

American Economist

DEVOTED TO THE PROTECTION OF AMERICAN LABOR AND INDUSTRIES

VOLUME XLVII.—No. 8.

NEW YORK, FEBRUARY 24, 1911.

{ \$2.00 A YEAR.
SINGLE COPY, 5 CENTS.

TWO HEARTS THAT BEAT AS ONE.

A Republican President and a Democratic Free-Trader in Agreement on the Reciprocity Question.

(Correspondence AMERICAN ECONOMIST.)

Washington, February 23.—The House of Representatives has approved the Canadian "reciprocity" agreement by a vote made up of practically all the Democrats and about one-third of the Republicans. If the bill passes the United States Senate it will be by about the same relative proportion of votes of the members of the two parties in that body.

The most amazing spectacle that has been witnessed by the American people in a quarter of a century is that a professedly Protectionist Republican President and an avowed Free-Trade Democrat stand on the same platform. President Taft declares that he is a Protectionist, but he favors the entire removal of Protective duties on all products of the farm entering the markets of the United States from Canada. Champ Clark of Missouri, who is slated to be Speaker of the next House, is opposed to Protection, believes in a Tariff for revenue only, and at the same time, to make certain that no Protective duties shall be possible, he would so frame a Tariff that it would produce only revenue, and if not enough revenue he would increase direct taxes upon the people by imposing a graduated income tax.

"Protectionist" and Free-Trader Agreed.

President Taft has declared in many ways since the Canadian "reciprocity" agreement was proposed that he favors it because it will benefit American exporters and will not injure the American producer whose products it places on the free list. Champ Clark and his colleagues in the House of Representatives voted for the bill under the claim that it is a thoroughly Democratic measure and to just that extent curtails the measure of Protection to American industries and labor. In the midst of his speech Champ Clark called attention to what he said was the approval given by President Taft to three propositions, namely: Canadian reciprocity, reciprocity with Mexico and South America, and reciprocity with all nations of the civilized world! In an outburst of poetic enthusiasm, Mr. Clark declared the President and himself to be—

Two souls with but a single thought,
Two hearts that beat as one.

Another thing Champ Clark did in that speech was to declare that it was the

duty of every Democrat to oppose everything favored by THE AMERICAN PROTECTIVE TARIFF LEAGUE. Mr. Clark is certainly true to his declared principles in that behalf.

Early Stand Against Reciprocity.

On January 16, 1902, THE AMERICAN PROTECTIVE TARIFF LEAGUE passed a resolution which among other things declared:

Resolved, That reciprocity in competitive products by treaty is unsound in principle, pernicious in practice and condemned by all experience. It is contrary alike to the principle of Protection, to the fair treatment of domestic producers, and to friendly relations with foreign countries. . . . As at present advocated, reciprocity is a policy of favoritism. It would tend to array industry against industry and section against section at home, and foment industrial retaliation and political antagonism abroad. . . .

There is not an earnest, sincere, well-grounded Protectionist in the United States who does not know and believe that reciprocity in competing products, whether procured by treaty or by agreement, is just as wrong, just as pernicious and just as undesirable, whether with Cuba in 1902 or with Canada in 1911.

When the resolution above referred to was adopted by THE AMERICAN PROTECTIVE TARIFF LEAGUE, in 1902, Andrew Carnegie, who is now quoted as being in favor of the pending Canadian reciprocity agreement, gave his unqualified endorsement to the principle laid down in the resolution, and said:

We will make several enemies for everyone we favor. The policy of our fathers is the true Republican policy, the friend of all nations, the ally of none, equal justice to all, favoritism to none.

In the short space of nine years, Mr. Carnegie has forgotten the decided stand he took against reciprocity in competing products, and he is now said to be lined up with the Democratic party in Congress and President Taft in favor of just the kind of combined favoritism and injustice which in 1902 he denounced.

How to Destroy Protection.

One of the most distinguished Protectionists this country has known since the Civil War said at the time the Tariff League adopted the resolution above quoted:

It is quite easy to see why professional Free-Traders and even why the opposing party should encourage the administration in urging the policy of reciprocity. In the first place, it is the entering wedge which ultimately will disrupt the Protective policy. Those who honestly believe in Free-Trade very naturally will welcome and indeed labor hard to bring about such a consummation. Anything which will injure Protection, whether it be by a direct cutting down of the duties or by entirely disrupting the Protection party so as to make it at war with itself is all the same, so that the result is the overthrow of Protection.

That statement is as true in 1911 as it was when uttered in 1902.

Some notable speeches were made during the progress of the Canadian agreement through the House of Representatives. The policy of Protection in antagonism to destruction of Protection by piecemeal, in this Canadian agreement attack upon the interests of the farmer, was admirably set forth by Representative John Dalzell of Pennsylvania, who led, with six Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee, the opposition to the approval by the House of this agreement. Representative Underwood of Alabama, who is slated to be the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee in the next Democratic House, made a noteworthy speech, because in it he indicated what his plans and purposes will be as the maker of the next Democratic Tariff law. The speech by Champ Clark was also noteworthy in that it disclosed how thoroughly this distinguished Democrat believes that this Canadian agreement is Democratic, not Republican, and that it is in the interest of Free-Trade, not Protection.

Experience with Canadian Reciprocity.

Among the significant facts brought out in the speech by Representative Dalzell were his comparisons of existing conditions in Free-Trade with Canada under Protection and what really happened during the ten year period from 1854 to 1865, when we had a similar reciprocity agreement with Canada. Representative Dalzell quoted from a speech made by Senator Morrill, of Vermont, who advocated the abandonment of the former Canadian treaty, and who gave his reasons at the time the treaty was abandoned, as follows:

Our exports to Canada in 1855 were \$20,828,676, but under the operation of reciprocity, then commenced, they dwindled in 12 years down to \$15,243,834, while the exports of Canada to the United States increased from \$12,000,000 and odd to \$46,000,000 and odd. When the treaty began the balance of trade had been \$8,000,000 annually in our favor and that paid in specie, but at the end the balance against us to be paid in specie in a single year was \$30,000,000. Here was a positive yearly loss of over \$5,000,000 of our export trade and a loss of \$38,000,000 specie, all going to enrich the Canadians at our expense.

What We May Lose.

In striking contrast to the situation as it was presented under the former trade agreement with Canada, Mr. Dalzell pointed out that the balance of trade in our favor in 1910 was \$138,552,000, or 134 per cent. This striking showing is all the more emphasized when it is ob-

(Continued on page 101.)

AN ILL-ADVISED, JUG-HANDLED PLOT.

Robert Ellis Thompson's Keen Analysis of the Proposed Canadian "Reciprocity" Agreement.

(Written for the *Irish World* by Robert Ellis Thompson.)

Mr. Taft and his Free-Trade Secretary of the Treasury propose to the country to renew the folly of 1855, by re-establishing a "jug-handled" reciprocity with Canada. The only difference is that it is not a treaty, which might be rejected by a minority of our Senate, that they have negotiated, but an agreement that each country shall enact a special Tariff on the imports from the other. That is, they propose to evade the national Constitution, which guarded the country against inconsiderate agreements with other countries by requiring that they be ratified by a two-thirds majority of that branch of Congress which is least susceptible to the impulses of popular drifts. They purpose to carry such an agreement through both branches of Congress on a wave of feeling about lowering the cost of living, and by the pressure from the White House, which is organized for what are called Administration policies. The national Senate would consult its dignity by refusing even to vote on such a proposal.

No Guarantee of Permanence.

This treaty, which is not a treaty in the sense of the law, has no guarantee of permanence. Either party can repeal any part of it without notice to the other, and take advantage of the lower rates of duty, while it withdraws its own concessions, until the other has time to legislate. There is no time to elapse between "denunciation" and repeal, as in the case of a treaty. There are no rules of international law to control its interpretation. There is no international court to pass upon any dispute about its interpretation, and such disputes are sure to arise, as they did under the treaty of 1855. It is one of the finest arrangements for promoting quarrels and bad blood that could be devised, and its advent is hailed by our sentimentalists as opening a new era of good feeling between the two halves of this Western world.

Free-Trade in Farm Products and Fish.

The first feature of the arrangement is the admission of every kind of farm produce and of fish into America duty-free. Our national policy has created in New England one of the greatest food-markets in the world. Indeed New England never fed her own people. Even in Colonial times she drew upon the Middle Colonies for supplies of grain and the like; and Long Island Sound was the channel through which she exchanged her tar, lumber, oil and fish for pork, wheat and corn. With the rise of those States into great manufacturing communities, and the inflow of population from Quebec,

Nova Scotia and Europe, her need for imports of food has increased. One State produces grain enough to give its people a single meal in the year; another to feed its people for one day in the year; and so on.

What the Canadian Farmer Would Like.

Under our Tariff legislation this demand is met by our Middle and Western States, especially the latter. Of the great train-loads of Western meats, wheat, corn and flour, which cross the Alleghanies, only a small part reach the salt water. The rest is consumed by a few great cities, and by the manufacturing districts of New England. Naturally the Canadian farmer wants free access to this great market. He knows that the American Tariff does as much for our farmers as it does for our manufacturers, and he likes to hear the American farmer shout for Free-Trade in the expectation that he has nothing to lose by the lowering of the Tariff. If the Western farmer has sense enough to look at the question whole, this reciprocity plan will enlighten him, and give his representatives pause.

Great Wrong to American Fishermen.

The free admission of Canadian fish would be the crowning-stone of the edifice of the wrongs of our fishermen. We have just been bargaining away their traditional rights to fish within the bays of Canada, after bargaining away our control of the bays on the other side of the continent. We have agreed to put up with the inhospitable and illegal treatment of our fishermen in the matter of "wood, water and shelter." By the decisions of the Halifax Tribunal, under the Treaty of Washington, we paid to Canada a huge sum, on the credit of false statements made by Canadian officials as to the value of the fisheries in question. That bulk of American money has been capitalized by the Dominion government to pay subsidies to the rivals of our fishermen, and those bounties are paid to date. It is with fishermen subsidized out of our Treasury that our own are called to compete, and every rag of advantage to be withdrawn from men who pursue an employment the most exposed and the fullest of hardships. Of course they can give it up, and find work in the factories and on the farms, as others have done. But in that case on whom will our Navy draw for its supply of experienced seamen? These fisheries have been the nurseries of our Jack Tars from the beginning of our history. Well might the fishing vessels at Gloucester drape their flags at half-mast when the terms of this agreement was telegraphed to them. More that they have reason to half-mast the flag, on hearing of such a surrender of American interests.

Canada Offers Little in Return.

And what does Canada offer in return for these vast concessions? A fair return would be the opening of the Dominion to our manufactures. But she does

nothing of the sort. A few bulky articles, which are not imported from Great Britain because of the cost of transportation, such as carts, wagons and agricultural implements, are put upon the free list, or under a slightly reduced duty. As the Ottawa Evening Journal says: "The United States Executive has met us half-way about food and raw materials, and has said practically nothing about manufactures. The acceptance by the United States Cabinet of such an arrangement is, frankly speaking, a staggering surprise. If Congress accepts it, an excellent thing will have been accomplished for this country." Yes, but what sort of a benefit for our own country does this exulting Canadian think we will have achieved? It is substantially a renewal of the Treaty of 1855, which was "denounced" and repealed within a decade after its establishment.

What the Newspapers Wanted.

Among the things which are to come in free of duty are sawed lumber and wood alcohol. Lumber in logs is already on the free list, and can be had for making paper-pulp as cheaply as if this reciprocity plan were in force. What was wanted by our newspapers was the removal of all restrictions upon its export to America; but this is not promised. The Dominion government, which negotiates this arrangement, has no power in the matter, and promises nothing. "Fortunately," writes one Canadian editor, "the Dominion government has no control over the pulp-forests, and it is not to be expected that the Provinces will abandon their restrictions and prohibitions on export." This is a notable fact, as the two forces which have worked for a Reciprocity agreement are the newspapers, and a number of manufacturers of New England, who have hoped that cheap food from Canada would enable them to make higher profits by paying less wages. The former are no nearer their object than they were before. Canada does not mean to sacrifice her supply of pulp-wood to the necessities of the American press, except on terms which will recoup her for the loss. Export duties cannot be levied by an American State; but the Provinces of Canada retained that power when the Dominion was set up, and they mean to exercise it.

British Interests Well Guarded.

Naturally England does not half like the new adjustment of the commerce between Canada and America. The Free-Traders profess to rejoice over it as a great gain for the Free-Trade cause, as indeed it would be. But those who care for the perpetuity of the British empire, believe that the enlargement of commercial relations must lead to political results. Germany, they remember, was drawn into national unity by the Zollverein, among other forces. But they need not fear, so long as British interests are so carefully guarded as in this proposal. Every ad-

vantage we have from it is secured equally or in a higher degree to British trade. The discrimination of 25 per cent. higher duties on American than on English goods of the same class, remains in force. But hardly anything covered by the contract is of the class that England would send to Canada.

An Appeal to Baser Instincts.

The Times of New York says: "We can tell the Republicans that there is a sure presidential victory for the Democrats in the Canadian Reciprocity agreement if they reject it." The Springfield Republican thinks this worth quoting, and adds that if it do not pass this Congress the Republicans will bear the blame. It does not seem to have occurred to either of these highly moral and independent newspapers that any such thing as a principle might be at stake, and such a threat is an appeal to the baser instincts in either party or man. The infamy of selling their votes in Congress for a partisan benefit would be only a little less than it would be to sell them for hard cash. If we are to have Free-Trade with Canada, even of this one-sided sort, let the Free-Trade party enact it, and be responsible for the harm it will do the country. America will never respect any party which deserts its convictions for a political victory. That was the suicide by which the Whig party died when the Republican party arose to avow and act on its principles.

Whatever the Democrats may do or fail to do, genuine Republicans have no choice. To vote for this Reciprocity plan would be to sacrifice the end for which their party exists—*causa vivendi perdere causas*.

ROB'T. ELLIS THOMPSON.

Michigan Farmers Speak.

Cassopous (Mich.) Vigilant.

At yesterday's session the following resolutions were unanimously adopted by the Cass County Farmers' Institute, and a copy sent to Congressman Hamilton at Washington:

Whereas, the reciprocal treaty with Canada now pending before Congress is being urged for the express purpose of reducing the price of farm products, thereby lessening the income of the farmer, and inasmuch as we, the farmers of Cass County, assembled in our annual institute desire to be heard in this matter:

Therefore, We submit that the farmers should have in their homes those comforts and conveniences of life considered indispensable in urban households; that the farmers should be able to live decently, dress decently and educate their children properly. If these conditions are to prevail a sufficient farm income is a necessity. It should therefore be the duty of our government to aid the farmers in these matters instead of compelling them to sell in a Free-Trade market while they buy in a Protective Tariff market. Therefore,

Resolved, That we are opposed to the admission to this country free of duty of farm products from Canada or any other country unless all Tariff duties on commodities manufactured in the United States shall at the same time be removed.

WM. FIERO, President.

N. G. VAN NESS, Secretary.

MUST WE LEARN THE LESSON AGAIN?

Are We Forgetting the Protection Taught by Hamilton, Clay, Lincoln, Blaine and McKinley?

The most remarkable thing in American political life at this time is the determined efforts of would-be great American statesmen and actual great political leaders to defame, discredit, disgrace and destroy great American interests by Tariff reduction, while pretending to protect the same. This, after 125 years of experience showing Protection to be essential to general American prosperity and after trying the opposite policy several times with sure disaster and general distress and ruin where prosperity had reigned under Protection. These leaders have led our people to demand another taste of cheapness accompanied by its usual poverty and distress.

With a regular Free-Trade Democrat such folly and blindness are natural and expected, because it was born in him. Free-Trade was grafted on and instilled into his party some 80 years ago in behalf of American slavery as its only object of interest in this country; and they have never awakened to the fact that both of these proteges were long since dead and slavery buried out of sight. But with Republicans it is different, and they have no such excuse for ignoring the light and thus misleading their party following.

Are Republican leaders playing blind Democracy in Tariff matters? All we have to go by is their work. They filched their Tariff notions from the Democrats and beat them in reducing the Tariff. All this has been forced onto a Republican convention by the big stick and rich pap. And now the administration digs up Democracy's old Canada reciprocity of 1855, under ten years of which our exports to Canada fell off 25 per cent., while Canada's exports to us gained about 400 per cent. The terms of the Taft and the Pierce treaties are almost identical on products. If this is not switching the Republican party onto a Free-Trade track, if present leaders are followed, there is no Free-Trade in the Tariff question.

If these leaders are not followed, then where are the men to lead and save Protection by teaching the true doctrine? A Hamilton to teach that Protection by competition lowers cost and production. A Jefferson to insist that all Tariff reductions benefit foreigners to the injury of home producers. A Clay to teach the necessity of Protection for our general as well as industrial interests. A Lincoln to teach that when we buy at home we have the goods and the money, but when we buy of foreigners we have their goods and they have our money; while the man that lives at home on Tariff protected home products pays none of the Tariffs thereon. A Blaine to teach that true

American reciprocity admits of nothing which we can ourselves produce. A McKinley to teach that Protection furnishes revenue and expands our foreign markets.

Have we the teachers? It appears that all these lessons have to be learned over again by our people, and it is doubtful whether they will listen until they go through another period of Free-Trade disaster and distress from present leadership.

J. W. ALLFREE.

Newton, Iowa, February 22.

Don't Want Reciprocity.

The fight against the reciprocity treaty with Canada has been taken up in the legislature through a concurrent resolution introduced in the Senate by Senator Watkins. This action comes from the country members, who are thoroughly aroused against the treaty and who have been declaring they would enter a protest in the legislature. The general belief around the capitol is that while the house will probably have enough votes among its country members to pass such a protest, it is hardly likely that the Senate will concur. As a matter of fact the legislature is divided with a sharp distinction over this matter. All the city members are shouting for the treaty, while all the country members are strongly opposed to it. It is practically possible to call the roll on the question now because of the drawing of the line so sharply. Senator Watkins' resolution is as follows:

Whereas, The Canadian exports are very largely agricultural, and it is proposed to open the great American markets to the agriculture of Canada and to allow the vast and growing production of this great domain to come into active and unrestrained competition with the products of the American farmer, who has only recently come into his own and begun to receive some share of the benefits to be derived from the long-fostered industries and markets of the country; and,

Whereas, Believing that there is no possible adequate advantage to come to the American farmer from such reciprocal trade arrangements, but only agricultural stagnation, since we believe it is the ultimate purpose of this measure to materially reduce the price of the farmers' products; and,

Whereas, It is universally admitted that the general welfare and prosperity of the country is most intimately related to the prosperity and success of the American farmer; now therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Senate (the House concurring), That we deem the passage by Congress of a measure that will result in throwing open the markets of this country to Canadian agriculture, a menace to the American farmer and a violation of the policy of Protection to American industries; and further be it

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to each member of Congress from Michigan.

Michigan does not want Reciprocity—Free-Trade. Neither do the farmers of Osceola county, nor the people of Reed City, nor the Clarion. The Protective Tariff to the farmers, and Protection to American industries are good enough for us.—Reed City (Mich.) Clarion.

Within a week oats have reached the lowest price on the Chicago market in years. We wonder why.—Des Moines Capital.