

@

HF2601

H66

Cornell University Library  
HF 2601.H66

The Canadian agreement as related to the



3 1924 014 100 162

mann

**THE CANADIAN AGREEMENT AS RELATED TO THE FARM HOME  
AND COST OF LIVING IN CITIES.**

---

**SPEECH**

OF

**HON. ASHER C. HINDS,**

OF MAINE,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

*Saturday, April 15, 1911.*

---

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 4412) to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, and for other purposes—

Mr. HINDS said:

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

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

**THE QUESTION TO BE ARGUED ON BROAD NATIONAL GROUNDS.**

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

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

**BURDENS AND BENEFITS NOT JUSTLY APPORTIONED.**

The manner in which this bill distributes its supposed benefits and its undoubted hardships violates mankind's fundamental idea of justice and equity.

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

Names count for much with us, and the names of Blaine and McKinley are being used to commend this proposition. There is no warrant for this. In his youth, in 1864, as a Member of this House, Mr. Blaine voted to repeal an arrangement with Canada far better than the one proposed now, since it gave free coal, which this does not. And in his later days Mr. Blaine in his Twenty Years of Congress referred to that reciprocity as "one-sided, vexatious, and unprofitable." Mr. McKinley made the very tariff duties which you are now trying to sweep away; and, like Mr. Blaine, never favored reciprocity in competing products.

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

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

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

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

#### LONG ESTABLISHED POLICY SHOULD BE REVERSED ONLY AFTER CAREFUL EXAMINATION.

I am not one of those who believe that a policy should always continue because it has continued a century and a quarter. Because butter, wheat, oats, and potatoes were protected in 1824 is not in itself a reason why they should be protected now. Because even the Democratic tariff makers in 1857 and again in 1894 considered it wise to give the farmers a substantial protection is not a compelling reason to constrain our acts here and now. But when wise men

and partially wise men in certain situations have at different times reasoned out the same line of action, what they have done has attained great authority and dignity. Statesmen and jurists have used their acts as the mariner uses the lighthouse. They have been disregarded only after the fullest investigation and the most mature deliberation.

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

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

#### THE NECESSITY OF ACCURATE REASONING ON THIS QUESTION.

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

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

#### GREAT DISTINCTION BETWEEN THE FARM HOME AND THE FACTORY.

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

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

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

The farmer acquires land that he may found a home.

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

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

Dividends are the fundamental condition of manufactures.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### INDEPENDENCE OF THE FARM HOME AND ITS RELATION TO MANUFACTURES.

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

#### EQUILIBRIUM BETWEEN AGRICULTURE AND MANUFACTURES.

This brings us to the question of proportion, or equilibrium, of manufactured and agricultural products. And it is right here on this point that the whole situation likely to be created by this reciprocity treaty develops itself. Our manufactures, syndicated as they are by trusts and associations, are easily controllable and do not tend to run into an overproduction, disastrous to profits on capital or the wages of labor. But the farms, being an aggregation of homes, disorganized, and each impelled by its own necessities, tend constantly to over-

produce. And this overproduction becomes disastrous unless the limitation of acreage possible to be cultivated intervenes to prevent. Therefore the element of prime importance in this discussion is the relation of acreage to the capacity of the home market furnished by the nonagricultural classes.

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

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

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

#### RELATION OF THE EQUILIBRIUM TO NATIONAL POWER AND SOCIAL LIFE.

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

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

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

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

#### HOW THE EQUILIBRIUM OF THE FARMERS’ MARKET WAS LOST.

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

Up to 1850 this equilibrium between agriculture and the home market was maintained the world over, because transportation was still costly on land and sea, and agricultural products, being bulky, were restrained by the cost of

freight from flooding any particular market. But from 1850 onward the application of steam to land and water transportation revolutionized the economic condition of the world, and soon brought to the front one great and all-controlling economic phenomenon—the opening of the broad and fertile prairies of the western United States.

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

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

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

In New England this destruction of his markets brought the farmer a great revolution and a long dearth. The measure of that dearth is found in the values of farms and farm buildings in those six States. When agriculture has a fair chance, farm values ought to increase. The accumulations of industry ought to result in permanent improvements, the betterment of buildings, the fertilization of the land. What was the case? The total value of the farm realty of New England in 1890 was very little more than it had been in 1860, 30 years before. In those 30 years that splendid race of farmers practically stood still, and \$20,000,000 measures the only increase in the value of their property. From 1890 to 1900 the increase was nearly \$40,000,000, and from 1900 to 1910, when the equilibrium of markets was restored, the increase was over \$170,000,000. [Applause on the Republican side.] I dwell on this feature of the equilibrium of markets because the percentage of this increase bears a striking resemblance to that between 1850 and 1860, when the old equilibrium existed.

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

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

Year.	Total.	Maine.	New Hampshire.	Vermont.	Massachusetts.	Rhode Island.	Connecticut.
1910.....	\$3,798	\$2,650	\$3,176	\$3,442	\$5,238	\$5,287	\$5,166
1900.....	2,753	1,628	2,392	2,510	4,189	4,206	3,616
1890.....	2,579	1,590	2,270	2,473	3,710	3,977	3,609
1880.....	2,802	1,591	2,367	3,078	3,806	4,164	3,957
1870 <sup>1</sup> .....	3,240	1,722	2,719	4,120	4,393	4,019	4,871
1860.....	2,589	1,413	2,285	2,980	3,462	3,616	3,607
1850.....	2,222	1,173	1,181	2,129	3,202	3,170	3,240

<sup>1</sup> One-fifth should be deducted for depreciated currency.



## THE DEARTH NOT PECULIAR TO NEW ENGLAND.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## SIMILAR EFFECTS IN THE ENGLISH FARMER'S MARKET.

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

Agriculture in England—

89673—9828

He says—

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

The English tariff commission gives in 1906 the same report:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The German farmer owes his proud position largely to the wisdom of Bismarck, a statesman of that school who investigate first and then act, instead of acting first and investigating afterwards. [Applause.] He had been a free trader, but facts converted him, and in May, 1879, he bore this testimony in the Reichstag:

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

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

## HAPPY POSITION OF THE FRENCH FARMER UNDER PROTECTION.

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

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

## TARIFF ON AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS PROTECTS FROM TROUBLE.

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

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

When the long dearth comes to the farmer there are no spectacular accompaniments. He finds one day that his market has dropped below the line of profit. He drives home sadly, searching his mind in vain for a cause that may lie at the end of a railroad a thousand miles away, or 10,000 miles away across two oceans. As prices continue low, he goes quietly to the local Pharaoh, and soon the farmer holds the title and pays the taxes, while the Pharaoh holds the mortgage and gets what little income there is, although there is not much in it for even the Pharaoh. And so the long struggle goes on. When the farmer's arm fails, the children take up the battle—the son or the daughter. When the trouble comes to the factory, the machinery stops and the smoke ceases to roll from the tall chimney. The smoke does not fail in the farmhouse chimney, for on the hearth burns the oldest altar fire of the race. The farm goes on through the long dearth, but the hardship is none the less great.

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

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

## WHAT WILL CANADIAN COMPETITION DO?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

In the commodity a deficit of—

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

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

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

#### GREGORY KING'S LAW AS ILLUSTRATING THE POTATO SITUATION.

In connection with this law of Gregory King, the potato situation in the United States is worth considering. While the consumer in the cities has found potato prices high, the farmers know that potatoes have been low, around 25 cents a bushel. Our own farmers have overstocked our own home market, great as that is, our manufacturing industries alone disbursing to their officers and employees, who are consumers, over \$3,000,000,000 a year in salaries and wages. Do you know how little of acreage participates in the overproduction that knocks down the potato market—to the producer, not to the consumer

necessarily? Potatoes are produced all over the United States to an extent that meets a large proportion of the local demand, but 13 counties in what are called the 5 potato States—Maine, New York, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota—make up the deficit and produce this year the one-tenth or two-tenths of surplus, which, under Gregory King's law, drives down the price three-tenths or eight-tenths. Our 13 counties are liable to overstock even our magnificent home market, where \$3,000,000,000 of industrial wages are floating about, and our potato farmer prospers only because he gets good years in with the bad. But add to our 13 counties the acreage of the great potato Provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Quebec, with the hope of our near-by home market to stimulate their farmers, and bad years must inevitably be constant. Their whole surplus will pour over our line, because they have no home market to absorb it. The industrial disbursements of those Provinces are but little more than those of the little State of Rhode Island.

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

#### CONDITIONS IN CANADA'S FOUR EASTERN PROVINCES.

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

#### BOUNDLESS RESOURCES OF WESTERN CANADA AS A COMPETITOR.

When we turn to western Canada we have a repetition of the conditions which once prevailed in the United States. Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, and British Columbia are an empire of a million square miles. The Canadian representative at the International Institute at Rome told the delegates last year the prairie Provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta were as large as England, France, Germany, and Italy. The five great western Provinces, rich in a fertile soil, have a domain as great as that of the combined States of Illinois, Missouri, Iowa, Wisconsin, Minnesota, the two Dakotas,

Kansas, Nebraska, Oklahoma, and Texas. When we remember the vast flood of agricultural produce that those States have poured into the markets of the world we can form some idea of what western Canada will do to the equilibrium of markets for the next two generations of Americans. The London Economist, England's great journal of finance and trade, has recently sent a correspondent into western Canada. After noting that the United States produced 600,000,000 bushels of wheat in 1910, this correspondent records that in the Canadian west there are 200,000,000 acres of wheat land not yet touched by the plow that can produce 3,000,000,000 bushels of wheat annually, and there are furthermore 250,000,000 acres suitable for cattle raising. But wheat and cattle are not the only products. In 1909 Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta produced 10,000,000 bushels of potatoes, and in the last year the dairy commissioner of Canada has noted that the dairying industry is growing rapidly in northern Saskatchewan and northern Alberta. Northern Ontario, hitherto almost unknown, but now opened up for mining, has been found to have splendid potato land, equaling the best in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. The Canadian Pacific and Grand Trunk are opening up this region to settlers and promise to make it as populous as older Ontario.

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

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

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

#### VAST POSSIBILITIES OF AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE UNITED STATES.

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

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

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

Only one-half the land in private ownership is now tilled. That tillage does not produce one-half what the land might be made to yield, without losing an atom of its fertility.

In profit we are satisfied with a small yield at the expense of the most rapid soil deterioration. We are satisfied with a national annual average product of \$11.33 per acre at the cost of a diminishing annual return from the same fields, when we might as well secure two to three times that sum.

WE SHOULD ENCOURAGE AND NOT DISCOURAGE THE FARMER.

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

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

MAINE AN EXAMPLE OF WHAT FAIR MARKETS WILL DO.

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

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

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

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

## THE GREATEST OPPORTUNITY FOR CONSERVATION.

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

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

[Applause.]

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

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

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

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

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

	Received by farmer.	Paid by consumer.
Onions.....	\$821,000	\$8,212,000
Potatoes.....	8,437,000	60,000,000
Coffee.....	2,501,000	12,009,000
Rice.....	1,334,000	6,191,000
Cabbages.....	1,825,000	9,125,000
Milk.....	22,912,000	48,880,000
Eggs.....	17,238,000	28,730,000
Meat and poultry.....	219,300,000	201,000,000
	274,280,000	404,147,000



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

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

Mr. Yoakum shows that the price of the potato increased more than seven times on its way from the farmer to the New York City consumer. If this high authority is correct, has anyone searched the people who have that potato between the time it leaves the farmer's hands and gets to the consumer? And if no one has, ought it not to be done before we try and convict the farmer as the robber and sentence him to lose his paltry protection of 25 cents a bushel? Is the man who takes one-seventh for a potato he has planted and raised to be pursued, while no questions are to be asked as to those who get the six-sevenths?

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

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

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

#### THE TARIFF OF NO EFFECT ON PRICES TO THE CONSUMER.

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

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

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

#### CONSUMERS OF COAL, FLOUR, AND MEAT.

By admitting that this question should be settled on broad, national grounds only, I do not wish to be understood as condoning in any way the great injustices committed on certain industries and certain sections of the country. It has been a longing of New England, stimulated by the Democratic orators

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

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

#### THE FISHERIES.

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

#### THE SAFE AND UNSAFE COURSE.

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

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

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

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



