

MR. A. B. FARQUHAR'S ADDRESS.

[Notable Deliverance before the Reciprocity Convention at Washington, D. C.]

"The history of reciprocity treaties, so far as this country is concerned, goes back to that concluded with Great Britain for Canada, in 1855. The history of successful application of the reciprocity idea by this country is far older—is, in fact, closely connected with the very origin of our government. The impulse that gave rise to our federal constitution, which has so magnificently redeemed its promise of forming a closer union and promoting the general welfare, first came from the incurable condition of affairs under the old confederation, in which all trade between the growing states was cut down by the power then possessed, and freely exercised, of stopping it as it crossed state boundaries. The duties levied by New Jersey under the confederation are recalled as having been peculiarly vexatious; not because she was an offender above all others, for the retaliatory impulse led more than one commonwealth astray in the mad endeavor to outdo its neighbors; but most vexatious because the position of that state, on the high-road from north to south, and right in the way between Philadelphia and New York, gave her an exceptional power to obstruct. In its action on inter-state commerce, the work of the constitution of 1787 was a formal and enduring treaty of reciprocity; for trade in one direction was granted by each state in return for trade in the opposite; and the principle was none the less manifest because reciprocity in that case was unlimited while the applications of the idea to Canada in 1855, to Hawaii and Spanish American republics, and to many countries in the treaties now before the United States senate, are carefully limited. We are justified in adducing our splendid success with unlimited reciprocity across state boundaries, as indicating for us a probable similar success with limited reciprocity across national boundaries, for substantially the same reasons in both cases: Each serves the whole country, and all participating countries, by advancing and widening commerce.

"The benefits of a wide commerce are material, intellectual and moral—material in satisfying outward wants by use of the over-production of our industry; intellectual, in teaching us the needs, the commercial customs and the mechanical devices of other nations, and stimulating us to meet rivalry abroad; moral, in the broadening and deepening of human sympathy that unconsciously accompanies all widening of the mental horizon. These benefits are so universally recognized that our people will wel-

come every extension of their commercial facilities, and will hold as enemies all who would interfere with such extension.

"We can only secure an unobstructed access for our manufactured goods to the foreign countries most ready to accept them by yielding an equivalent on our own part, and the way to do that, if our general scale of import duties is not to be modified, is by special arrangements with the countries into which we are endeavoring to introduce our goods.

"That our import duties as they stand invite retaliation from countries with whose interests they conflict, every week's cable dispatches bring us added testimony. Europe, frightened by the inroads of American wares in its markets, is considering ways and means for shutting us out. Our manufactures are on the threshold of every land, but are met with closed or closing doors. Those doors can only be opened by tariff concessions in return for reciprocal concessions. Our lamented president in his last and greatest speech, clearly stated the case: 'We cannot longer expect to sell unless we buy.' Our tariff is the highest in the history of the world, and to allay the general antagonism its rates have aroused, we must have reciprocity treaties. Russia has recently proven how quickly a demand for six or eight million dollars' worth of American manufacturers could be cut off, while Germany is maturing a schedule of duties expressly intended to close her markets against the goods now exported from this country. Their new tariff, designed to replace that now in force, is quite complicated, but clear enough in that it largely increases the duty on almost everything imported from us. For example, the advance is 600 per cent. on bicycles, 80 per cent on shoes, 100 per cent on wagons, pumps, mowing machines, etc. Some of their highest advances are upon farm products. The German minister announces that this schedule is not final, but that it is a basis on which special treaties with other countries may be made; so that it teaches us what we may expect if we fail to make our treaty.

"Our manufactures are now practically barred from France by a maximum tariff, which we alone of all important nations are forced to pay. But over two years ago a treaty was negotiated with France under the direction of president McKinley, by which we offered an average reduction of less than seven per cent. on 126 items out of 705 named in the Dingley tariff. The French government conceded an average reduction of 48 per cent on 635 items of the 654 items in their schedule, leaving but 19 unaffected. It was estimated that this treaty would

have increased our exports to France by twenty-five to thirty millions of dollars. President McKinley told me that he looked upon it as a magnificent bargain for our country, and that he did not believe a single one of our industries would be appreciably injured; and yet the senate has left it to lie idly on the table. A second extension of time has been agreed upon at the request of our government. The manufacturers' committee of which I was a member, visited Washington a number of times in its interest. We had the earnest support of the president from first to last, and the senate committee upon foreign relations voted unanimously to report the treaty with a recommendation for ratification, yet the senate failed to act upon it.

"The failure to ratify this treaty has increased the feeling against us and made the action of the Russian and German governments seem reasonable. Must it not be an excuse for other governments to take similar action? The sentiment in favor of reciprocity generally, and the ratification of the French treaty in particular, has been growing stronger day by day. It has the support of nearly all the press and boards of trade everywhere. The action of the Russian government shows in an impressive object lesson how speedily a hard blow may be struck back at our commerce. A campaign of education must be carried on throughout the country by those who are interested that our manufactures should not be crippled by such blows. We are the greatest manufacturing nation upon earth, and the general prosperity depends largely on that of the manufacturers of the country. To secure that prosperity we must seek, in our dealings with Europe, to give ourselves reciprocity in the place of retaliation, by moulding conflicting interests into harmony through treaties amicably concluded for mutual benefit. Such treaties have now become necessary to us as never before. Formerly we were content with trade among ourselves, but our marvelous resources, supplemented by inventive skill and economical methods, have given us the industrial supremacy of the world. Our capacity for production at low cost renders foreign markets a necessity to keep our labor employed.

"Yet undoubtedly, despite the benefits which our manufacturing enterprise will draw from the extension of our markets abroad, it is from a few manufacturers of the United States that the strongest opposition is feared. Some of that opposition has already found utterance, and is notably bitter in tone—not sparing even our late President from its scathing criticism. But we are here less concerned with the motives and the manner of ob-