SENATE.

FRIDAY, *June 30, 1911.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

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

ADJOURNMENT FROM SATURDAY UNTIL WEDNESDAY.

Mr. PENROSE. I move that when the Senate adjourns to-morrow it be to meet on Wednesday next, July 5, at 12 o'clock.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Pennsylvania moves that when the Senate adjourns on Saturday it be to meet on Wednesday next at noon.

The motion was agreed to.

BUSINESS AT SATURDAY'S SESSION.

Mr. PENROSE. I ask unanimous consent that at the session of the Senate to-morrow, Saturday, no vote be taken on any motion or bill or other matter except upon a motion to adjourn.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The request of the Senator from Pennsylvania has been heard. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and that order is entered.

SENATOR FROM WISCONSIN.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the secretary of state of the State of Wisconsin, transmitting a certified copy of joint resolution 58 adopted by the legislature of that State, relating to the primary and general election of 1908 and the election of United States Senator in 1908 in that State, together with a copy of volumes 1 and 2 of the Wisconsin senatorial investigation, which, on motion of Mr. HEYBURN, was, with the accompanying documents, referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. CULLOM presented memorials of Team Drivers' Union No. 50, of Belleville, Ill.; of the Central Labor Union of Woonsocket, R. I.; of Local Division No. 2, Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Saratoga, N. Y.; and of the Trade and Labor Assembly of Kenton and Campbell Counties, Ky., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Poughkeepsie, N. Y., praying for the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WATSON (for Mr. CHILTON) presented a petition of Local Union No. 404, United Mine Workers of America, of Mammoth, W. Va., praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. MYERS. I present a numerously signed petition from farmers, stock growers, and business men of northern Montana in favor of Canadian reciprocity. The letter which brings to me the petition says:

> If we had the time to get them, we could get several hundred more names. Reciprocity is very popular here.

I ask that the body of the petition be read by the Secretary.

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

The Secretary read as follows:

> We, the undersigned farmers, stock growers, and business men of Chester and northern Montana, do pray that you will use your influence in the passage of the reciprocity bill—"Canadian pact"—believing it will be for the best interest of Montana and the country in general.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petition will lie on the table.

Mr. MYERS presented memorials of sundry citizens of Kalispell and Creston, in the State of Montana, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Johnston Sunday-rest bill, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PERKINS presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Oakland, Cal., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Johnston Sunday-rest bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BROWN presented resolutions adopted by the Commercial Club of Lincoln, Nebr., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the so-called corporation-tax law permitting corporations to make returns at the end of their fiscal years, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. McCUMBER, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill (S. 2909) for the relief of John K. Wren, asked to be discharged from its further consideration, and that it be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, which was agreed to.

Mr. BURTON, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 2789) to change the location and straighten the course of the channel of the Grand Calumet River through the lands of the Gary Land Co. and the Indiana Steel Co., and for other purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 92) thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. WATSON:

A bill (S. 2931) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Mount; to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. WATSON. I introduce a bill for my colleague [Mr. CHILTON], who is absent on account of illness in his family.

A bill (S. 2932) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion, to sell the old post-office and courthouse building at Charleston, W. Va., and, in the event of such sale, to enter into a contract for the construction of a suitable post-office and courthouse building at Charleston, W. Va., without additional cost to the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Maine:

A bill (S. 2933) granting a pension to Josiah J. Perkins (with accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 2934) granting an increase of pension to Azel W. Drake (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

ASSISTANT CLERK TO COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND RETRENCHMENT.

Mr. CUMMINS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 94), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

> *Resolved*, That the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment be, and it is hereby, authorized to employ an additional clerk at an annual salary at the rate of $1,500 per annum, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate until otherwise provided for by law.

ASSISTANT CLERK TO COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR.

Mr. POINDEXTER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 95), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

> *Resolved*, That the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of the Interior is hereby authorized to employ an additional clerk at a salary of $1,000 per annum, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate until otherwise provided for by law.

MANEUVERING GROUNDS IN TENNESSEE.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, maps, and illustrations, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed (S. Doc. No. 59):

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith the report of the commission appointed to investigate and report on the advisability of the establishment of permanent maneuvering grounds, camp of inspection, rifle and artillery ranges for troops of the United States at or near the Chickamauga and Chattanooga Military Park, and as to certain lands in the State of Tennessee proposed to be donated to the United States for said purposes, in compliance with the joint resolution of Congress approved February 24, 1911.

WM. H. TAFT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 30, 1911.*

LAWS OF PORTO RICO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying document, referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico and ordered to be printed (S. Doc. No. 60):

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 26, 1911.

SIR: As required by section 19 of the act of Congress approved April 12, 1900, entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenues and a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," I have the honor to transmit herewith a copy of the Journal of the Executive Council of Porto Rico for the session beginning January 9 and ending March 9, 1911.

Very respectfully,

WM. H. TAFT.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

RECIPROCITY WITH CANADA.

Mr. PENROSE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the reciprocity bill—House bill 4412.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4412) to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, and for other purposes.

Mr. CUMMINS rose.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

SEVERAL SENATORS (to Mr. BORAH). Withdraw the suggestion.

Mr. HEYBURN. I do not think there is any option when the suggestion has been made.

Mr. PENROSE. It can be withdrawn.

Mr. BORAH. I withdraw it for the present.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Idaho withdraws the suggestion, and the Senator from Iowa will proceed.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, in order that we may proceed properly and not establish a bad precedent—and I am not going to urge this, because it is immaterial with me whether it is acted on or not—I think the suggestion of the absence of a quorum can not be withdrawn.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair sees no reason why it can not be withdrawn. It seems to the Chair that any Senator, possibly immediately after suggesting the absence of a quorum, might discover that he did not wish to make the suggestion and withdraw it. The Senator might by observation conclude a quorum was present. The Chair had not ordered the roll to be called.

Mr. PENROSE. It can be renewed by any Senator, of course.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Certainly.

Mr. HEYBURN. I merely wish that we do not go off and make a mistake and establish a precedent now. I think it will be found upon an examination of the precedents that it is held the suggestion can not be withdrawn.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Possibly the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], immediately after he made the suggestion, discovered by observation that there is a quorum present.

Mr. HEYBURN. During a former session of the Senate I was in the position that my colleague occupied this morning, and I was very promptly informed that it was not my privilege to withdraw it; that the suggestion having been made it could only be determined by a roll call. I think we should have a uniform practice in the matter. I was at that time the victim, if I may so speak, of the situation.

Mr. CUMMINS. I desire to submit some proposed amendments to the pending bill, which I ask may be printed and lie on the table until I call them to the attention of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be printed and lie on the table, as requested by the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, when we adjourned yesterday I was calling to the attention of Senators a grave objection, as I think, to the form of the bill under consideration. I shall not review what I said yesterday with regard to it, but the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. HEYBURN] very kindly, and in order to emphasize, I think, the objection that I was making, referred to the form the author of the resolution in the Canadian Parliament seemed to think wise to express the idea; and I am so much impressed with the reference made by the senior Senator from Idaho that I intend this morning to read, so that it may appear in my remarks, precisely what is proposed in Canada in this regard. I hold in my hand a copy of the resolution offered in the Canadian Parliament, and its concluding paragraph is as follows:

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

It thus appears, Mr. President, that however much confidence Canada may have in the good faith of the United States the Dominion intends that her changed customs shall not go into effect until all the advantages which are promised by the arrangement with the United States shall become effective.

I now pass to another objection which, it seems to me, is well founded and which may be laid against the arrangement in the form in which it is now before us. In order that I may supply an omission in my own amendment respecting the point I am about to mention, I desire to perfect the amendment by inserting certain words that were inadvertently left out. I perfect the amendment by inserting in it the words that I have sent to the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is the Senator's privilege. The amendment has not been acted upon.

Mr. CUMMINS. Senators, I have proposed the following amendment, as found in the series of amendments submitted to the Senate some days ago:

> *Provided further*, That if at any time after the articles hereinbefore mentioned are admitted free under the aforesaid proclamation the President becomes satisfied that the rates of transportation upon any such article from Canada into the United States are unreasonably low or that the rates of transportation upon any such article from the United States into Canada are unreasonably high, as compared with fair and reasonable rates upon the like article for substantially the same distance in the United States, he may issue his proclamation to that effect, and thereafter the said article or articles, when imported from Canada into the United States, shall be subject to the general tariff law of the United States.

Mr. President, if we are not entirely lost to all reason, if we have a real desire to protect the people of our own country, then whatever may be the view of the majority of the Senate with respect to the wisdom of this arrangement, they certainly can not and will not subject the citizens of our country to the grave and imminent peril to which they will be subjected if the amendment that I have now proposed be not inserted in the bill.

I need not dwell upon the long struggle that has taken place in the United States to secure, through the action of the Interstate Commerce Commission, fair and reasonable relative rates, so that all our people can reach the markets of our country upon such charges as are relatively fair and reasonable. It has been one of the great problems which we have endeavored to solve. It has been one that has given both the legislative and administrative departments of the United States more perplexity and more concern than any other with which we have grappled. We have tried hard, both by legislation and by administration, to so adjust our rates of transportation that our producers in various parts of the country can reach their market upon just, relative rates.

Every Senator here knows that the development of the United States has been arbitrary, as decreed by the transportation companies. Every Senator knows that the railway companies and other transportation companies have determined what communities shall prosper and what communities shall languish, what cities shall grow and what cities shall decay, and we have done all we could, recognizing this evil in our transportation system, to give to every community in the United States a fair chance to reach our own markets. Every Senator knows that the prosperity of any community commercially depends upon fair rates as compared with its competitor or competitors. Every Senator knows that a discrimination of a very few cents per hundred pounds or per article will determine the channels of commerce in the United States and determine whether a particular community can profitably do business or not as against its rival or rivals.

We have no control over the rates of transportation from Canada into the United States. We have no control over rates of transportation from the United States into Canada; and if you pass this bill as it is now and the roads leading from Canada into the United States shall for purposes of their own, to accomplish objects which may be entirely reasonable to them, reduce the rates of transportation upon agricultural products into our market, and if it should happen that our transportation lines should refuse to reduce their rates accordingly, you will have given the producers of Canada a monopoly in the markets of the United States, and you will have driven your own people to the hard necessity of employing export rates alone in order to transfer or transport their products to distant shores. If there were nothing else objectionable in this bill, this omission to protect our people against a power over which we have no control ought to be sufficient to cause the rejection of the measure. What will you do if from the grain fields of Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, or Alberta the railroads and water lines of Canada reduce the rate on wheat 3 cents a bushel or 5 cents a bushel, which they might do in order to build up their own country? Tell me in what attitude you will then be before the American people. Tell me, or describe if you can, the incalculable injury that you will have done to your own people, even if you desire to put them into free competition with the people of Canada.

I repeat, as I have repeated many times, that I am not projecting this argument against the free admission of agricultural products, although I believe the proposition to be totally unsound and unfair; but, assuming that you have made up your minds—as I think you have—to allow all these products to come into the American market, am I to be told and are the American people to be told that you will not give them the safeguard of requiring that the rates of transportation from the

foreign country into our market shall be fair and reasonable as compared with our own rates?

You have no other power over these rates save the power of retaliation. If the Canadian transportation companies shall do the thing that I have suggested, and which I believe they will do, you have the power to say that then the general tariff laws of the United States shall attach to Canadian imports. It is the only power we can exercise, and if we fail to exercise it we shall be held faithless to the interests of our people.

I made this complaint to the authorities who prepared this agreement. I did not wait until the subject came for discussion before the Senate in order to express my concern with regard to this feature of the proposed legislation. I laid it before the men who have been instrumental in bringing before us this bill, and without, I think, betraying any confidence, I may be permitted to say that the answer was that at some time a treaty might be made with the Dominion of Canada that would organize a tribunal to review international rates, and that through that tribunal we might receive justice. Do you intend—I put it to you in all earnestness—to allow our people to encounter the peril I have mentioned? My amendment will not destroy the arrangement; it will not impair it. It is intended to do the scantest justice to our own country.

The transportation history of this country will show that the danger I have outlined is not an imaginary danger. These lines of transportation will pursue the course which, in their opinion, is most profitable to them and for the country that they are serving. If we are so blind as to refuse to amend the bill in this respect, I think the people who are denied this justice will demand it at the first opportunity that is given to them; and I hope they will demand it in every way and at every time possible under the laws of our country.

I now pass to a brief examination of the arrangement itself. It has never been analyzed in this Chamber, or, so far as I know, in any other. We are proceeding broadly and generally upon the hypothesis that in some way, in some fashion, it is to confer very great benefit upon the people of the United States, and also a benefit upon the people of Canada, and that between the two we shall be drawn into closer and better relations. I now propose to look briefly into it, for the purpose of discovering just exactly what we give and precisely what we receive. I use for this purpose not the bill before us, but the schedules attached to the correspondence between the two countries. The first schedule in the diplomatic exchange is Schedule A. It is a reciprocal free list. I shall not again recite the items found in the free list or in either list, but I ask, Mr. President, that the tabulation which I have here of these articles, and which I hold in my hand, may be printed as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, permission is granted.

Mr. CUMMINS. The tabulation referred to is as follows:

RECIPROCAL FREE LIST—ARTICLES ON WHICH FREE TRADE IS TO BE ESTABLISHED.

The schedules attached to the correspondence which passed between the representatives of the two countries are four in number:

The first, being Schedule A, is a reciprocal free list; that is to say, it specifies the articles which are to be admitted free of duty when imported into the United States from Canada and when imported into Canada from the United States. I will not attempt to recite all the items, but will content myself with a reference to the principal commodities.

1. All live animals; and there are mentioned specifically cattle, horses, mules, swine, sheep, and lambs.
2. Poultry, alive or dead.
3. Wheat, rye, oats, barley, buckwheat, edible dried peas and beans, corn, flaxseed, linseed, cotton seed, grass seed, and all seeds (except flower seeds), hay, and straw.
4. All vegetables in their natural state.
5. All fresh and dried fruits, except lemons, oranges, limes, grapefruit, shaddocks, and pineapples, coming from Canada into the United States.
6. All dairy products, and eggs in the shell.
7. Honey and cottonseed oil.
8. Fish of all kinds, except when preserved in oil.
9. Fish oil.
10. Salt.
11. Timber, when squared otherwise than by sawing, and lumber when not further manufactured than sawed; posts, poles, staves, pickets, and palings.
12. Crude gypsum, unmanufactured mica, crude or ground feldspar, sulphate of soda, or salt cake, and soda ash.
13. Cream separators.
14. Rough brass in bars and rods; thin rolled iron or steel sheets; cast-steel wire, valued at not less than 6 cents per pound; galvanized iron or steel wire of certain gauges; type-casting and typesetting machines; barbed fencing wire; rolled wire rods, not over three-eighths of an inch in diameter and not smaller than No. 6 wire gauge.
15. Pulp of wood, however manufactured, and paper valued at not more than 4 cents per pound.

With regard, however, to wood pulp and paper it is provided that the free admission applies only to such wood pulp and paper as come into the United States without any export duty, license fee, or charge of any kind, or any prohibition or restriction upon the exportation; and it is further provided that wood pulp and paper shall not be admitted free of duty from the United States into Canada until they come into the United States from all parts of Canada free of duty.

The schedule with regard to wood pulp and paper was amended in the House of Representatives before the bill passed the House at the last session, and I may have occasion to explain the amendment later on.

EQUAL-DUTY LIST—ARTICLES BEARING SAME TARIFF WHEN ENTERING EITHER COUNTRY.

The second schedule is Schedule B, a reciprocal dutiable list; that is to say, articles to be admitted into each country from the other at the same rates of duty; it comprises:

1. Meats of all kinds, including lard and tallow.
2. Fish packed in oil.
3. Vegetables in cans or other air-tight packages.
4. Wheat flour, rye flour, buckwheat flour, oatmeal, rolled oats, and all cereal foods; corn meal, bran, middlings, etc.
5. Barley malt, biscuits, wafers, and cakes.
6. Maple sugar and sirup.
7. Agricultural implements; cutlery; the small sizes of plate glass; automobiles and motor vehicles, but not including rubber tires.

I have not mentioned all the articles in this schedule, but have referred to the principal ones.

NONRECIPROCAL DUTIES—ARTICLES EXPORTED OR IMPORTED ON WHICH SCHEDULES ARE FIXED.

The third schedule, being Schedule C, is a list which prescribed the rates of duty on certain articles when exported from Canada into the United States, but upon which the duties are not reciprocal. It contains:

1. Laths; shingles; sawed boards, planed or finished on one or more sides; iron ore, and coal slack.
2. Aluminum, in plates, sheets, bars, and rods.

EXPORTS TO CANADA.

The fourth schedule, being Schedule D, is a list of articles to be admitted into Canada, when exported from the United States, at certain rates of duty which are not reciprocal. This list comprises:

1. Cement.
2. Trees.
3. Condensed milk; unsweetened biscuits; fruits in air-tight cans or other air-tight packages.
4. Peanuts.
5. Bituminous coal.

In considering the purely commercial advantages or disadvantages of the proposal of which I have now given you the substance, it is obvious that we must view it from at least two standpoints.

First. The expansion of our exports into Canada induced by the additions to her free list of certain articles, and the reduction of her duties on certain other articles.

Second. The effect upon our domestic producers and consumers of adding to our free list certain commodities, and of reducing our duties upon other commodities."

Now listen. I hope I shall receive the attention of Senators for a moment, especially upon this statement.

I take these viewpoints in the order in which I have stated. The aggregate of the imports into Canada from all countries in 1910 was, in round numbers, $443,000,000, of which there came from the United States, in round numbers, $270,000,000. Canada bought of us, therefore, under existing tariff conditions, practically three-fifths of all her foreign purchases, and, excluding the element of increased consumption, it is apparent that whatever inroads we make we must make upon the remaining two-fifths of her imports.

WOULD CUT REVENUES HEAVILY.

Upon the articles in the proposed reciprocal free list which we exported into Canada for the year ending March 31, 1910, there were paid in duties $1,476,129.13. These articles were of the total value of $21,957,605; that is to say—now mark you, Canada levied an average equivalent of a 6.7 per cent ad valorem duty upon our exports of the articles embraced in the proposed free list, so that the concession, as a whole, on these things can not exceed the percentage I have named.

That is to say, upon the free list, concerning which so much has been said here, Canada concedes to us an average ad valorem duty of 6.7 per cent. The reason of the meagerness of the concession arises from the fact that a very large proportion of the articles contained in the free list is already free in Canada, and she concedes us nothing whatsoever with regard to the articles already free, nor can she; but we are getting a reduction upon this entire free list in Canada of 6.7 per cent, and no ingenuity can increase the extent of that concession.

Agricultural products—and I am now speaking of all the products of the soil—bear in Canada now substantially a duty of 20 per cent ad valorem, and we are receiving with respect to

those products a reduction of 20 per cent upon the average, but not upon the entire list.

The lumber on the proposed free list, with one exception, is now free when exported from the United States into Canada. The one article of stave bolts is the only concession which Canada gives the United States with respect to lumber from her list as already established by law. We have a concession of 17½ per cent on crude glycerin, of which we exported last year $50,000 worth. We have salt made free, of which we exported last year $81,000 worth, in round numbers. Canada now has a duty of 5 per cent on tin plate and 20 per cent on typecasting and typesetting machines. We exported last year those articles to the value of $296,662.

I pass the paper schedule, because we get nothing whatsoever from Canada at the present time with regard to pulp wood or paper; and it is very doubtful, as we all agree, whether there ever will be or can be any concession from Canada to the United States with regard to pulp wood, paper, and the like.

The value of the imports into the United States from Canada of the articles covered by the proposed free list for the year ending June 30, 1910, was $39,811,560, and the average duty levied converted into ad valorem was 10⅜ per cent.

That is, our average duty now upon the articles which we propose to put upon the free list is 10⅜ per cent. Taking it in the aggregate, it is not more, and can not be construed to be more, than a fair revenue duty upon those articles.

The imports of agricultural products, including those of the orchard and garden, grouped as before, aggregated $7,981,336, upon which our duties were $1,662,310, or an average of a little less than 21 per cent.

We imported of timber and lumber of all kinds made free by the proposal of the value of $18,959,753, upon which our duties were $1,323,530, or a little in excess of 7 per cent.

We imported crude gypsum, unmanufactured and ground mica, feldspar, and crude asbestos of the value of $1,861,149, but asbestos is now free, and we imported of that commodity to the value of $1,087,098. The other articles are not of the first importance.

Turning to the reciprocal list I find that we imported articles from Canada during the year ending June 30, 1910, to the value of $5,901,923, upon which duties were levied of $968,309, or 16.4 per cent. We reduce these duties by the proposed arrangement upon an average of 6.4, leaving the equivalent of a duty upon them of 10 per cent ad valorem. This reduction may enlarge the imports of these things slightly, and it may reduce a little the price of laths, shingles, and planed boards and lumber.

SOME BENEFIT CONCEDED.

While it is not possible to estimate with any accuracy the effect of the change, it is sufficient to say that whatever effect is produced will be beneficial to the people of the United States who use these commodities.

Before leaving the subject, it may be well to say that laths are reduced from 20 cents per 1,000 pieces to 10 cents per 1,000 pieces; shingles from 50 cents per 1,000 to 30 cents per 1,000; lumber, planed or finished on one side, from $1 to $1.75 per 1,000 feet, to 50 cents per 1,000 feet.

And so on. I need not repeat the table that I have prepared.

Now, Mr. President, without taking the time of the Senate to read further from this, it is apparent that upon the free list the concession given by Canada to us is exceedingly slight. The concession given to us upon the reciprocal dutiable list is also very slight, and it is impossible that these reductions and these admissions to the free list shall have any serious or great effect upon our export trade. However, I am not objecting to the agreement upon that ground, for I believe, as I said yesterday, that Canada has given us in this arrangement practically all she can give us.

The only inference I desire you to draw is that if you want to relieve the people of the country from unjust burdens by way of high duties the logical, the reasonable, the just way in which to proceed would be to reduce all our duties, having reference upon the one side, if that party is in power, to its doctrine of a revenue tariff, or upon our side, if we are in power, to reduce them according to the acknowledged standard established by the last Republican convention.

But, coming now to another phase of it, what I propose to do is first to put lumber on the free list so far as Canada is concerned. What objection have the Senators upon the other side of this Chamber to putting lumber on the free list? I am not assuming that you are doing wisely in putting agricultural products upon the free list. You say that to put the farmer into free competition with Canada will not seriously injure him. Do you think it will seriously injure the lumberman, the owner of the great areas of pine lands, to put his product upon the free list? Will it injure him? If it is true that the conditions abroad are substantially the same as the conditions at home, why will you not add lumber to the free list, so far as Canada is concerned, not asking Canada to do anything for us in that respect, but for the sake of your own people, if you are trying to do justice to them and believe that free lumber will enable the farmer, or, indeed, any other citizen of the Republic who desires to use this commodity—if you believe it will do him or them some good, why are you not willing to put lumber on the free list?

You can not answer by saying that you fear that this will imperil the agreement. Canada surely will not object to the enlargement of our free list in that respect. Who will object? Only the lumberman; only the owner of great areas of pine lands. You can not allege that the authorities who are responsible for this arrangement will object because you put lumber on our free list. It is one of the things that we have been trying to accomplish. If you want to enable the farmer to deal as freely in the lumber market as you propose to compel him to deal with respect to wheat and oats and all the other agricultural products, why will you not attach lumber to the free list?

If you do not—I will not say what I was about to say, but I will say that your action in that respect will be as mysterious to me as has been the action of those who have proposed the arrangement now before us.

Again, my amendment seeks to put coal on the free list, so far as the United States is concerned. It is a natural product. Coal has hitherto borne a duty of 53 cents a ton when imported from the United States into Canada. It has borne since the Payne-Aldrich tariff law a duty of 45 cents a ton when imported from Canada into the United States. The effect of this arrangement is that Canada reduces her duty 8 cents a ton and permits our coal to enter Canada at 45 cents per ton.

I am not now to enter into a discussion whether coal ought to be made free or not. There are many on this side of the Chamber who believe it ought not to be free. I believe it ought to be free. Do you upon the other side believe it ought to be free? Do the Senators who fought here for some amelioration of the burdens of the protective system believe that coal ought to be free? If you do, why will you not attach it to the free list so that if the reduction of duties does have any effect upon the price of commodities the farmer when he takes his wheat into a free market can return with his wagon loaded with free coal?

Do you say it will imperil this agreement? Why? I do not ask that Canada shall admit our coal free. I am only asking some compensating advantage to our buyers of coal. And yet you stand firm and resolute against allowing the people of this country to enjoy whatever benefits may arise from free coal with Canada.

The authorities who are responsible for this arrangement can not object to introducing free coal, because Canada will hail with delight the opportunity to enter our markets with her coal without paying duty.

Again, I ask that iron ore shall be put upon the free list. Do you believe iron ore should bear a duty? I do not know just what your views are with respect to that, but I have long contended for free iron ore. I want to see iron ore free, not only with Canada but with every other country upon the face of the earth, and I intend to vote at every opportunity I have to make iron ore free. But the only chance we will have in the immediate future to allow iron ore to enter the United States free is the iron ore of Canada. You who complain of the monopoly of the United States Steel Corporation, you who complain of the gradual concentration of the source of supply in the hands of one corporation, can not, as it seems to me, refuse to add to this arrangement free iron ore from Canada.

Canada will not object; the President can not object; and therefore why do you stand resolute and determined that there shall be no change of the arrangement in this respect?

My amendment proposes to put meat on the free list. Tell me why you want to maintain a duty on meat as between Canada and the United States? Tell me why, after the cattle of our country are driven to a free market, the owner of those cattle should not return at least with free meat? Tell me why you desire to increase the advantages of the packer, of the monopoly, of the combination of men and capital that manufacture cattle into meat? Why do you want to give them free cattle, free raw material, and thus enlarge the profits they now enjoy? I can not understand the attitude of men who believe in the reduction of duties and who refuse to avail themselves of this opportunity to secure it. Canada will not protest against allowing her meat to come into the United States free. She will regard it as an additional reason why she ought to accept this arrangement. I do not know of anyone who is protesting against free meat except the packers, and are we here

for the purpose of making the business of the packers more profitable than it is now? You can not tell the country that you refused to put free meat into this agreement because it will endanger the final consummation of the arrangement. For Canada wants free meat into the United States; the people of this country want free meat from Canada; and therefore who is the objector? There is no objector from the ranks of those who sincerely desire some relief to the consumers of the United States.

It is idle for any man to stand before the country and say that he votes against free meat because he fears that the Executive of this country will decline to give his approval to the bill if it provides for free meat. No one is authorized to speak for the Chief Executive, I am sure, in making any such assertion. I will not believe that he could by any possibility object to this addition to the present arrangement. On the contrary, believing him to be a patriot, believing him to want the highest welfare of the people of his own land, he will hail, and must hail, with great gratification the proposal I have just made.

Again, I want free flour attached to this bill. Why do you want to tax flour? Why do you want the millers of Minneapolis and of other parts of the country, whom we may assume are already enjoying all the profits that are reasonable and fair to be reaped from any business, to still further accumulate fortunes at the expense of the producer of the raw material?

If you can give me any reason why flour of all kinds and cereal foods of all kinds and all the by-products of the miller, the coarse feed for animals, and all other things of that sort, shall not be permitted to come from Canada free into the United States I will listen with great attention and with great interest to that reason.

If you could say of this, as you have said already with regard to independent measures of reform, that if they were attached to this bill you have reason to believe that it would not become a law, I can understand that, although I do not agree to its soundness. I do not agree that there is reason to believe that the bill would be rejected if these things were added to it. But you have no reason to believe, nor has any man any reason to believe, that this bill would be less gratifying to the executive department of the Government or less satisfactory to the Canadian Parliament if we were to give her free meat or free flour and free manufactured products of all cereals.

I shall look forward with a great deal of interest to discover what reason will be given to the people of this country for closing the door to this opportunity. I want free agricultural implements. Do you want free agricultural implements? Apparently not, because I propose in this amendment to add to our free list agricultural implements of all kinds. I do not ask Canada to grant the same concession, because I am arguing this, or trying to argue it, upon the theory that it will pass and that we must not do anything which will make the agreement less satisfactory to Canada.

Of course, I think Canada ought to give us free agricultural implements, but fearing that she will not, and not desiring to be open to the reproach that I am urging these amendments for the purpose of defeating the bill, I have only asked that our door be opened and that we allow Canada to open hers whenever she may think the welfare of her country demands it.

I have put iron and steel upon the free list. Who will object to putting all kinds of manufactured iron and steel upon the free list so far as Canada is concerned? It may be that some one on our side may utter a protest, but those upon the other side are estopped from entering any protest against allowing free trade with Canada in the manufactured forms of iron and steel. I do not insist that Canada could do much at this time to correct the abuses of which we are gravely and seriously cognizant, because I think we produce most of these things as cheaply as they can be produced anywhere in the world, and certainly as cheaply as they can be produced in Canada. But here we are groaning under the tyranny of the United States Steel Corporation, and we want to do whatsoever we can to invite from some quarter or other a rival, a competitor, that will help to relieve the American people of the burden which they suffer. This would be an invitation to independent manufacturers in Canada to enter the business and to enter the markets of the United States, and some time or other we might secure a partial remedy for the evil that we now endure.

What is the objection to putting woolen goods upon the free list, so far as Canada is concerned? Do you think Canada will object? Do you think the President will object? No: if we have heard aright, the Chief Executive is insistent that we shall pass some bill that will put into effect the reciprocal arrangement which he has proposed and which he has consummated; but I hope he has not indicated, I do not believe he has indicated, his disinclination to approve any measure that will open still wider commercially the doors of the United States to Canada.

So with cotton, and so with silk, and so with leather.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DIXON in the chair). Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do.

Mr. SMOOT. I notice the Senator's amendment provides for free woolen goods. Would not that be a disadvantage to the American manufacturer on this account——

Mr. CUMMINS. I think it would. I want it to be.

Mr. SMOOT. Canada has free wool and we have protected wool. Therefore they would not be on the same basis, and it would be a great disadvantage to the American manufacturer.

Mr. CUMMINS. I think it would help to bring the American manufacturer down to the point of reasonable profit, anyhow.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to go further than that and have an understanding as to the effect of the Senator's amendment. The Senator certainly understands that his amendment provides that free woolen goods shall come into this country from Canada. If that is the case, would not the Canadian manufacturer have a great advantage over the American manufacturer in this way, that he is entitled to import wool free and the American manufacturer is not entitled to import wool free? Then the Canadian manufacturer would have his free raw material, or wool, as he calls it, without duty, and he would have just that advantage over the American manufacturer.

Mr. CUMMINS. I think he would, Mr. President; but that advantage is not commensurate, or more than commensurate, with the advantage that the American woolen manufacturer has in his established plant and in his established business. I for one, while we are putting articles upon the free list, am perfectly willing to see this country endure such competition as Canada can furnish in woolen goods, as well as in all other kinds of goods, for I began this argument by the statement that I am entirely willing to vote for free trade with Canada simply because I believe—and in that respect I am in concurrence with the President—that, taking all things together, Canada does not manufacture under more favorable conditions than we do.

I know that there is a hardship in free trade with respect to certain agricultural products. I know, and every Senator must know, that with respect to some of the agricultural products, Canada can produce and will produce more cheaply than it is possible for the American farmer to produce. But taking the subject as a whole I think the United States could compete with Canada; and my great complaint is that we select the one thing in which we have no advantage, and indeed are at a disadvantage as compared with Canada, to establish free trade, and leave the great body of the manufactured products, concerning which we have some advantage over Canada, still protected by high protective duties.

I regard it as the most illogical, the most indefensible proposition that has ever been put before the American people, and I am simply trying to make it better, to make it so that I can vote for it, for I do have a real desire to express my sympathy with the movement for freer and broader trade relations with the Dominion. But it now seems impossible for me to give it my assent so long as the invidious, the unjust discrimination found in the bill is perpetuated.

I now intend to take up for a little while the question of the favored-nation clause, and I hope that those who are interested in that will follow me.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Before the Senator from Iowa passes to the next point, I should like to ask him a question for information. If you amended the Canadian reciprocity bill by putting upon it free manufactured woolen goods and free agricultural implements and free manufactured steel and iron, how many stand-pat Republican votes on that side of the Chamber does the Senator suppose the bill as amended would receive?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not know; but I know that there are enough Senators upon this side of the Chamber who, added to the Senators upon the other side, will pass the bill if so amended.

Mr. WILLIAMS. As amended?

Mr. CUMMINS. As amended.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And send it on to the White House involving Canadian reciprocity in the speculation as regards a veto.

But to go back to this arena, not to the other end of the Avenue, because I believe some of us were lectured the other day about mentioning the other end of the Avenue even when

as a practical matter it was very much an element in a rational consideration of what we should do here, does the Senator give it as his opinion that all the class of Senators who are called by their enemies insurgents and by themselves progressives would vote for the bill as amended?

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I do not know, because I have had no——

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does the Senator give it as his opinion?

Mr. CUMMINS. Just a moment; allow me to finish. I do not know because I have had no conference with them upon that particular question, but I do know that the Senator from Mississippi ought to be able to answer for the fate of the bill if it shall go back to the House of Representatives. His political associates are in the majority there, and if they are willing to accept this amendment——

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not talking about that.

Mr. CUMMINS. It makes no difference what the Republican Members might do.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am talking about the fate of the bill here. Does not the Senator from Iowa think that if all those amendments were placed upon this bill the result would be that the bill would lose the support of every single, solitary Republican Senator who without those amendments would vote for it?

Mr. CUMMINS. I am not prepared to say that, and I am not prepared to express any opinion about it. I am not, as the Senator knows, in the close confidence of most of the Republican Senators who intend to vote for this bill. Most of them have entertained views with regard to the tariff which I do not entertain. Most of them have spent the best part of their lives trying to maintain duties so high that it requires a modern telescope to see the dizzy altitude of the law.

I do not know what they would do, and I do not pledge any vote, but I do believe that if the bill were amended so that it would be fair and reasonable in the way I have pointed out and shall point out in the future, it would receive enough Republican votes added to those upon the other side of the Chamber to pass the Senate. I do believe that the high authorities which negotiated the arrangement would find no objection to this enlargement. What the Democratic majority in the House might do with regard to the bill in the form I must leave to the better knowledge and better judgment of the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Mississippi has not raised that question and does not care to go into as broad a field of speculation as that, but I imagine it would be awfully difficult to frame reciprocal trade relations with Canada too free for a Democratic House of Representatives if it had any certainty of approval——

Mr. CUMMINS. If that be true the Senator from Mississippi——

Mr. WILLIAMS. One moment; if it had any certainty or feeling of assurance that as amended it would finally go upon the statute book.

Mr, CUMMINS. If the Senator from Mississippi needs no reassurance upon the latter question I am sure that he will speedily reach the conclusion to follow his own conscience and his judgment in trying to make this arrangement better than it is.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield further to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Continuing the interruption, the Senator from Mississippi is trying to follow his own conscience and his judgment, or would try to follow it, to make this agreement better, with this qualification, that he would not go so far, even in the direction that he himself would like to go in making it better, as to prevent the Canadian reciprocity agreement from being finally written upon the statute book.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I have been trying, and evidently vainly trying, to convince the Senator from Mississippi that the better arrangement would meet no peril on its way to a completed law. If I have not succeeded I must either assume that my arguments are without that weight which I hoped they possessed or that the Senator from Mississippi is deaf to reason.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do.

Mr. BACON. With the permission of the Senator, before he passes to the subject which he has indicated as the one which he is now about to take up, I wish to make one suggestion to him. I do not know that I will put it in the shape of an interrogatory.

The Senator has been pressing with very great earnestness, and I may say at times with great eloquence, the feature which he alleges in this proposed reciprocity legislation is one of very great injustice in the fact that it proposes that a particular industry—the farming industry—shall be relieved from the protection the law now gives it against foreign competition, and at the same time the farmer be compelled to buy in a protected market.

I want to say to the Senator that that argument appeals with very great force to Senators from my section of the country, because in the political domination of the party to which the Senator belongs we have been accustomed to that in the most pronounced form for the past 40 or 50 years—that is, those of us who have lived long enough for that to be the case. It matters not, Mr. President, whether that condition is brought about by the enactment of law or whether it exists in the nature of things, so long as the result is the same.

The Senator spoke very eloquently yesterday of the great injustice of compelling the farmer to sell in a free market and manacling him, as he expressed it, and compelling him to buy in a protected market. I simply want to say to the Senator that this legislation, if it shall be enacted, will bring to the farmers in the northern part of this country a realization of the great injustice which has been done to their brethren in the southern part of this country during all the time of the enactment and enforcement of a protective-tariff law. While the law does not condemn the southern cotton producer to sell in a free market, conditions do, as absolutely as law possibly could, produce this effect. At the same time, those engaged in this immense industry, one of which, as I stated a few days ago, the product is worth one thousand million dollars a year, have been compelled to buy in a protected market everything which they have used. As to every article for the support of themselves and their families and every article of machinery or other appliance used in the production of their cotton, they have been, in the language of the Senator, manacled and compelled to buy in a protected market.

I am free to say to the Senator that I do not think that that is a good argument why we should inflict a similar injustice upon any other farmers, and for that reason I said I was not going to put it in the shape of an inquiry, but I thought at this time it was well that the argument the Senator has been urging with so much force and eloquence should go home to the people at large, that the great iniquity—I use a word probably that might be offensive; I will say the injustice—of the protective-tariff system is that it is absolutely impossible of equal application, and that it is impossible that you can so frame a protective-tariff law so that whatever benefits may come shall be equal in their application and in their effect. I thought I would take the liberty of suggesting that in connection with the very strong and earnest argument which the Senator has been making upon that line.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I have long felt and I now feel the very great force of the suggestion made by the Senator. If there had been any way of controlling the natural laws of trade and commerce, every fair-minded man must have admitted in all these years that the cotton grower in the South was entitled to the same advantage that had been claimed for the grain grower of the North. If there were any way of reaching the injustice which has been so often pointed out, I would be very glad to join him in an effort to reach it; but the Senator from Georgia knows that with respect to at least a great mass of the productions of the South there is no way of reaching it except along the path that we are now trying to walk, namely, the reduction of the duties which enhance the price of the things the southern farmer must buy and the removal of the duty entirely whenever to so remove it will not destroy the business of the domestic producer.

Mr. BACON. Well, Mr. President, I think the Senator could go still further and say that in a case of such necessity as that, and such consequent gross injustice growing out of that necessity, there can be no possible excuse for putting upon any article that the southern planter has to use in producing his cotton any tariff other than a revenue tariff; in other words, there can be no possible defense for putting upon any article used by him in that production any tariff which is to inure to the benefit of an individual.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, it is very hard to gainsay what has just been stated by the Senator from Georgia; but I now address myself to the question that has arisen with regard to the favored-nation clause. It has been said many times, I think, that if we were to add to this arrangement any concession that did not find its equivalent in a Canadian concession, or, to put it more concretely still, if the Senate should

now exercise the power that it unquestionably has and do the thing which it should unquestionably do from my standpoint, and add to the concessions to Canada without receiving other concessions from Canada, we would be compelled, under the favored-nation clause of our various treaties, to extend those concessions to every country between which and our own such a treaty is in existence. In my opinion—and I do not profess great familiarity with the diplomatic or international law in this respect—the arrangement in its present form is in greater danger of meeting and being drawn within the favored-nation clause than it would be if amended as I have proposed and if additional concessions were granted to Canada without asking from Canada anything in return.

The difficulty with the bill in its present form is this: That it seems to contemplate compensation, article by article—that is to say, that we grant to Canada free wheat because Canada grants to us free wheat; that we grant to her free cattle because Canada grants to us free cattle; that we reduce the duty a quarter of a cent a pound on meat because Canada reduces her duty to the same point on meat. I fear—although I do not assert it with any positiveness or even with great confidence—that if this bill becomes a law and goes into effect, then any other country can take any article named in this arrangement, and, upon giving us the precise equivalent which seems to be given here, can claim the admission of that article into our markets upon the terms that we now grant to Canada.

There is another objection to the arrangement in its present form, so far as the favored-nation clause is concerned. We do not in and by the proposed law terminate our concessions to Canada at the time that Canada may terminate her concessions to us. As I remarked yesterday, Canada in a month or a day after these laws, hers and our own, shall go into effect, can repeal her law, can withdraw from us every concession that she has granted, and still our law remains in full force and effect, and the duties which we here prescribe will be the duties that will be levied against Canadian imports until Congress shall exercise its right of repealing or modifying the statute which we are about to pass. I fear that foreign nations, with which we have treaties of the character I have described, will say that this is not reciprocity, that it is not the extension to Canada of certain concessions in consideration of concessions granted by her to us, but that it is simply an adjustment of our tariff law in its relation to Canada, which may continue, and which, so far as its terms are concerned, will continue as to Canada without regard to the perpetuation of the status which may be established by any Canadian enactment.

These are questions which may well deserve and do well deserve the thoughtful attention of those who are interested in our foreign relations. I pass them, however, to announce these propositions: First, that it is now for Congress to make just such proposals to Canada as it may see fit to make, and that we are not embarrassed nor can what we do ever be weighed or determined or measured by anything that has occurred in the exchanges of diplomacy between the State Department of our Government and the ministers of the Dominion of Canada. This is a subject of which we have jurisdiction, and if we now propose to give to Canada certain things as a whole for certain things which Canada shall give to us as a whole, then foreign nations in construing or in passing upon the arrangement must consider the proposal as emanating from and originating in the Congress of the United States, for that body alone has the power to change or to determine what our tariff duties shall be.

I do not intend, Senators, to go elaborately into the history of the favored-nation clause, but it is interesting for us to know what has occurred between this and other nations in order to reach a conclusion upon the proposition that I have just made. Assuming now that this bill were so amended as to admit to its free list every article which I have proposed to put upon the free list, and that no additional concession were asked from Canada, I still maintain that under the favored-nation clause of our treaties, as uninterruptedly construed and interpreted from the beginning of the Government until the present moment, no other nation could claim the advantages which we would thus confer upon Canada.

So far as we are concerned, Mr. President, this subject was first put into the form of a provision in a treaty in 1778. May I be permitted to go back just a little into history before I read the provisions of our first treaty in that respect? This matter had been the subject of treaties amongst the countries of the civilized world for a hundred years before the American Nation came into existence. There had been employed during all that time among those nations a clause which was substantially without condition—that is to say, a clause which operated automatically to admit into the markets of the country a party to the treaty the imports of any other country with which it had a treaty upon the same duties and terms that had been conferred upon any particular or favored nation, without regard to whether the favor was conferred for a concession or otherwise; in other words, the nations of the world had before this time largely, not altogether, employed what is known in the world of diplomacy and international law as the unconditional favored-nation clause.

Mr. President, it has been suggested to me that possibly I ought to defer and might well defer the discussion of this question, which is very important, and I am sure it will be interesting—not in my presentation of it, but because of its own significance—until a later time. I felt a little guilty this morning in occupying the time that had been preempted, and properly preempted, by the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GAMBLE]. I feel that he ought to be allowed to go forward with his observations. I shall take up this question, however, if I can secure the floor, on next Wednesday; and I now ask unanimous consent that on next Thursday the pending question shall be considered and voted upon during that legislative day.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, does the Senator mean the pending question or the pending amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCUMBER in the chair). The Senator referred to the pending question, which is——

Mr. CUMMINS. The pending question—I think I have stated it with entire accuracy—is upon the adoption of the amendments which I have offered, which are before the Senate and which constitute the pending question.

Mr. SMOOT. I may be mistaken. I thought, of course, the pending question was the reciprocity bill itself.

Mr. CUMMINS. The pending question is the amendment.

Mr. PENROSE. I suggest to the Senator to ask for a vote prior to adjournment.

Mr. CUMMINS. I have not yet finished my request.

Mr. PENROSE. I beg pardon.

Mr. CUMMINS. I ask that the pending question—and I will state the request so that there shall be no doubt about it—being the series of amendments offered by myself, shall be voted upon before adjournment upon that legislative day, and that the question shall be, upon the motion of any Senator, divided according to the rules of the Senate and of parliamentary law.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I want to inquire if that means if there should be a prolonged discussion in regard to the separate and individual amendments the Senate could take a recess until Friday or Saturday, or so long as the discussion might last on these amendments? I would not want to consent to a vote on the calendar day of Thursday.

Mr. CUMMINS. I am not asking for that. I am asking that a vote be taken on that legislative day, to be continued so long as may be required to reach a vote.

Mr. BRISTOW. A parliamentary inquiry. I should like to know if under the unanimous consent these proposed amendments of the Senator from Iowa can be voted upon separately? There are a number of them that I am very anxious to vote for, but I do not know whether I would want to vote for all of them or not. But for most of them I do. I should like to have an opportunity of voting on the amendments individually and separately.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the opinion of the Chair that it is the right of any Senator to have a pending amendment divided where it consists of two independent propositions and an independent vote upon any independent proposition, irrespective of any agreement.

Mr. CUMMINS. I will now ask to finish my request, that the votes be taken by the yeas and nays.

Mr. SMOOT. I hardly see what advantage we would gain by granting the request if the measure is to be discussed day after day. If there was some time fixed to vote, I would be glad to consent.

Mr. CUMMINS. That fixes the legislative day. It is precisely the agreement that the chairman of the Finance Committee asked and secured with respect to the amendment proposed by the Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT].

Mr. PENROSE. Will the Senator permit me?

I do not consider it important to fix an hour for this vote, and I understand that is not the wish of the Senator from Iowa. But I certainly think there ought to be something in this understanding that no recess shall be taken to prolong the legislative day until the following calendar day. In other words, that this shall be the final disposition of these pending amendments.

Mr. CUMMINS. I would not, as the author of the request——

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President——

Mr. CUMMINS. Just a moment.

I would not, as the author of the request, want to preclude the right of the Senate to take a recess if it is desired to do it. I myself would hope there would be no recess, but I do not want to put that into the request for unanimous consent. I think I can assure the Senator from Pennsylvania that so far as I am concerned there will be no desire, no inclination, to postpone by a single moment beyond the time when Senators desire to speak upon the amendments the disposition of them.

I have made this request largely in order to advise Senators of the time when the amendments will probably be disposed of. I am not insisting upon the request at all.

Mr. SIMMONS. I should like to inquire—I was not here when the Senator made his request—what is the request?

Mr. CUMMINS. The request is that the pending question, which consists of the series of amendments I have offered to the bill, shall be voted upon next Thursday—the legislative day of next Thursday—and that the votes be taken by the yeas and nays, and that the right of division of the question, which undoubtedly exists, shall be preserved, so that votes can be taken upon the separate amendments in so far as they involve separate subjects.

Mr. SIMMONS. If the Senator will permit me, I have no disposition to interpose any objection to the earliest possible consideration and action upon these amendments and the bill. But I want to suggest to the Senator from Iowa that there are those who desire to speak upon some of the amendments which he has offered. I myself desire to address myself somewhat at length to several of the amendments which the Senator has offered, and I shall probably offer some amendments on the same line, somewhat different from those offered by the Senator. I do not think I can get ready to speak by that time. And assuring the Senator that I have no disposition to interfere with fixing the earliest practicable date, so as to allow those who wish to speak an opportunity to do so, I suggest that he name some later date to vote on the amendments, so as to give Senators on this side an opportunity to speak. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. TAYLOR] at my left suggests to me that he also desires to speak.

Mr. CUMMINS. I think there must be some misapprehension about the effect of the unanimous agreement for which I ask. The effect of it, as I stated, is that on Thursday, at the close of the morning business, the question would be taken up and the debate would be continued until no further debate was desired, and that then we would begin to vote upon the amendments. My only purpose, as I say——

Mr. SIMMONS. I understand the Senator to mean we would just continue the legislative day by the process of taking a recess?

Mr. CUMMINS. If the debate be not concluded on the calendar day, it would be necessary to take a recess, of course.

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes. The difficulty about that, if the Senator will permit, is this: Senators who desire to speak on this question have to make some preparation for it, and they would not know, they could not possibly know, how long that legislative day was going to be extended. In case they did not feel they would be able to make their speech on Thursday or Friday, they would feel much safer if a later day were fixed before which the vote shall not be taken.

Mr. CUMMINS. Very well.

I have in addition to the purpose I mentioned a moment ago another, which is to indicate to the country and to Senators that those of us who feel that this bill ought not to be passed, at least in its present form, are not disposed to prolong unduly and unnecessarily the debate.

The Senator from North Carolina understands perfectly that some of us have been very severely arraigned for what is alleged to be an effort to prevent the adjournment of Congress within reasonable time. I am not conscious of any such purpose. I intend to stay here until these questions can be thoroughly and completely debated, and then I am ready to vote, and I ask for this consent in order to indicate my desire to speed the bill as well as my desire that all Senators could thus be notified of approximately the time at which a vote would be taken, and therefore all could be here.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator will understand that I am laboring under the same embarrassment that he is. I am, with him, opposed to the passage of this bill, but I do not desire to do anything that could possibly be construed into a purpose to delay action. I want speedy action. But at the same time I think the Senator is a little hasty, and his proposition does not allow reasonable time for the discussion of the very important amendments which he has offered. They are amendments which go to the most vital phases of this question, and they ought to be pretty thoroughly discussed before there is a vote upon them. I know there are several Senators here who desire to discuss them. As we will probably adjourn over until Wednesday, if the present proposition were to prevail there would be very little time given for discussion on amendments.

I am just as anxious as is the Senator—that is, what I mean to say now—to preclude any suggestion that I am making opposition to his present suggestion in any way to obstruct quick action and early action.

Mr. CUMMINS. What would the Senator from North Carolina think about Friday?

Mr. SIMMONS. I would not myself object to fixing Monday of next week, or if the Senator prefers, Saturday. I think at least two days—Wednesday, Thursday, Friday; three days—would not be more than is needed to discuss the Senator's amendments.

Mr. SHIVELY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do.

Mr. SHIVELY. I thoroughly appreciate the disposition of the Senator from Iowa to expedite the consideration of this measure. Some days ago he introduced these amendments. There is a long series of them. They are all amendments of importance. Day before yesterday the Senator occupied the floor in a speech of considerable length. He spoke excellently well, as he always does. Yesterday he again occupied the floor through most of the session, and spoke well, of course. To-day he has again occupied the floor up to this time, to the entertainment and instruction of the Senate. Now he serves notice that on next Wednesday he expects again to take the time of the Senate in a discussion of these amendments, and follows this notice by proposing, in the interest of economy in the time of the Senate, that we now fix Thursday as a continuous legislative day as the time to vote on and finally dispose of these amendments. In all probability the Senate, on account of the Fourth of July, will not be in session Saturday, Monday, or Tuesday.

I submit to the Senator whether down at bottom he regards that as a generous, or even just, proposition?

Mr. CUMMINS. I answer the Senator from Indiana in this way; I have made such inquiries as I could, and I have not found anybody who wants to speak upon these amendments.

Mr. SHIVELY. Is that the reason the Senator has felt constrained to occupy so much time on them?

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator from Indiana need not expend his wit upon me.

Mr. SHIVELY. I am not. It is not a question of wit.

Mr. CUMMINS. I have made my request in perfectly good faith. If the Senator from Indiana wants to object, it is entirely within his province.

Mr. SHIVELY. The Senator from Indiana has interposed no objection. But the Senator from Indiana must be permitted to address himself to the reason of the Senator from Iowa on the proposition which the Senator himself has submitted to the Senate, and to suggest whether, after having occupied the floor for three or four days, he regards it as quite the right thing to propose that immediately after he gets through we shall commence voting on the amendments.

Mr. CUMMINS. Certainly not, if I had any reason to believe that any other Senator desired to address the Senate with regard to these amendments. Everybody knows that when these amendments are disposed of then there will come forward certain other amendments touching the general tariff, and I am very anxious that we shall get along with the whole subject as rapidly as we can.

If the Senator from Indiana, or any other Senator either upon this side of the Chamber or the other, will suggest even that further debate is likely I will very gladly withdraw my request. I should like to see these amendments debated for a long time, if others will take up the debate.

Mr. SHIVELY. I hardly think the Senator can be in the dark on that question. The Senator from North Carolina just announced to him that he himself desires to discuss some of these amendments. He also took the privilege of announcing that the Senator from Tennessee wished to submit remarks. So the Senator from Iowa is not without information on the subject.

Mr. CUMMINS. I understood the Senator from North Carolina to say he proposed to offer amendments of his own on the same general subject.

Mr. SIMMONS. I said I desired to address myself to some of the amendments offered by the Senator from Iowa and to offer some myself on the same line.

Mr. CUMMINS. I am delighted to know that I have aroused some interest in these amendments, and debate can not continue too long to suit me, so long as the debate, I am sure, will pro-

mote chances of their adoption. And I therefore withdraw the request that I made for unanimous consent.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I regret that the Senate has not seen its way to grant the consent asked for by the Senator from Iowa. I desire to state that after the reassembling of the Senate on Wednesday, July 5, I shall ask the Senate to meet at an earlier hour in the morning, and to vote down motions for early adjournments, so that Senators who have exhibited this desire to speak on these matters may have full opportunity to do so.

Mr. SHIVELY. Why does not the Senator fix that now, so that every Senator will be on notice that we are going to meet at an earlier hour?

Mr. PENROSE. I will take my own——

Mr. SHIVELY. I will join the Senator from Pennsylvania in that.

Mr. PENROSE. I have no objection to doing it now; and I will move that——

Mr. SMOOT. We have an order to-day. We already have one order. Beginning Thursday is all right.

Mr. PENROSE. While I personally am perfectly willing to make the motion now, in view of the fact that one order has been made this morning, I will not press it. I assure the Senator from Indiana that Wednesday next I shall move that the Senate hold its meetings at an earlier hour until otherwise ordered.

Mr. SHIVELY. I assure the Senator from Pennsylvania I will join most heartily in support of that motion.

Mr. PENROSE. I am very glad, indeed, to hear that the motion will have the cooperation and help of the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I should like to state that I have no dispositon personally to delay a vote on the Canadian reciprocity bill and the amendments to it, but I am not disposed to agree to fixing a time at which the vote shall be taken, because frequently I think we can vote quicker by not fixing a time than by fixing a time.

Then I want to make another suggestion, and that is, after the reciprocity bill is disposed of, the unfinished business is off of the calendar, there are some other matters to which I think the Senate should give attention before Congress adjourns. I think the bill for the admission of Arizona and New Mexico should be disposed of at this extra session. I am in sympathy with any movement that hastens our proceedings and still gives full opportunity for discussion; but it seems to me that Senators should have in mind that when the Canadian bill is disposed of there are a number of other measures that will be before the Senate which are just as important, and, from my point of view, much more important than this Canadian bill.

I make this statement because I do not want the impression made throughout the country that Canadian reciprocity is the only legislative matter that is before Congress at this session.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. President, it is not my purpose to speak at undue length on the pending measure. The subject already has been very fully discussed by others. I, however, consider the provisions of the pending agreement a matter of tremendous import to such a large class of our population, and, in my judgment, it is striking such a severe and unwarranted blow at the agricultural interests of our country I feel it a duty to myself and to the people of the State which I have the honor, in part, to represent to give my views thereon.

I am a Republican and have full faith in my party, and for years have been guided by its policies and have sought to follow its traditions. Being a Republican, it necessarily follows I am and have been a protectionist. As a result of that policy the people of our country for the past 50 years in their manifold activities have steadily advanced in unparalleled prosperity and material achievements.

Under this policy the Republican Party since it became responsible for legislation has given the country an opportunity for its greatest progress and development. During all these years, with only one exception, the protective principle has been the fixed and permanent policy of the Government. During this time our progress and development have been unequaled in the history of the world. It has added to our wealth, developed our resources, extended our commerce, and multiplied our activities. Under its stimulating influence we have become the dominant force amongst the governments of the world.

Since the inauguration of the protective policy by the Republican Party we have accumulated and added to our material wealth upward of $110,000,000,000, which is practically one-fourth of the wealth of civilization. Under the same policy and the range of prices therefor from the wealth of the soil our agricultural production is the greatest in value each year of any people in the world. There has been built up under the same system our manufacturing establishments that produce each year practically one-third of the manufactured product of the world. As a result our export trade exceeds that of any of the governments of civilization.

We therefore should take care that the matter now in hand should not invade the protective principle of the party and imperil the prosperity of any class of our people or overthrow through this process the bulwark of protection that has made possible our marvelous development and accomplishments.

This policy, in my judgment, has given the fullest and most enlarged opportunities to our own people to do their own work, to employ their own capital, to maintain and preserve their own market, and not to suffer displacement in either in the world's competition. It has reserved to the American wage earner unequaled opportunities and has protected him against foreign competition and the lower level of wages and of living in other lands. Under our economic system it has always been the concern of the Republican Party to protect the home market, both as it relates to the producer, the manufacturer, as well as to labor.

The principle of protection was clearly defined in the last national Republican platform as follows:

> In all tariff legislation the true principle of protection is best maintained by the imposition of such duties as would equal the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad, together with a reasonable profit to American industries.

As to the clearness and meaning of the rule laid down there can be no controversy. The difference in the cost of production at home and abroad should be susceptible of demonstration, and with that determined the rates then should be fixed in relation therewith, and, in addition, a preference given to American capital for investment with a reasonable profit.

In conformity to the principle so declared the Payne bill of 1909 created a Tariff Board, and an appropriation was made to pursue such investigation, so that in any future revision of the tariff exact data and information would be available. Last year a much larger appropriation was made by Congress to insure the thoroughness and efficiency of such investigation and the result secured at the earliest practicable time. Legislation more extended and complete was sought in the last Congress looking to the creation of a tariff commission to more successfully prosecute the work in hand, that all essential data and exact information might be secured. Unfortunately the measure failed, even after it had passed both Houses with substantially the same provisions.

The highest obligation is imposed upon Congress to enact the legislation in question. It is in line and in sympathy, I believe, with the judgment of a large majority of the people of the country. Full and exact information thus secured would make more effectual and certain as well as just any future legislation that may be had upon the tariff. At any rate, an ample appropriation was made for the coming fiscal year for the carrying on of the work of the present Tariff Board, whose efficiency and competency will, I believe, be amply justified when its reports are made.

Reciprocity has been defined in our national platforms, and it has been the guiding principle governing the party when it has had to do with either negotiations or legislation thereon. It is well defined in the Republican platform of 1900, 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 the Republican national platform of 1904 the party further declared:

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

The principle of reciprocity was most clearly and succinctly stated by the late President McKinley in his first inaugural address, as follows:

> 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 of our own people, but tend to increase their prosperity.

The principle of reciprocity has been interpreted and followed by all of the great leaders of the party. It perhaps was never more clearly stated than by the late Charles Emory Smith:

> When readily 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, and she agrees to concessions for our machinery. That is reciprocity.

To my mind reciprocity means reciprocal and fair exchanges between different countries as far as may be in noncompeting products. It seems to me a fair and just reciprocal arrangement between the United States and Canada that is just and fair to every interest is much to be desired. I do not wish to be understood as opposing such a reciprocal agreement. It occurs to me, however, the measure proposed is unjust, unfair, un-Republican, and is in violation of the declared and settled policy of the party for more than a generation. It means to me a serious and unwarranted blow to the American farmer which places him in an unequal and unfair competition with his Canadian rival without any fair or just compensation in return for the protection that is now accorded him under existing law.

This is not the first experience our country has had in reciprocity with Canada. The treaty of 1854 was injurious and inimical to the prosperity and welfare of the people of the United States. It retarded our industrial and commercial development, and was unjust to practically every interest. Although patiently borne until 1866, it was then renounced.

Mr. Blaine, in his Twenty Years in Congress, makes the following comments, among other severe criticisms of this treaty:

> The selection of the commodities, as shown by the schedule, was made almost wholly to favor Canadian interests. There was scarcely a product in the list which could be exported from the United States to Canada without loss, while the great market of the United States was thrown open to Canada without tax or charge for nearly everything which she could produce and export. All her raw materials were admitted free, while all our manufactures were charged with heavy duty, the market being reserved for English merchants.

Mr. Fielding, in speaking in the Canadian Parliament of the present agreement soon after it was promulgated, stated:

> It is the reciprocity treaty of 1854 over again, with comparatively little change. It promises prosperity to the people of Canada, and this House would make a grave mistake and do a grave wrong if it would refuse to take advantage of it.

The history of the operations of the treaty of 1854 discloses the fact that we remitted to the Canadian Government many millions of dollars in duties, and instead of there being a balance of trade in our favor as it had been under normal conditions, during the greater part of the time while it was in force it was largely against us. When the treaty was ratified the balance of trade in our favor annually was $8,000,000. At its close the balance against us was $30,000,000. Under such conditions, considering the unfortunate experience we have heretofore had and the loss we then suffered without material gain, is it wise or the part of good statesmanship to practically renew an agreement that in the first instance proved so disastrous to our producing and commercial interests?

Mr. President, I can not persuade myself that in any sense this agreement follows either the rule of our party faith in the policy of protection or in that of reciprocity. As far as I am concerned I can not vote for its enactment or its ratification. It is neither protective nor reciprocal, but diametrically at variance, in my judgment, with both. Had it been proposed by the opposition, I could readily appreciate it as in line somewhat with their sympathies and their policy. When first submitted to the last Congress it was promptly and unanimously adopted at a caucus of the Democratic Party of the House of Representatives on January 31 last. It was reported from the Ways and Means Committee in the House of the last Congress by a vote of 12 to 7—6 Republicans and 6 Democrats for and 6 Republicans and 1 Democrat against. It was thereafter passed through the other House by the full vote of the Democratic Party, with only five exceptions, and with a minority of the Republican membership. It was reported to the Senate from the Finance Committee of the last Congress without recommendation, and the Senate declined to consider it.

It was passed through the present House by a vote of 267 for to 89 against. The number of Democrats who voted in favor of it was 199; against it, 11. The number of Republicans who voted in favor of it was 67, and against it 78. It was reported by the Finance Committee to the Senate without recommendation.

Under such conditions it can hardly be claimed this is a Republican measure, as far as legislative action so far is concerned. I feel at liberty, therefore, and am disposed, to exercise my own convictions thereon, independent of Executive action.

I desire, however, Mr. President, to express my high opinion of and confidence in the wisdom, the character, the patriotism, and unselfish devotion to the public service of the President of the United States. He has the highest ideals of public service, is unselfishly and patriotically devoting himself and his administration to the solution of great problems that immediately concern the present and future well-being of the Republic. The record this administration has made in advanced, substantial, progressive, and constructive legislation, and in the vigor, energy, and effectiveness of its enforcement of law against concentrated and powerful monopolies is unequaled by any administration during the same length of time.

With the highest respect for the President and great confidence in his wisdom, I am, however, unwilling to follow him in the proposed legislation. This I very much regret, but to do so would do violence to my highest convictions and firm sense of right.

I have no criticism to make upon the President for the course he has pursued. I would have preferred, however, that the Senate, in the first instance, had been advised with and consulted therein, and we would not have here a proposition of Executive origin only to be arbitrarily disposed of. The treaty-making power is vested by the Constitution in the Senate as well as with the Executive, and in that connection it requires a two-thirds vote of the Senate to ratify. In this proposal the two-thirds majority is avoided, and to give vitality to the treaty, which it is, and a revenue measure at the same time, a majority vote of the two Houses only is required.

It, however, is but the ordinary and natural result from the course of the election last fall. The result was a criticism and, to a certain extent, a rebuke to the party in many localities on certain specific rates of the Payne law. Many of the farmers joined in this attack. "The high cost of living," as a result, was the slogan employed by the great consuming public, and with that as a pretext the principle of protection has been overwhelmed and engulfed.

The proposal to my mind, however, is at variance with the policy and traditions of the party. It is not reciprocal. It invites competition in like productions, and the advantages are all in favor of Canada.

The chief sufferers, if it is enacted into law, will be the agricultural producers. It proposes, as far as this country is concerned, to open to our people the market of a country of not over 7,500,000 people, much of whose area is new and undeveloped, and in exchange throw open to them the market places of upward of 92,000,000 people, with their multiplicity of activities and infinity of resources and with inexhaustible consuming power. To my mind it is unequal, and the exchange is all in favor of the Canadian people.

Mr. President, I had supposed it was the fixed policy of the party to take no further step in the revision of the tariff on any of the schedules without first having a report thereon, with exact information as to the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad on the schedule or schedules proposed to be revised made by the Tariff Board or tariff commission. It, however, is proposed, as far as the negotiations and the action of the House are concerned, without any such evidence having been submitted or evidence gained or sought to be gained on any of the articles enumerated in the bill from such a source, to revise, alter, change, and modify the rates of duty specified on the articles in question, without, in the first instance, any pretense of evidence or information submitted from the board or from practically any other source. This attack is almost alone made upon the agricultural schedule, and the farmers are to be stripped absolutely of the protection afforded them under the Payne law, without any opportunity for hearing or a suggestion even made as to the exact facts connected therewith, except as given by the Finance Committee of the Senate during the present session.

To all intents and purposes, as far as the American farmer is concerned, it is a revision of the tariff as it affects his interests, and the products of the farm are to be put upon practically a free-trade basis, without any equivalent in reduction of the things he is compelled to buy. In other words, as far as the products of the farm are concerned, they are to be placed upon the free list and the farmer still compelled to buy in a protected market the articles he needs.

As far as H. R. 4413—known as the "farmers' free-list" bill—is concerned, I will only stop to observe it was never intended by its authors to become a law. Its object was political merely. It is illogical, follows no known rule or precedent, is subversive of every principle of tariff legislation, and if enacted into law would be destructive of every interest it aimed to serve. Its further consideration, in my judgment, will not be seriously urged in its present form.

I am free to confess I had somewhat sympathized with the new rule promulgated from high quarters in the party that the true rule in the revision of the tariff was to revise it schedule by schedule. Upon this theory, however, it was clearly understood no revision would be had on any article of any schedule without exact information from the Tariff Board or tariff commission. Whatever delusions I may have had in respect to this have been abruptly dissipated by the program now in-

voked. The agricultural schedule alone is now opened to attack. Every other interest is ready for the onslaught upon the claim of "the high cost of living."

The farmer is to be sacrificed and his prosperity checked and his opportunity for extension and enlargement curtailed by a combination of every other independent interest. In this respect he is practically helpless to protect himself, by combination or otherwise, to save himself from the general onslaught. If the present program is to be a test of the new doctrine, as far as I am concerned, I feel I am ready to disavow it.

Mr. President, the policy of protection to the western farmer for many years was indirect and largely theoretical. Its chief aim was to give encouragement to and to develop our new and struggling manufacturing industries. It had application to and direct relation largely to the eastern manufacturing interests. The western farmer was far from market and rates of transportation were high. It developed a nearer market; gave employment to labor in the manufacturing establishments; increased the number of consumers and the price of all farm products.

Under the impetus and encouragement of this policy the manufacturing establishments developed and extended westward, seeking locations nearer the source of supply. It increased the consumers, shortened the distances of transportation, lessened the freight charges the farmer originally was compelled to pay, and in the highest sense demonstrated the beneficent effects of the policy of protection and brought in a practical way the agricultural producer and the consumer of his products in close proximity.

In every sense it has had a most salutary effect, both upon the agriculturist, the manufacturer, and labor. It increased farm values, raised the price of farm products; developed a local consumption not only for the products of the farm, but in return gave a market to the manufacturer in the prosperity of the agriculturist.

During the last few years the farmer has largely come into his own, and this result has demonstrated the beneficence and helpfulness of the protective policy. The great body of agriculturists have felt justified and repaid for their loyalty to the party that inaugurated the policy, and, as a rule, have largely sustained it. The producer and the consumer of late have met practically on equal terms, with fair exchange between both.

Is it fair, is it just, is it patriotic, and is it wise when the farmer recognizes his equality and is satisfied with existing conditions that a revision should be inaugurated on the agricultural schedule alone and the farmer stripped of the protection the law now gives him and engulf and overwhelm the home market through free-trade competition in all his products when the reduction upon the things he buys is so meager it in no sense is a just or fair equivalent? Can it be expected the agriculturist is to sustain a party under such a policy which as a result must necessarily depreciate the value of his holdings, make unremunerative his employment, lessen the price of the things he has to sell, and place him in competition with a foreign people where production is had upon cheaper lands with greater productive capacity, with less investment of capital, with rates of wages in many cases less, and he be content to support a policy or a party that is willing to do violence to every sense of right in the farmer's relation to the other members of the citizenship of our country and leave the latter protected in all other interests and place the farmer alone in such unequal competition?

Mr. President, the western farmer for years has been the bulwark of Republican strength and has sustained the party, as a rule, in all crises with rare exceptions. He is intelligent, patriotic, high minded, and believes in fair play. It can hardly be hoped, however, that his highest rights are to be invaded, his possessions depreciated, his products cheapened, and he be expected to cooperate and sustain a policy that proposes to do such violence to him.

Under the Payne law he is abundantly protected in all his products against foreign competition. Under it and the Dingley law great prosperity has come to him. If he is to be stricken down and his interests sacrificed on the combined demand of the selfish consuming public, and unable to defend himself, it can hardly be expected he will be loyal to a party that is chargeable, without right or justice, in bringing such results upon him.

To my mind, if this policy is to be pursued it is but the beginning of the end of the protective system. If one interest is to be sacrificed and stricken down, a disposition certainly will be invited and encouraged to undermine all other interests, which in the end can not be other than disastrous to our whole economic policy. Each should be treated on an equality and each is deserving of a fair and just measure of protection. This rule should be followed in any case, whether it be protective or on a tariff for revenue basis. Every industry should be treated with exact justice under any and all economic systems.

An unrelenting press has been most insistent in an unjust and largely an unwarranted attack upon the tariff act of 1909, for the reason chiefly that print paper was not placed on the free list. I am free to confess many of the farmers sympathized with this warfare and felt many of the rates were unduly high. In many cases in the last election they voted their rebuke to the Republican Party, and the result is clearly discernible in the Democratic majority in the House of Representatives, and it is plainly visible in the membership of this body since March 4 last.

Mr. President, I am free to admit many of the rates in the Payne law were placed higher than, in my judgment, the facts warranted. Notwithstanding this fact, however, the farmer alike with every other industry in the country since the passage of the law has met with unusual prosperity. Farm prices have largely maintained their level until recently, agricultural lands have appreciated in value, labor has found ready employment at higher rates of wages than ever before, the commercial and industrial activities of the country were not impeded, but on the contrary the fullest measure of prosperity has prevailed. The law converted a deficiency in the revenues in its first year to a handsome surplus.

If this agreement is to be ratified and enacted into law, I have confidence the agricultural population of our country will have a higher and juster appreciation of the law and of the protection afforded them under the act of 1909 than they have heretofore manifested.

"The high cost of living" is the battle cry of all the interests favoring the ratification and enactment of the proposed measure. If the claim be true, it must necessarily follow the removal of the duties upon the products of the farm and opening the door to Canadian competition must lower the price with the hope that the ultimate consumer will be the beneficiary. If he is to profit, it necessarily must be at the expense of the farmer. The prices of agricultural products and of live stock will be reduced as a result.

The profits of the farm under present conditions are not unduly remunerative. Land values are high, equipment is purchased in a protected market, farm labor is scarce and almost prohibitive in many localities as to rate of wages, and as a result the farmer's profits are much less than on an equal investment along other lines of industry.

The serious and admitted difficulty in the way of the ultimate consumer is the cost of distribution. The fault lies in there being too many consumers and not a sufficient number of producers. Too many, and far too many, are engaged in domestic or retail distribution to the consumer who in the end is obliged to pay the added cost. Even if there were as a result of this agreement a lessened cost of the products of the farm, little or no benefit would accrue to the ultimate consumer for the reason the depreciation in price originally would be appropriated by the middlemen before the product reached its final destination.

The census of 1910 tells its own story. The population of the agricultural area in many sections of our country, even in the most productive regions, shows a less population than 10 years ago. The segregation and the increase have centered in the larger cities, where rates of wages are higher and where it is felt greater opportunities lie in individual effort. This should not be so. Within the last decade rural life, with its opportunities, has been made much more attractive and agreeable. The improvements in agricultural machinery have made farm work much easier and less a drudgery. Rural free delivery extends throughout every rural community where the density of population at all justifies it. The rural telephone is accessible to practically every farm home. It brings the farmer into immediate touch with his own community and his business and commercial center. The automobile in modern rural life, with its rapidity of communication, is not an exception. Improved highways have added to the accessibility of rural districts and with their commercial and industrial centers. In every way farm life has been modernized, improved, made more attractive, and it is where the highest ideals of citizenship are nurtured and upon which the stability and security of our institutions largely rest.

Mr. President, to my mind these things have largely been made possible by modern development under the stimulus and encouragement of the Republican policy of protection. In my judgment there might be a modification under the existing tariff law when the exact facts are obtainable, but to enact the proposed measure is a revulsion of existing conditions which will retard, if not crush out, the prosperity and development of farm life and in every way defeat the upbuilding and advancement of our rural communities.

The arable lands of the Nation are practically occupied. Much can be done in rejuvenating a large part of the farm lands of the East. Greater care and better farming should be followed in the newer communities. We, however, can increase our acreage and productiveness somewhat through irrigation, which has taken such splendid form under the Federal Government. Much can be done by intensive and also by dry farming in the semiarid regions. Congress has recognized this fact by recent legislation in enlarging the area of this class of lands under the homestead law.

Under such conditions and the legitimate and ordinary and natural increase in the value of farm products, is it not fair and just the farmer should profit thereby and this condition should have relation under the existing economic policy of the Government to the area of lands within our own boundaries and the citizenship which occupies it and produces therefrom?

The proposition now is to throw open the vast area of the Canadian northwest, which is as yet largely undeveloped and with possibilities almost beyond computation in the production of the cereals, and to open our market to strangers and foreigners which can have no other result than to depreciate and lessen the price of all products and live stock raised on the American farm.

The area of northwestern Canada, as well as the productiveness, is almost limitless. The Provinces of Saskatchewan, Manitoba, and Alberta embrace practically 370,000,000 acres, with a tillable area of 214,000,000. The area of these Provinces is nearly equal to the great States of Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Idaho, Iowa, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin, the imperial granary of our own great Northwest. I insert a table heretofore used in this discussion showing the respective areas in the different Provinces and States above named:

Area of Provinces and States.

Provinces and States.	Number of acres.	Number of acres of tillable land.	Number of square miles.
Saskatchewan	160,416,000	86,826,240	250,650
Manitoba	47,188,480	27,000,000	73,732
Alberta	162,000,000	100,000,000	253,125
Total	369,604,480	213,826,240	577,507
Minnesota	53,353,600	.....	83,365
North Dakota	45,307,800	.....	70,795
South Dakota	49,696,000	.....	77,650
Nebraska	49,606,000	.....	77,510
Idaho	54,272,000	.....	84,800
Iowa	35,856,000	.....	56,025
Illinois	36,256,000	.....	56,650
Michigan	37,705,600	.....	58,915
Wisconsin	35,865,600	.....	56,040
Total	397,919,000	.....	621,750

The possibilities of the development of these Provinces are enormous and can not well be comprehended. The lands are much less in value than on this side of the border. A much less investment is required in production, and even if the rate of wages does not greatly differ the American farmer would have an unequal task in competition against such tremendous odds.

Mr. President, I will not review in detail all of the articles affected by the proposed agreement. I take occasion to mention a few. Under the Dingley law the production of flax, protected by a duty of 25 cents per bushel, was greatly stimulated. The farmers, especially in the Northwest, largely increased the acreage, and the production rapidly developed. In the year 1898, succeeding the passage of the Dingley law, the production of flax in the United States aggregated 12,500,000 bushels, with an average price of 95 cents per bushel and a total valuation of $11,237,000. Ten years later, or during the year 1908, the production of flax had increased to 28,500,000 bushels, with an average price of $1.18 and a total farm value of $30,577,000. The crop for 1910 was very short and the production was 14,116,000 bushels, with a farm value per bushel of $2.30 and a total farm value of $32,554,000. I submit the following table, which clearly demonstrates that the American farmer, and especially in the Northwest, secures the advantage of the tariff thereon over his Canadian rival.

The places are immediately adjacent along the international boundary line, and the prices given are in themselves sufficiently eloquent in their demonstration of the fact without the necessity of elaboration or further comment. It makes clear the American farmer is protected by the rate of duty levied under the different laws in force.

Flax.

[Prices paid Jan. 9, 10, and 11, 1911.]

United States.	Jan. 9.	Jan. 10.	Jan. 11.	Canada.	Jan. 9.	Jan. 10.	Jan. 11.
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

Mr. President, as further showing the yield per acre as well as the farm price per bushel of the flax crop for the year 1910 in the States and Provinces named, I submit the following which I have compiled from the recent report of the Tariff Board. It shows the average yield per acre in Canada more than 2½ bushels over that in the States named, but the price per bushel in these States is 30 cents over that in Canada.

United States.	Yield per acre.	Farm price per bushel.	Canada.	Yield per acre.	Farm price per bushel.
	Bushels.			*Bushels.*	
North Dakota	3.60	$2.35	Manitoba	11.79	$2.09
Minnesota	7.50	2.30	Saskatchewan	7.87	2.08
South Dakota	5.00	2.29	Alberta	4.48	1.87
Average	5.38	2.31	Average	8.04	2.01

The total production of flax during the year 1910, as shown by the Department of Agriculture, as hereinbefore stated, was 14,116,000 bushels, with a farm value of $32,554,000. The following States, in the year 1910, produced nearly 90 per cent of the flax crop of the United States:

States.	Bushels.	Farm value.
North Dakota	5,778,000	$13,578,000
Minnesota	3,540,000	8,142,000
South Dakota	3,300,000	7,557,000
Total	12,618,000	29,277,000

The foregoing very clearly demonstrates the great interest the people of the above-named States have in the pending measure in its effect on this single crop.

The production of barley in the United States in 1898, the year succeeding the enactment of the Dingley law, was 60,000,000 bushels, with a farm value of $37,000,000. The production for the year 1910 was 162,227,000 bushels, with a farm value of $93,785,000. The following Northwestern States, as shown by the report of the Agricultural Department, produced upward of 50 per cent of the barley crop of the United States:

States.	Bushels.	Farm value.
Minnesota	26,985,000	$16,191,000
Wisconsin	22,429,000	14,355,000
South Dakota	18,655,000	10,633,000
Iowa	15,045,000	8,425,000
North Dakota	5,428,000	2,935,000
Total	88,542,000	52,589,000

That the farmers of the Northwestern States were effectively protected from Canadian competition in the importation of this crop, I submit the following comparative table of current prices on the dates named in the United States and in Canada at adjacent points near the boundary line. The duty on this product saved the market to the Northwestern farmer, and the advantage this gave him was his security and protection.

Barley.

[Prices paid Jan. 9, 10, and 11, 1911.]

United States.	Jan. 9.	Jan. 10.	Jan. 11	Canada.	Jan. 9.	Jan. 10.	Jan. 11.
	Cents.	*Cents.*	*Cents.*		*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*
Pembina	.....	.....	67	Emerson	.....	.....	42
Neche	68	66	67	Gretna	37	38	38
Hannah	.....	.....	64	Crystal	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.

Mr. President, in further demonstration of the fact that the existing rate of duty on barley does protect the northwestern farmer on this grain I submit additional data which I have compiled as to yield per acre of this crop for the year 1910 from the report of the Tariff Board and the farm prices therefor in the following-named States and Provinces. This discloses the fact that the average price per bushel on this side of the line is practically 20 cents over that on the other side of the international boundary line, but the Canadian farmer has an advantage of an average yield per acre of 13 bushels:

United States.	Average yield per acre.	Farm price per bushel.	Canada.	Average yield per acre.	Farm price per bushel.
	Bushels.			*Bushels.*	
Minnesota	21.00	$0.60	Manitoba	20.21	$0.390
Wisconsin	25.90	.64	Saskatchewan	26.18	.358
South Dakota	18.20	.51	Alberta	20.32	.383
Iowa	29.50	.56			
North Dakota	5.50	.55			
Average	20.00	.572	Average	33.20	.377

The total production of spring wheat for the year 1910, as shown by the Department of Agriculture, was 231,399,000 bushels, with a farm value of $207,868,000. The following States produced practically 75 per cent of the spring-wheat crop during the preceding year, as shown by the following table:

States.	Bushels.	Farm value.
Minnesota	94,080,000	$88,435,000
South Dakota	46,720,000	41,581,000
North Dakota	36,105,000	32,494,000
Total	176,905,000	163,510,000

The people of the foregoing States naturally and necessarily have a tremendous interest in the provisions of the pending measure. Its enactment is fraught, they believe, with great consequence to their present and future welfare. The present law saves them from competition with their Canadian rivals and protects them in their home market.

If the present rate of duty is removed, as is proposed, their present market will be overwhelmed and the price reduced to the Canadian level. Under existing conditions and the rate of duty now in force the American farmer has the advantage and receives a higher price for his products, as shown by the following table, giving current prices for wheat on either side of the border:

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.			
Pembina	97	Emerson	82
Neche	96	Gretna	81
Walhalla	97	Haskett	82

As further showing the difference in the price of wheat and the advantage to the American farmer in the rate of duty over that of the Canadian producer, I submit the following table, submitted by the Tariff Board in its report to the President on February 28, 1911, showing the Minneapolis and Winnipeg prices, and advance of the Minneapolis prices over Winnipeg prices during each month of the year of 1910. It shows a difference in the price per bushel in favor of Minneapolis over Winnipeg from 6½ cents to 15⅝ cents throughout the year. It occurs to me the American farmer should not be called upon to surrender this advantage he now has to satisfy the selfish demand and what seems to be an unreasonable hope of the public, and from which no reduction in the end will be realized by the ultimate consumer.

	Minneapolis prices.	Winnipeg prices.	Difference.
1910.			*Cents.*
January	$1.15½	$1.04	11½
February	1.14	1.02¼	11¾
March	1.14	1.04	10
April	1.11½	1.03½	8
May	1.11	.97¼	13¾
June	1.05	.89⅜	15⅝
July	1.25¼	1.17⅜	7⅞
August	1.15⅝	1.05¼	9⅜
September	1.11½	1.05	6½
October	1.07¾	.98⅞	8⅞
November	1.04⅝	.91½	12⅝
December			

The farmers of the Northwest, under the fostering care of the Dingley and Payne laws, were induced to engage especially in the production of flax and barley, and great interests looking to the manufacture of products from them have located near the sources of production; and instead of the prices being fixed by the eastern or the European markets, they have been dictated largely at Chicago, Milwaukee, and at Minneapolis. That they have been protected in their industry and in these productions is clearly demonstrated by the prices this side of the border as compared with those on the other side of the line, as is shown by the foregoing quotations.

The advantage under protection as it relates to each product is with the American farmer.

Substantially the same conditions exist as to the oat crop as to that of wheat, barley, and flax. It is not my purpose to detain the Senate by a discussion thereon or to encumber the RECORD by elaboration. The argument that applies to one largely has equal force to the other. The oat crop for the year 1910 aggregated 1,096,396,000 bushels. It represented a value of upward of $380,000,000. The North Central States produced 80 per cent of this great crop. The producers of the great bulk of this crop in the United States, as a rule, are in immediate and close competition geographically with their Canadian rivals.

Mr. President, I have called attention to the production of spring wheat, especially in the northwestern area embraced within the States of Minnesota, North and South Dakota, where substantially 75 per cent of this crop is produced annually. Notwithstanding the fact that these three States, with an area of upward of 230,000 square miles, produce such an abundant supply of this cereal, it is insignificant in comparison with the larger and more extensive area of northwestern Canada. The area embraced in Saskatchewan, Manitoba, and Alberta alone comprises 577,600 square miles. This vast acreage, mostly of highly productive land, is two and one-half times the area of the States last named.

The average yield per acre of wheat in the States named during the year 1910 was as follows: Minnesota, 16 bushels; South Dakota, 14 bushels; and North Dakota, 13 bushels; while Saskatchewan was 22 bushels per acre. With such a tremendous area open to the cultivation of wheat and only 10 or 12 per cent of the lands now under cultivation, what will be the result in a few years with the possibility of the future development of this extended area?

There has been an enormous and marvelous increase in recent years in the production of spring wheat in the region immediately north of the States which produce the great bulk of the spring-wheat crop, and, as heretofore stated, with the advantage all in favor of the Canadian producer, with the cheaper lands and greater production per acre, the volume of its production will be wonderfully accelerated and in the end will overwhelm the producers of this great crop in the United States.

I need not amplify, as far as the argument is concerned, in relation to the production of wheat and to competition with the American producer, nor need I add further to the suggestions heretofore made in regard to the competition as to flax, oats, and barley. The argument as it applies to the wheat crop is equally true as to barley, oats, and flax.

Mr. President, it seems to me, should this proposal be consummated, the menace of competition and depreciation in the price of the products in question to the American farmer, and especially to those of the Northwest, is definite and certain. The area susceptible of the profitable cultivation of the cereals and of flax is so extensive and vast in northwestern Canada, it occurs to me, no other result can be reached. Its extent is disclosed by the table I have already used. The area in crops in the year 1909 was less than 12,000,000 acres. Yet with this limited acreage they produced 147,482,000 bushels of wheat, at

an average yield per acre of nearly 22 bushels, while the average yield in the United States was about 15½ bushels.

The Canadian Yearbook for 1909 further states that the total production of crops in northwestern Canada for that year was 240,000,000 bushels. The area capable of producing grain, from the same authority, is stated to be 220,000,000 acres and that the unoccupied land in the future will at least produce 5,000,000,000 bushels annually, and this without taking into consideration the Mackenzie Basin, which is also capable of producing grain. With such an annual production and with such a limited area now under cultivation, it is but a simple proposition in mathematics to determine what the result will be in a very limited number of years, when even only a small part of this vast area is made productive through cultivation. I have seen it stated that in recent years more than one and a half millions of acres annually of their arable lands are broken, and that during the present year it is estimated that at least that acreage of new lands will be opened and ready for crop the next year. This, in my judgment, is a very low estimate. This development would be accelerated under normal conditions.

In my judgment, should the proposal now made be enacted, it would immeasurably hasten the development, increase its production, and to that extent add to and intensify the competition with the American farmer and depress his market.

Mr. President, it is most vigorously contended, and from high sources, that the Liverpool market fixes the price of wheat as well as of all our grains; that this being so, the proposed modification and the removal of the existing duties would not affect the price of wheat to the American farmer. The wheat production in the United States in the year 1909 was 664,802,000 bushels. Of that amount we consumed practically 90 per cent, and only 10 per cent was for export. The great bulk of the crop that is now produced is paid for in the American market, and the amount for export each year will undoubtedly be a diminishing quantity.

I submit the following table, taken from the report of the Tariff Board, submitted to Congress on March 1 of the present year, showing quarterly prices of wheat in Liverpool, in Winnipeg, and other markets in the United States for 1909–10:

	1909				1910			
	Jan.	Apr.	July.	Oct.	Jan.	Apr.	July.	Oct.
Minneapolis, No. 1 northern	$1.07⅜	$1.26⅜	$1.31⅝	$1.03⅞	$1.15½	$1.11½	$1.25½	$1.07¾
Duluth, No. 1 northern	1.06½	1.25½	1.30⅝	1.03⅞	1.14¼	1.11⅝	1.28⅛	1.07¼
Chicago, No. 1 northern	1.08¾	1.26⅝	1.30	1.05	1.16½	1.16	1.25	1.12
Winnipeg, No. 1 northern	.99¾	1.23¾	1.30	.99⅝	1.04	1.03½	1.17⅝	.98⅞
Liverpool, No. 2 northern (Manitoba)	1.16	1.37	1.43	1.31	1.22	1.18	1.18	1.16

It will be observed the range of prices varies somewhat, but with uniformity the price at Minneapolis and Duluth during the two years covered by the table is higher than at Winnipeg, in some cases the difference ranging as high as 10½ and 11½ cents per bushel, and in no case lower than 1⅝ cents. If the price of wheat at Minneapolis and Duluth is fixed by the price at Liverpool, why, I ask, is there a difference between the price of this cereal at these points and Winnipeg, as above demonstrated, sometimes ranging over 10 cents per bushel, when at the same time the freight rate on wheat from Winnipeg is less to Liverpool than from Minneapolis? It occurs to me from the evidence thus adduced by the Tariff Board it is incumbent from some authentic source to make explanation. The facts, however, clearly establish the truth of the statement, and in my opinion any other position is untenable.

The senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], in his very able report to the Senate on this bill, shows that in order to export wheat from Minneapolis to Liverpool the price at the latter place would have to be at least 16 to 17 cents per bushel higher than at Minneapolis in order to pay the freight rates, insurance, commissions, handling, and so forth, and allowing a reasonable profit on capital and risk of business. It is further shown that the average prices of No. 1 northern in Minneapolis and Liverpool for the years 1908, 1909, and 1910, as reported by the Bureau of Statistics, were as follows:

Years.	Minneapolis.	Liverpool.	Difference.
1908	$1.11	$1.25	$0.14
1909	1.20	1.29	.09
1910	1.14	1.14	None.

If therefore the Liverpool market had fixed the price at Minneapolis, and computing the difference at 17 cents per bushel, the price at Minneapolis would have been 3 cents lower in 1908, 8 cents lower in 1909, and 17 cents lower in 1910. The loss on the wheat crop of Minnesota and North and South Dakota for the three years would have been as follows:

Years.	Total crop.	Loss per bushel.	Total loss.
	Bushels.	*Cents.*	
1908	174,847,000	3	$5,245,410
1909	232,430,000	8	18,594,400
1910	177,905,000	17	30,243,850
Total loss of 3 States for 3 years			54,083,660

Under present conditions the farmers of the Northwest, even with the existing rates of duty against Canadian importations, have no undue advantage over their Canadian competitors. Their lands in the United States are of greater value. The productive capacity of the soil is less in wheat, barley, flax, and oats. The quality of each is inferior to that produced by the Canadian farmer. By reason of the greater production per acre of these crops in Canada the average cost of the production of a bushel of grain is very much lessened, and this all to the advantage of those across the international boundary line.

If this is not true, why has there each year been such a large emigration from many of the Northwestern States to Canada? Few of these people return, and they appear satisfied with conditions and the opportunities there afforded them. It has been asserted by high officials of the Canadian Government that already 500,000 Americans have transferred their allegiance to Canada, and with their energy and industry and means are now contributing to the development and upbuilding of Canada.

This already has been a serious loss in wealth and to the industrial strength and producing capacity of many sections of our country. Shall we, by legislation of the character proposed, increase and encourage that movement, and by force of changed conditions, which must surely follow, drive our own people from the fields they now occupy to the more promising and hopeful opportunities under a foreign flag? The sole remedy, it occurs to me, is to maintain the present tariff rates, and under improved industrial and economic conditions an equitable balance will be secured and maintained.

Mr. President, the interests to be materially and substantially affected by the provisions of the pending measure are extensive and immense, and it should receive the most careful and painstaking consideration before the agriculturists with all their interests should be so materially affected. The data as to agriculture as it will be shown by the census of 1910 are largely not obtainable, and we are obliged to look to the information given us by the census of 1900. That year the value of farm lands, including buildings, farm implements, and machinery, and live stock, aggregated $20,439,000,000.

This aggregate must have tremendously increased during the past decade. It is estimated by Mr. North, the former Director of the Census, as given in the American Yearbook for 1910, that the value of all farm property, as will be shown by the agriculture census for 1910, will be approximately $50,000,000,000. This estimate seems excessive, but it is sufficiently accurate for my purpose.

The number of persons engaged in agricultural pursuits, according to the census of 1900, aggregated upward of 10,381,000. The number so engaged during the last decade has added very materially to the above great total. The value of the annual output, as shown by the report of the Secretary of Agriculture for the year 1909, for farm animals and crop products, aggregated practically $9,000,000,000. With such a large per cent of our population engaged in agricultural pursuits and with such a tremendous investment of capital and with such an aggregate in annual production, it certainly should be sufficient to arrest the attention and demand the earnest consideration of Congress in treating a subject of such vast consequence and affecting such a large percentage of our population, as well as the value of their investments and the price applying to such an enormous production. The capital invested in manufacture, as shown by the returns in 1905, was $12,686,000,000, and the number of persons engaged therein was 5,470,000. The gross value of the manufactured products for that year was $14,802,000,000. If, however, the cost of materials used, and of fuel, freight, and so forth, were deducted, it would leave a net value of the product of $9,821,000,000.

In the measure before us it occurs to me it has relations to and affects most materially the farmer and the value of his

products, which, in comparison, as far as the amount of the investment is considered and the number of individuals engaged therein, are far in excess of the capital invested in manufacture and the wage earners employed, while the net value of the annual product of the two industries is substantially the same. The measure retains protection to the latter and guards the manufacturer practically in all his rights, while at the same time it proposes to break down the protective policy to the larger interests of agriculture, placing it upon a free-trade basis and in open competition with strangers and foreigners, while the shield of protection is reserved to the manufacturer with only a limited lowering of certain of the rates. To my mind it is so inequitable and unjust that for my part I can not accede to it.

As a result it will discourage the agricultural producer, depreciate his holdings, lessen his possibilities for success, drive him to the necessity of disposing of his lands, crowd more and more the centers of population, increase the consuming public, and the American farmer will be forced to seek the cheaper lands in the Canadian Dominion, where his chances for success are greater and his opportunities enlarged, and instead of encouraging and protecting our home citizenship it will lead to discouragement and, I fear, to disaster.

To my mind the most serious and substantial objection to the pending measure, as far as it relates to agricultural production, is that it proposes to open our markets to the same class of production that will enter into immediate, direct, and ruinous competition with the identical products of our own people. It is not reciprocal, it is competitive, and will be ruinous to our own producers. The proposal is at variance with the declared principle of reciprocity whenever asserted as a party policy or announced or defined by the older or more recent leaders of the party.

Mr. President, in these observations I have confined myself somewhat to local or sectional conditions in the Northwest. They are apparent, immediate, and striking to the people of that locality. The situation, however, is just as apparent and as imminent in other respects immediately adjacent along the entire international boundary line as affecting the same and other like productions. I trust, however, I am not so narrow or that I am biased by such a selfish or sectional interest that I would not want to do full justice to the people of the whole country irrespective of local or sectional conditions. In the vote I shall cast upon this measure I mean it shall be in the interest of the whole people and for the highest well-being of the present and future of a common country.

Mr. President, in addition to the direct effect on the market price of all the products of the farm, in my judgment history will again repeat itself and it will result in seriously depressing the value of farm lands in the United States should this measure receive the approval of Congress. Before the settlement and development of the great Northwest assumed such stupendous proportions some years since the value of farm lands in the Eastern States, and even in the Ohio Valley, were not unduly high, and agricultural pursuits were profitably carried on.

Great depression, however, soon followed. The eastern farmer could not successfully compete with his western rival. The western lands were rich, wonderfully productive, and easy of tillage. Freight rates were reduced, and the western farmer could deliver his products in the eastern market at less cost and at greater profit than the eastern producer. The latter was obliged to meet adverse conditions. The soil had long been tilled and was exhausted in many cases. It required fertilizing and greater care and labor in production. The investment was higher and the cost of production much in excess of his western competitor.

Government statistics disclose the fact that in the States of New England and New York alone over 7,000,000 acres of agricultural lands were abandoned between the years 1880 and 1900. They also disclose the further fact that these States, including the States of Ohio and Pennsylvania, lost in the value of their farm lands and buildings between the years 1880 and 1900 the enormous aggregate of $427,000,000. Substantially like conditions manifested themselves during the same period in other Eastern and older States.

But, Mr. President, during the last decade a wonderful change has come. The Eastern States have more than regained what they had lost during the opening and development of the newer West. As shown by the returns of the last census, the New England States, with New York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio, gained in the value of farm lands and buildings from 1900 to 1910 the vast sum of $1,232,000,000. The country as a whole during the last 10 years makes a marvelous showing as to the increase in the value of farm lands and buildings. The increase has been upward of 100 per cent. The total value of farm lands, including buildings, as shown by the census of 1900, was $16,675,000,000, while the returns so far made for the census of 1910 would indicate the aggregate would reach the stupendous sum of $34,000,000,000. Although the eastern farmer during the time mentioned felt keenly the depreciation of his holdings and the great loss that came to him, he could at least console himself with the thought that the burdens he bore were incident to the development of the area within our own territorial limits, and the benefits that accrued were added to the wealth of our own citizenship under favored conditions.

With tariff restrictions removed, the area to be opened in the Canadian northwest is greater, and its productive capacity in the cereals far exceeds that of the lands opened in our own western domain a generation since, that so greatly lowered the value of the farms of the East and of the Middle West, made the industry unprofitable, and resulted in the abandonment of millions of acres of farm lands.

Should this measure be enacted, in my judgment no other result can follow and history will repeat itself. The loss, however, will not fall this time alone upon the agriculturist of the East and of the Middle West as heretofore, but its blighting and depressing effect will more concern the farmer adjacent to the international boundary line, and especially those of the Northwest. Are the agriculturists called upon to again meet such a condition, suffer such great loss, and struggle through such an experience, not as a result of conditions within our own borders or for our own citizenship, but for another Government and for aliens under a foreign flag?

Mr. President, the States which are more directly in competition with the Canadian northwest, in the productions to which I have referred, are Wisconsin, Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota. The average value per acre of improved land in these States, as shown by the census of 1910, is almost double that of the average value of the lands in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta. I submit the following table of the value per acre of improved land in the Canadian Provinces, as given in the report of the Tariff Board. The value in the States named is from the last census:

Average value per acre of improved land in 1910.

United States.	Price per acre.	Canada.	Price per acre.
Wisconsin	$57.00	Manitoba	$29.00
Minnesota	46.00	Saskatchewan	22.00
North Dakota	28.95	Alberta	20.00
South Dakota	38.67		

There has been marvelous development and prosperity in my own State during the last decade. Each year during the past fourteen there has been contributed in the production of new wealth the largest percentage per capita of any State in the Union.

As shown by the census of 1900, the total value of farm land and buildings in the State of South Dakota was $220,133,000. Last year the census returns disclosed the value to be $1,003,451,000, an increase of 356 per cent. The average value per acre of farm land and buildings in 1900 was $11.54; in 1910 it had grown to $38.67, an increase of 235 per cent.

Independent of the effect the proposed measure will have on the prices of all products of the farm or of farm values, the people of my State have also a great interest in the proposed elimination of duties on the importation of live stock, in which they feel they will be injuriously and seriously affected in case of the ratification of the measure in question. I quote from the Crop Reporter, published by the Department of Agriculture, for February, 1910, giving the estimated number, average price, and total value of farm animals in South Dakota on January 1, 1910:

	Number.	Value.
Horses	612,000	$64,260,000
Mules	10,000	1,210,000
Milch cows	656,000	21,648,000
Other cattle	1,341,000	28,832,000
Sheep	829,000	3,316,000
Swine	805,000	8,963,000
Total	4,253,000	128,229,000

It will be observed from the foregoing table that the farmers of South Dakota have a large and increasing interest in this measure, which, they feel, will injuriously affect the value of all farm animals.

I will not take the time of the Senate to discuss at length the separate classes and items independent of what I have heretofore presented. In my judgment, the bill is a grievous and unwarranted assault upon every interest of agriculture, and opens the vast field of the Canadian northwest to direct and immediate competition with all productions of the farm, including live stock. It is in no sense reciprocal, nor does it propose an exchange in noncompeting products, but on the contrary it puts the farmers of the United States in open competition with the Canadian producer with substantially the same character of productions.

As I have heretofore stated, it is giving an advantage to the manufacturing interests of the United States, and the agriculturists are to be sacrificed in order to secure that advantage. It will be a benefit especially to the manufacturers of agricultural implements, to the great packing interests, to the great railway companies, especially along our northern borders; but in order to serve these interests and that large profits should come to them, is it either just or equitable that all of the agricultural interests should be imperiled, their profits reduced, and the value of their holdings lessened? The foundation of all prosperity lies in agriculture, and if its interests are to be jeopardized and the profits of the farm and the farmer are to be sacrificed, their loss and their discouragement will enter every avenue of industry, of commerce, of manufacture, as well as of transportation, and general depression, which will affect every commercial and industrial interest, must be the ultimate result.

Mr. President, the wheat produced by the farmer is placed upon the free list, but the great milling interest is protected by a duty on flour, bran, mill feed, and middlings, and in which the agriculturist has no advantage.

The producers of barley are shorn of their protection, but the malsters and the brewers are to suffer no loss, while barley malt retains a duty of 45 cents per 100 pounds.

While the farmer on this side of the line may raise flax, which has been protected by a duty of 25 cents per bushel, this measure removes that duty, but retains a duty of 15 cents per gallon on linseed oil produced therefrom for the benefit of the great oil mills of the country.

It is proposed that the American farmer shall meet free competition in the raising of his horses, cattle, sheep, and hogs, while the packers are still protected in a duty on dressed meats.

The farmer is to meet free competition in all his products, but in the things he has to buy they are to be purchased in a protected market. The farmer is to be sacrificed, and he is to bear the burden for the advantages that are to come to the millers, the maltsters, the packers, the publishers, the manufacturers, and the railway lines adjacent to the international boundary; and all this, Mr. President, to be accomplished under what seems to me the assumed and false assertion of the reduction of "the high cost of living," which in the end will not be realized by the ultimate consumer.

Mr. President, for my part I shall assume no such responsibility. I believe in giving equal opportunities to all classes of our population, and each should bear equally the burdens which necessarily flow from any economic system in our governmental life. The measure proposed is inequitable, unfair, unjust, is in the clearest sense class legislation, which should not be tolerated. It follows no known or recognized rule in our legislative history as far as tariff legislation is concerned, and, in my judgment, will not promote the end sought, but, on the contrary, will bring depression, discouragement, and great loss to a large class of our population, which, instead of being sacrificed by the enactment of this proposal, should receive the sympathy, the encouragement, and by legislation maintain them in their well-earned and strong position which, under adverse conditions, their energy, their industry, and their patriotism have wrought out.

Mr. President, as it has relation to what I have heretofore stated in connection with the prosperity and development of South Dakota under existing conditions, I ask to submit without reading as a part of my remarks the following extract from a report of the Director of the Census, a summary covering the agricultural productions of South Dakota, compiled from the Thirteenth Decennial Census:

WASHINGTON, *June 19.*

Statistics relative to the leading crops for the State of South Dakota collected at the Thirteenth Decennial Census, are contained in an official statement issued to-day by Acting Census Director Falkner. It is based on tabular summaries prepared under the direction of Dr. Le Grand Powers, chief statistician for agriculture in the Bureau of the Census. The figures are preliminary and subject to slight revision later, when a few other farms, whose returns, now incomplete, will be included in the final tables. It is not expected that these additions will materially modify the amounts or rates given in the present statement.

The leading crops in 1909, ranked in the order of valuation, were: Wheat, $42,881,000; corn, $26,385,000; oats, $16,038,000; hay and forage, $15,240,000; barley, $10,870,000; flaxseed, $6,993,000; emmer and spelt, $2,626,000; potatoes, $1,967,000.

DECREASE IN WHEAT.

From 3,984,659 acres in 1899 the wheat acreage fell off in 1909 to 3,104,622 acres, a decrease of 22.1 per cent. The preceding census showed an increase; the acreage being, in 1889, 2,259,846 acres. Although wheat decreased in acreage during the past decade, the aggregate yield increased for the same period from 41,889,380 bushels in 1899 to 45,289,818 bushels in 1909. The yield of wheat per acre was reported as 15 bushels; the value per acre, $13.80.

CORN MAKES BIG INCREASE.

From 1899 to 1900 the acreage of corn increased from 1,196,381 acres to 1,975,558, or 65.1 per cent. Notwithstanding the enormous gain by oats during the last decade, corn has retained its position among the cereals, ranking second in acreage and first in production. The acreage in 1889 was 753,309. The total yield for 1909 was 53,612,093 bushels, a lead over its nearest competitor in production—wheat—of more than 8,000,000 bushels. The average yield per acre was 27 bushels; the average value per acre, $13.35.

IMMENSE INCREASE IN OATS.

From 1899 to 1909 the acreage in oats increased from 691,167 acres to 1,480,075, or 114.1 per cent. During the past 10 years oats have more than doubled their acreage and are now pressing close upon corn for second place among the cereals. The acreage in 1889 was 580,289 acres. The aggregate yield in 1909 was 41,255,569 bushels; the average yield per acre, 28 bushels; the average value per acre, $10.80.

GREAT GAIN IN HAY AND FORAGE.

The acreage devoted to hay and forage in 1909 was 3,429,527 acres. It has been constantly increasing. With 1,554,913 acres in 1889, it rose to 2,287,875 in 1899, and again to 3,429,527 in 1909. The increase since 1899 has been 49.9 per cent. The acreage in 1889 was 1,554,913 acres. The total yield in 1909 was 3,649,577 tons; the average yield per acre 1.06 tons; and the average value per acre, $4.40.

BARLEY TRIPLES ITS ACREAGE.

From 1899 to 1909 the acreage in barley increased from 299,510 acres to 1,057,533, or 253.1 per cent. Since 1889, when 97,370 acres were harvested, this crop has multiplied more than tenfold. The increase in the decade, from 1889 to 1899, was notable, but that for the past 10 years has been even more remarkable. The total yield in 1909 was 20,325,498 bushels; the average yield per acre, 19 bushels; the average value per acre, $10.25.

FLAXSEED SHOWS INCREASE.

The area devoted to flaxseed in 1909 was 507,286 acres, as compared to 302,010 acres in 1899, an increase of 68 per cent. The acreage in 1889 was 354,951. The total yield in 1909 was 4,649,237 bushels, a gain of over 2,000,000 bushels. The average yield per acre was 9 bushels, and the average value per acre, $13.80.

POTATOES INCREASE.

From 1899 to 1909 potatoes increased in acreage from 33,567 acres to 50,203, or 49.6 per cent. The total yield in 1909 was 3,439,686 bushels; the average yield per acre, 68 bushels; the average value per acre, $39.20.

CROP COMPARISONS.

The cereals had an aggregate acreage of 7,892,482 acres in 1909, as against 6,211,202 acres in 1899, an increase of 1,681,280 acres, or 27 per cent, as compared to an increase for the preceding decade of 67.8 per cent. The average value of cereals per acre in 1909 was $12.50, over twice that of hay and forage. Wheat shows the highest average value per acre of the cereals; buckwheat the lowest. Of the hay and forage crops, alfalfa is well above the rest in average value per acre. There are but a small number of miscellaneous crops, though the average values per acre of several of them are well above those of the more usual crops.

Mr. GRONNA. I desire to give notice that on Thursday next, after the Senator from California [Mr. WORKS] shall have concluded his address, I intend to make some observations on the Canadian agreement.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CULLOM. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 3 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, July 1, 1911, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 30, 1911.

ASSISTANT SOLICITOR OF DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND LABOR.

Edward T. Quigley, of New York, to be Assistant Solicitor of the Department of Commerce and Labor. An original vacancy created by the act approved March 4, 1911, entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912, and for other purposes."

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

Cadet William Benjamin Hardigg, graduate of the United States Military Academy, for appointment as second lieutenant in the Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from June 13, 1911. His appointment as second lieutenant of Cavalry, submitted June 27, 1911, withdrawn.

CAVALRY.

Cadet Thomas Jonathan Jackson Christian, graduate of the United States Military Academy, for appointment as second lieutenant of Cavalry, with rank from June 13, 1911. His appointment as second lieutenant of Coast Artillery, submitted June 27, 1911, withdrawn.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 30, 1911.

MINISTER.

Nicolay A. Grevstad to be minister to Paraguay and Uruguay.

COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION.

Philander P. Claxton to be Commissioner of Education.

DEPUTY WARDEN OF FISHERIES.

G. Dallas Hanna to be deputy warden, Alaska service, Division of Alaska Fisheries.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Commander Marbury Johnston to be a captain.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) James S. Woods to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 4th day of March, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

Asst. Paymaster Frank T. Foxwell to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy from the 26th day of February, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

POSTMASTERS.

CONNECTICUT.

Alfred W. Converse, Windsor Locks.

KANSAS.

T. J. Robinson, Severy.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Hans N. Smith, South Windham.

MISSOURI.

Charles H. Grissom, Dexter.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, *July 1, 1911.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

The SECRETARY. The Senate will receive a message from the President of the United States.

A message in writing from the President of the United States was delivered to the Senate, by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

Mr. SMOOT. I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Will the Senator from Utah yield to me, that I may give a notice?

Mr. SMOOT. I will yield for a notice.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. Secretary, I give notice that on the 5th of July, during the morning hour, I will address the Senate upon a bill which I propose to introduce upon that day organizing a commission of interstate trade for the regulation of industrial corporations.

Mr. SMOOT. Did the Senator say the 5th or the 6th?

Mr. NEWLANDS. The 5th. We are not to adjourn until the 6th?

Mr. SMOOT. No; we are to adjourn until the 5th; but already there has been a notice given that on July 5 the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] will address the Senate. I suppose the Senator from Nevada means to follow the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. That will be all right. I move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. THORNTON. I request that the motion be temporarily withdrawn until I can give a notice.

Mr. SMOOT. I will withhold the motion until the Senator from Louisiana gives a notice.

Mr. THORNTON. I give notice that at the close of the morning business on Friday, the 7th, I shall desire to address the Senate upon the bill (H. R. 4412) to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, and for other purposes.

Mr. SMOOT. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to, and (at 12 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being under the previous order of the Senate, until Wednesday, July 5, 1911, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, *July 1, 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, whose changeless goodness pours itself out upon us in a thousand blessings day by day, receive our sincere thanks, pardon our sins, quicken our conscience, and strengthen us in every good resolution, that we may do the work Thou hast given us to do cheerfully, patiently, faithfully, and efficiently. In the spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message, in writing, from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House of Representatives that the President had approved and signed bill of the following title:

On June 30, 1911:

H. R. 8649. An act to authorize the extension and widening of Colorado Avenue NW. from Longfellow Street to Sixteenth Street, and of Kennedy Street NW. through lot No. 800, square No. 2718.

ADJOURNMENT OVER.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama moves that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Wednesday next.

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

ADMINISTRATION OF PUBLIC-LAND LAWS.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I have presented a resolution relating to the administration of public-land laws, and upon that resolution I ask unanimous consent that I may print in the RECORD the reasons for that resolution, so they may go with it in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to print a statement in the RECORD.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is it about? I would like to have some information as to what the gentleman desires.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, the resolution is intended to have the Public Lands Committee investigate the administration of the public-land laws relating to mining claims, homesteads, and the rights over public lands, so that the people may know the present condition of those laws. Under that resolution I have prepared a statement consisting of but little over three pages, showing the reason and necessity for such an investigation, and which simply is intended to bring out the subject of the administration of those laws.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, there was a very distinct understanding, not at the last meeting of the House, but at the meeting before the last, that no business of any kind should be transacted, but that we should simply meet to adjourn until after the Fourth of July. Therefore, I object.

PRINTING OF SPEECHES IN RECORD.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to get the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL]. I desire to make a request for unanimous consent. Of course, if the gentleman thinks it comes within the agreement, I will not insist upon it. I introduced a few days ago a joint resolution touching the printing of speeches and matter connected with them in the RECORD. The resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules, but it occurs to me that under the rules it ought to have gone to the Joint Committee on Printing. So I simply wanted to ask unanimous consent that the reference might be changed. But, as I say, if it comes within the purview of the agreement, of course I shall withdraw the request.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me the resolution is properly referred to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Of course, if there is going to be any contest about it, I shall not insist on it, because I do not want to take up the time of the House now.

Mr. DALZELL. I think the matter might very well go over.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania objects.

PERMANENT MANEUVERING GROUNDS, ETC.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and,