the Committee on Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6690) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Slenker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6691) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Knepp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6692) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Grafius; to the Committee on Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6693) granting an increase of pension to Clayton P. White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6694) granting an increase of pension to David Rorabaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
Also, a bill (H. R. 6695) granting an increase of pension to John Abott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6696) granting an increase of pension to William E. Clarke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6697) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Casson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6698) granting an increase of pension to John H. W. Lawrance; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6699) granting an increase of pension to George W. Buckbee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6700) granting an increase of pension to John A. Crissman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6701) granting a pension to Mary A. Rowland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6702) granting a pension to William Lammerhirt; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6703) granting a pension to Martin V. Stanton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6704) granting a pension to Charles W. Brace; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6705) granting a pension to Paulina L. Klepper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6706) granting a pension to Emma J. Huff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6707) granting a pension to Sara Jane Staddon; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6708) granting a pension to Lou Pedigree; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6709) granting a pension to Edward H. Presit; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6710) granting a pension to Katie E. Shaffer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6711) granting a pension to Chauncey G. Tripp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6712) granting a pension to William T. East; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6713) to correct the military record of John H. Smith, alias Henry H. Smith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6714) to correct the military record of George P. Bailey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6715) to correct the military record of John A. O'Dell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6716) to correct the military record of Hiram B. Willson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6717) to correct the military record of Joseph G. Young; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6718) to correct the military record of George O. Pratt; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6719) to correct the military record of Dennis Haneen; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6720) to correct the military record of C. W. Walker; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6721) for the relief of James R. Brown; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6722) for the relief of Stephen Campbell and Isaac Overdorf; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6723) for the relief of William S. Rote; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6724) for the relief of John L. O'Mara; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

My Mr. WOODS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 6725) granting an increase of pension to Apollas W. Moffit; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6726) granting an increase of pension to Matthew Crawford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6727) granting a pension to Fidel Borer; 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. AKIN of New York: Petition of workers in paper mills at Glens Falls, N. Y., against reciprocity with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: Papers to accompany bill for increase of pension of William J. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of Cantwell Shoe Co. and 20 other merchants of Coshocton, Ohio, against parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. AYRES: Petitions of Spingarn Bros. and of Washburn, Crosby & Co., both of New York, in favor of parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER: Petition of citizens of the tenth congressional district, State of Indiana, against the parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DANFORTH: Petition of Baptist Church of Penfield, Monroe County, N. Y., favoring the passage of H. R. 1620, to prevent the nullification of State antigambling laws by international or interstate transmission of race-gambling bets or of racing odds; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Fairport Grange, No. 467, Patrons of Husbandry, of Fairport, Monroe County, N. Y., against the passage of the proposed reciprocity treaty with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: Petition of citizens of McLeod County, Minn., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DRAPER: Resolutions of Chamber of Commerce and Manufacturers' Club of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Resolutions of the New Orleans Cotton Exchange, earnestly declaring that all bagging and ties used in the baling of cotton should be placed upon the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOCHT: Papers to accompany bills for the relief of Joseph W. Adams (H. R. 5359), Beneville De Long (H. R. 5362), Jacob A. Wolfe (H. R. 5364), William H. Bobbs (H. R. 5361), Peter Beicher (H. R. 5360), John R. Leffard (H. R. 5363), and Jackson Taylor Vaun (H. R. 5440); to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FORNES: Petitions of Manufacturers of New York Association and Niagara Falls Local, No. 51, International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Pratts Patent (Ltd.), against H. R. 4413, putting dog biscuits and other domestic food for animals on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOSTER of Illinois: Petition of G. M. Ward and other citizens of Mount Vernon, Ill., against the parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of American Paper & Pulp Association, against the Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of La Salle, Ill., for the creation of a national department of health; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

Also, petitions of Querns Bros., of Philadelphia; G. C. Hetzel & Co., of Chester, Pa.; John Thompson, editor of Farmer and Breeder, Sioux City, Iowa; George F. Tullock, secretary County Grange, Rockford, Ill.; and numerous other citizens, against the Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: Petitions from 994 residents of Gloucester, Manchester, Beverly Farms, Salem, and Haverhill, Mass., favoring a national department of public health; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

By Mr. GOEKE: Resolutions of Holly Start Grange, No. 1718, of Canton, Ohio, and Auglaize Grange, No. 347, Allen County, Ohio, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANNA: Petition of citizens of Lankin, N. Dak., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of J. D. Lammle, of Ashley, N. Dak., against parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Enderlin, N. Dak., favoring increase of salary to the rural free delivery carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HAYES: Petition of William R. McHaffie and 49 other citizens of San Francisco, Cal., who are dependent upon the pulp and paper industry for their income and support, protesting against the passage of the reciprocity agreement with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: Petition of citizens of Bellingham, State of Washington, for the observance of Sunday in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KAHN: Petition of William R. McHaffie and 49 other residents of San Francisco, Cal., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions by San Francisco Labor Council, protesting imprisonment without trial in Rostov and Novocherkaska, Russia, of 500 Armenians, for political causes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MADDEN: Petition of the financial board of the African Methodist Episcopal Church, now in session in Washington, D. C., against the Hardwick bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: Petition of residents of Omaha, Nebr., asking that lemons be placed on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOTT: Petition of Herbert F. Hagadorn and others, of Carthage, N. Y., and Martin Nolan and others, of Hainsville, N. Y., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Resolution of Carpenters' District Council, Providence, R. I., to repeal the 10-cent tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SABATH: Resolution 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, resolution of Chamber of Commerce and Manufacturers' Club, Buffalo, N. Y., favoring Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of Irish-American and German-American societies of New York, which have also been indorsed by their respective divisions in Kansas City, Mo., protesting against a new arbitration treaty with Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Petition of board of directors of the produce exchange of Los Angeles, and the members thereof, protesting against the passage of Senate bill 7649, whereby the time of carrying butter, eggs, and poultry in cold storage is to be limited to 90 days; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of Spratts Patent, America (Ltd.), of Newark, N. J., protesting against putting dog cakes and other foods for domestic animals on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of George C. Edwards, Bridgeport, Conn., favoring Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania: Petitions of Tioga County Pomona Grange, No. 30; Bert Tuttle and others, of Austenburg; Tioga Valley Grange, No. 918, of Mansfield; and Lookout Grange, No. 1426, Keating Summit, all in the State of Pennsylvania, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of A. G. Graham and others, of Jersey Shore, Pa., and Charles Anderson and others, of Sheffield, Pa., requesting the withdrawal of troops from Mexican border; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *April 21, 1911.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Our Father in heaven, fountain of wisdom, source of all good, keep us, we beseech Thee, in touch with Thee through the remaining hours of this day that we enter not into temptation, that we do wrong to no man, but with high resolves and noble purposes we may go forward with the work Thou hast given us to do. In the spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, Mr. HILL was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Kate Malioi, Sixty-first Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House the papers in the case of Jake H. Wackert, Sixty-first Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

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

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

By unanimous consent, the Committee on War Claims was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6096) relating to claims arising under the provisions of the captured and abandoned property act, and for other purposes, and to amend and revise the same, and the same was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CANADIAN RECIPROCITY BILL.

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, a bill to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4412, the Canadian reciprocity bill, with Mr. SHERLEY in the chair.

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Chairman, in arising to close the debate in behalf of those Members upon this side of the House who believe in the policy of the present bill, I desire to say that I think the House is to be congratulated upon the illuminating discussion to which it has had an opportunity to listen. The speeches delivered upon both sides of the question and upon both sides of the aisle have been worthy of the subject—a subject which, as was said by the gentleman from Illinois yesterday, is one of the most important ever before the American Congress. The bill has important international aspects and features of an economic character that call for the careful consideration of every Member. It does not make an appeal for the use of the heroics of the hustings, but for the best thought each one of us is capable of giving it.

I listened with great interest to the speech of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HINDS]—the first speech that he has had an opportunity to deliver in this House, of which he has been almost the directing agency for nearly 20 years. It was a speech beautiful in structure, such a speech as is made out of a full mind, and it was entirely worthy of the subject which he discussed. I say that, although I profoundly disbelieve in the conclusions which he maintained. I regretted to notice, however, the pessimistic tone that the gentleman adopted with reference to the American farmer. But it is not strange that, having been in a position where for 20 years he could not escape from listening to the debates, he should have caught the minor key in which the praises of the farmer are usually sung upon this floor. [Applause.]

According to his eulogists here, the American farmer is a very serious-minded individual, with his wife and numerous progeny gathered about him—and I observe that these eulogists usually bless him with a bountiful offspring—desperately and with great solemnity endeavoring to cling to a precarious existence. These orators lament over his rugged qualities, they almost brood over his virtues, and as for his faults, he has none, for he is a being to whom it is impossible to sin.

Mr. Chairman, I have had some experience with the American farmer. I have seen him in his native lair. It was my great good fortune to live for a number of years in my boyhood upon one of those glorious farms in northwestern Illinois—a $200-an-acre farm, as the gentleman from Indiana called it—one of those prairie farms, not the flat farms that you have farther to the west, but where you have the billows of the prairie tumbling about you. One of those farms which, when they are under cultivation, present a scene of pastoral beauty and of fertility such as can scarcely be found anywhere in the world. I have seen farmers actually burn corn for fuel, as has been so dramatically stated in this debate. Why, it has been presented here, as if it showed the destitution of the American farmer and his straitened circumstances, that he actually burned corn for fuel. I have seen him burn corn. Sometimes he would overcrop with one grain and could not sell it profitably, but he was pretty sure to get even on some other grain; and instead of brooding over the burning of corn, more probably the farmer would sit cheerily smoking his pipe in the light of its blazing fire and his sons would rejoice that they did not have to chop wood. [Laughter and applause.]

The American farmer is not the sad-eyed monstrosity, always staring destiny in the face, that we have had painted here. The farmers, as I knew them, were a prosperous, independent, and happy race of men. I have known many farmers, and I have known some men even on Wall Street, and I have made up my mind that they both belong to the same race, and that there is about as much human nature in the one class as in the other. I have sometimes thought that if the numbers were reversed and that if we had 5,000,000 voters on Wall Street and only a few hundred farmers, our statesmen would sing the homely virtues of J. P. Morgan and his crew and would bestow upon them some of these lugubrious eulogiums of which the American farmer has been so long the patient victim. [Applause and laughter.] And their worst enemy could hardly wish them a harder fate.